

## **Sent Home: Mapping the Absent Child into Migration Through Polymedia**

Deirdre McKay, Geography, Keele University, UK

### **Abstract**

Migrants and their transnational families represent children on social networking sites, documenting child-rearing practices to enhance social mobility. This article identifies a new group of migrant children—those sent home to parents' countries of origin for an imagined "good childhood." It demonstrates that social networking sites (SNS) sustain these children and create new norms for publicness and visibility in transnational parenting. Exploring how families document child-raising across international boundaries, it shows how the trajectories of parenting relationships remain open ended. The article counters the predominant focus on transnational parenting as a kind of abandonment attached to left-behind children. Instead, it refocuses research on the opportunities polymedia affords to families to create and sustain intimacies, making the trajectories of migrant families and children increasingly dynamic. The article thus documents important shifts within the global migration—a transformation that requires changes in the way scholars approach transnational families and long-distance parenting.

Keywords: social networks; transnational families; transnational migrants; children; ICTs; citizenship

Word count:

d.c.mckay@keele.ac.uk

## **Sent Home: Mapping the Absent Child into Migration Through Polymedia**

Deirdre McKay, Geography, Keele University, UK

### <A> Introduction

Examining how sent-home children are represented on social networking sites, this article reveals how child-rearing practices open up social mobility for transnational families. The article analyzes a case study of British-born children of Filipino migrants parents who have been sent home to the Philippines, making an original contribution to the study of global migration and transnational parenting. It identifies a new group of migrant children—those sent home to parents’ countries of origin for an imagined “good childhood.” It then demonstrates how these children are sustained by the expanding role of social networking sites (SNS) and polymedia as technology creates new norms for publicness and visibility in transnational parenting. By showing how the trajectories of these relationships remain open ended, the article counters the predominant focus on transnational parenting as a kind of abandonment attached to left-behind children. Instead, it reveals how polymedia offers new ways to create and sustain family intimacies, making the trajectories of migrant families and children increasingly dynamic. The article thus documents important shifts within the dynamics of global migration—a transformation that requires changes in the way scholars approach transnational families and long-distance parenting.

Around the world, labor migrants seek to convert their short-term contracts in host countries into eventual citizenship. Permanent status

should then open up secure opportunities for family formation. In the United Kingdom, however, austerity has undermined the abilities of contract and even settled migrants to raise children. Here, some Filipino professionals now opt to send their British-born children home. In the Philippines, their children are raised in less precarious surroundings and are parented long distance via polymedia. In what follows, I show how, by repatriating children with British citizenship, parents express their continuing affective investment in their Philippine connections. In the Philippines, their sent-home children sustain transnational families while expanding flexible citizenship into more global and popular forms.

Globally, it is well established that children's movements and the ways their absence and presence are mediated give shape to transnational family practices. Children absent from their biological parents and separated from them by national borders are found in this situation for a number of reasons. Left-behind children are separated from their parent(s) by transnational migration, often permanently and with damage to that relationship, at great emotional cost. Children themselves may cross borders to work or for their own education, while some children are trafficked into forced labor or sexual exploitation. Other children are adopted transnationally. Another category of children is those who are fostered in a country other than that in which their parents reside or sojourn. Children who are born while their migrant parents are abroad and then sent home occupy another part of this continuum of absence. While transnational migration creates social mobility for migrants and their families, it also reinforces inequalities in their sending country. In this context, children's movements and absences shape both their wider family's social mobility and migrant-sending societies. Transnational

migrants who send children home seek to offer them the best possible childhood through the spatial separation. Such separations are often predicated on the availability of new information and communications technologies (ICTs).

ICTs afford new kinds of co-presence in daily life. Scholars exploring ICTs in transnational families have highlighted their benefits and limits, focusing on the quality of co-presence and the sense of intimacy experienced by ICT users and family members (Baldassar et al. 2016: 134; Baldassar 2016; Madianou 2016; Madianou and Miller 2012; Madianou 2016; Nedelcu 2012). This paper shifts that focus from the intimate content of these long-distance relations to their more public performance on SNS, focusing on families with children and parents living apart. Rather than querying intimacy or the experiences of left-behind children (Parreñas 2005; Yeoh et al. 2012), it explores how making these long-distance, mediated family practices quasi-public opens up new strategies to perform and attain social mobility. For migrant parents, the potential to mediate co-presence via ICTs and thus transcend physical absence makes long-distance child-rearing possible. Much of the literature on transnational families has focused on parenting and family practices, particularly on the emotional toll migration takes on mothers and their ambivalence about long separations from their children. More recent studies on the impacts of ICTs on these relationships have extended this theme, but they have found that the technologies created redemptive effects, enabling both intensified intimacies and surveillance practices. This paper complements work on the quality of intimacy within long-distance parenting relationships and relationships between migrant parents and children's caregivers (e.g., Poeze et al. 2016) through exploring the more public aspects of SNS. Social

media make parenting relationships with sent-home and left-behind children public, and thus become part of the assemblage through which migration and childhoods are governed.

Beginning in the mid 1990s, scholars and policy makers became concerned with the impacts of parental migration on left-behind children in the Philippines (Asis 2006; Parreñas 2005.) Since the mid 2000s, there has been growing interest in the prevalence and challenges of long-distance parenting for migrants and families using social media (e.g., Madianou and Miller 2012.) The study of technology in sustaining such transnational family practices has moved on from initial work on text-and-phone-call parenting (McKay 2012; Parreñas 2005; Vertovec 2004) to webcam-chat parenting (Madianou and Miller 2012) and now to polymedia—a much fuller array of interlinked media platforms mostly accessed by smartphone, tablet, and laptop computer (Baldassar et al. 2016; Madianou and Miller 2013). Here, SNS are key platforms for migrants.

SNS such as Facebook enable people to recreate the transnational space of communication as a quasi-public field where “networked privacy” obtains (Marwick and boyd 2014 cited in Madianou 2016: 195). Here, what is particular to the mediate is that privacy is no longer an individual choice or shaped by a dyadic relation, but depends on relationships between individuals within networks. With Facebook’s dynamic privacy rules, comments and “likes” enable a post to be seen by “friends of friends” rather than only the intended correspondent. Thus, posting documentary evidence of transnational family practices (e.g., photographs of events, pictures of conversations, meals, celebrations, and the like) on SNS represents a choice to make these events accessible to others. People

choose to make particular aspects of transnational parenting and intimacy accessible to others through their own digital relationships with other people and their broader networks. The reasons behind their actions in making intimacy quasi-public and shaping such posts to strategic ends form a critical element of what Nedelcu (2012) calls the “new geographies of everyday life” for transnational families. This quasi-public space is where transnational families and members of the wider diaspora express anxieties about absent children and negotiate new norms for childhood and parenting.

The quasi-public space of social media draws together anxieties about children’s movements and ICTs. Children’s mobility has often been assumed to undermine family practices by creating anxiety and alienation, but this assumption does not hold in all instances, particularly with strong extended-family networks available to support both parents and children (Holdsworth 2013). Children are not different from other people living increasingly mobile lives (Elliot and Urry 2010) who can retain their sense of connectedness to others through their everyday mobility patterns. Distance, likewise, is not necessarily an insurmountable obstacle in building and sustaining familial intimacy (Baldassar 2016; McKay 2007, 2012). Like those in all families, transnational family exchanges are both reciprocal and asymmetrical, but can be more fraught or highly charged because distance offers increased opportunities for missed and misinterpreted communication (Baldassar 2016). Because distance and absence are not the source of all problematic aspects within long-distance family and intimate relationships, attributing family problems to the study of the weaknesses and failures of media platforms would be reductive (Madianou and Miller 2012). Long-distance, mediated family care is, in

many instances, capable of delivering an experience of adequate “distant co-presence” or care (Baldassar 2016). But mediation in these relationships is never an entirely neutral practice of translation. Media technologies can act as forces with trajectories of their own, shaping the fields that their affordances create (Baldassar 2016: 148). Using ICTs successfully to sustain transnational family practices requires not only accessible and affordable services, but families with time, education, social networks, technical skills, and money to spend (Baldassar et al. 2016: 138). The particularities of social media shape the messages sent, received, and understood, and thus the social meaning attached to sending children home.

This paper explores migrants’ practices of long-distance child-rearing for sent-home children by applying three concepts—polymedia (Madianou and Miller 2013); affective investments (Faier 2013); and prosthetic citizenship (McKay 2016)—to analyze ethnographic data collected with transnational families. These concepts are used to map posts on SNS that connect Filipino migrants in the UK with their sending families and children in the Philippines. My analysis shows how the new norms of long-distance belonging social media afford reconfigure transnational family practices and social norms for investment and citizenship.

### <A> Approach

I make the argument that social media are affording new norms of long-distance belonging and reconfiguring family practices and social norms with ethnographic data from interviews with 61 Filipino migrants and from participant observation in family and community events in London (2009–

2014), in the Philippines, and on social media. The case studies that feature in this article draw on an additional and separate set of nine formal interviews conducted in 2012 and 2013 in transnational families where parents were living in the UK and children in the Philippines. Data from transcripts of these interviews are supplemented by participant observations at community events and family gatherings, observations on social media platforms, and iterative follow-up interviews by Skype and Messenger chat (via Facebook). Combined, and then placed within the wider project (McKay 2016), these sources comprise a robust, diachronic set of qualitative data on sent-home children.

My migrant respondents in this study were all Filipinos from the Kankanaey ethnic group, one of the recognized groups of indigenous people from the Cordillera Central in the archipelago's northern island of Luzon. Importantly, the "good childhood" they imagined for their children was embedded in their Kankanaey culture. Kankanaey ideals for childhood and parenting have some differences from what a more homogenous set of class-inflected, generically Western expectations might be among mainstream Filipinos (Jocano 1998; Scott 1993). My data come from my broader study of transnational cultural practices of sustaining care (McKay 2016) in which I made it clear I was not examining my respondents' long-distance parenting to assess how globally (im)proper it might be. Instead, my approach was to celebrate, with them, the choices—though difficult—they had made to give their kids the best possible future, and the successes and challenges along that route. Following social media profiles was key to this approach.

<B> The general shape of polymedia



Madianou and Miller (2013: 170) define polymedia as “an emerging environment of communicative opportunities that functions as an “integrated structure” within which each individual medium is defined in relational terms in the context of all other media.” Thus different polymedia platforms have different uses and represent a particular kind of choice to balance distance and intimacy in communication (Baldassar 2016; Madianou and Miller 2012.)

For the 61 respondents in my larger study, emails, like letters, were comparatively indirect and asynchronous. Thus email felt more formal than a more spontaneous short message service (SMS) text exchange via phone or a chat exchange with Facebook’s Messenger function. Emails and Facebook chat messages were generally used to convey private information, which often included details of financial transactions or intimate conversations with sexual content or gossip. Other text-based platforms were an intermediate step towards publicness. Snapchat was most private, WhatsApp was group oriented, Twitter was public, and Facebook semipublic. Meanwhile, video calls, voice calls, and real-time chat—using Skype, FaceTime, or Messenger—were more intimate because they facilitated simultaneous co-presence, so produced more free-flowing interactions. Real-time chat was occasionally semipublic, with multiple people present at both ends of the conversation. Polymedia thus offered a complex ecology, giving people multiple ways to communicate a message and then share or store it. People saved emails and text chats and would show them to others as evidence of a particular communication, sometimes ignoring expectations that these would remain confidential. Facebook’s record of photographs and comments, in contrast, served as a kind of

quasi-public archive (McKay 2010, 2016). Thus my respondents were relaxed about my “friending” them on Facebook and discussing photos and posted comments or “likes.” To explain the context for these posts, they would sometimes show me text messages, the text of saved chats, or saved emails. Most of the time, they talked about Facebook with me in the same way they would talk about it with their peers, greeting me with “Have you seen ... on my Facebook?”

For my subset of nine respondents here, the public aspect of Facebook made it unique among the SNS they used. Thus it is worthwhile examining how, specifically, my respondents used this platform to shape social mobility through children’s mobility. Facebook was the “front channel” to contemporaneous private conversations, sustained by “backchanneling” on WhatsApp, Snapchat, Messenger, Skype, and SMS, and, occasionally, by voice calls (Baldassar 2016: 149). Everyone watched Facebook. However, they made their “serious” comments on what they saw there to others through more private platforms, not on the comments threads beneath Facebook posts. Their Facebook comments—with some significant exceptions—were generally positive, supportive, anodyne, or joking, posted in acknowledgement, not discussion. So, how absent children are represented and how these representations are engaged by publics and extended kin on Facebook becomes a key site of statements about family fortunes and family practices. We can think of accreted Facebook posts as a version of Appadurai’s (2003, 2016) archive of aspiration, revealing how polymedia frames the ways members of the emergent middle class from the Philippines move their children to secure social mobility.

The revelatory aspects of social media transform norms for personal intimacy, status, and ritual—and thus social practices themselves—within diasporic Filipino communities (Madianou 2012; Madianou and Miller 2012; Miller and Slater 2000). The transformation of social practices is particularly true of parenting practices that are at once highly particular to the child and parent(s) and very social—it takes a village. This village is a mediated one, because the combination of social media and family separations in a translocal field makes parenting very public. Social media meet a need to make visible things heretofore private, to recruit support for parenting approaches and share triumphs, and to maintain continual contact across distance. Facebook thus picks up and provides evidence of intimacy sustained on other platforms. For instance, among my respondents I saw “all-day Skype”—parents with a continually open channel in a jacket pocket feeding into a computer screen “back home.” This practice materialized Madianou’s (2016) concept of “ambient co-presence” and was polymediated, being linked with Facebook Messenger chat and Facebook posts. All of this would be facilitated by adults and documented on Facebook to show how, and how regularly, parents in London were in contact with Philippines-resident children.

My respondents used Facebook to share stories about long-distance parenting. On Facebook, for example, their “friends” could see Sonny giving Aila a birthday gift of an iPhone 6 in a London restaurant. Her new phone would help them stay in touch, via Skype, with their young son, Eric, back in the Philippines. Sonny and Aila’s Facebook profiles each then featured photos of Eric, taken via Skype on the iPhone, engaged in parallel play to the camera. Their posted comments showed that Eric was receiving feedback and encouragement from his parents on the audio feed. While

these polymedia connections don't give the same affective fullness as in-person contact, they are neither abandonment nor refusal of relationship. Instead, people are building new communicative ecologies of long-distance (co)parenting and family and developing very dispersed full-time intimate communities around parenting. These practices revealed a definite generational divide; Sonny and Aila are in their thirties. While people of all ages in migrants' families have discovered that constant flow of presence, potential interaction, and emotional availability across an open channel is something they wanted but didn't know how to articulate until they found polymedia, migrants in their 30s were most likely to explore all platforms for digital parenting, both when co-present with their children and especially in separation. Older family members were more skeptical and somewhat less adept with the technologies involved.

Here, the ways people think and feel about themselves as parents of very young children in and through a digitally mediated world become evident in their choices within the communicative ecology of polymedia: between webcam and chat and social networks. Facebook, in particular, was important because of its publicness—or, at least, “community-ness”—and its use by people of all ages in the transnational families I studied. This platform was the nexus where the trade-offs of money, space, family intimacy, career, and a child's perceived needs were played out for observers. To post about children to Facebook is to join in a public debate about which of the children's needs to prioritize, when and where. But the way this debate is structured and engaged on social media tells us something more about parenting in an interconnected world.

<A> The movements of the “London babies”

The key social media image that led me to my nine respondents was a photograph of five “London babies” lined up in a row on a sofa. These children had professional Filipino migrant parents, were 11 to 22 months old, and were attending a first birthday celebration for Eric. Grace, the mum of one of the other children, posted the photo to Facebook in late 2012. Another respondent, Blanca, whose own daughter was “left behind” in the Philippines, “shared” it with me so I could see that it had been taken at Blanca’s own London house. Four years later, four of the five babies, no longer infants or really even toddlers, were being raised “back home” in the Philippines.

The journey of the London babies back home occurred in the context of the Filipino diaspora. The Philippines has a long-standing history as a migrant-sending country (Asis 2008; Madianou 2016). In the Philippines, approximately 50% of all households now receive some share of their income from overseas (McKay 2012). Sustaining households with remittances from migrants abroad has become a social norm—an expectation among working- and middle-class Filipino families. Katigbak (2013) reports that families without overseas Filipino workers (OFWs) are the ones that now appear dysfunctional, rather than families with absent parents. The parents of the London babies remain in the UK, practicing their professions as nurses or senior care assistants, and most hold either Indefinite Leave to Remain status (the UK equivalent of permanent residency) or British citizenship. My respondents appeared to be earning secure salaries and have permanent status in the UK, but were sending their children back home. These children were all British born and, as far as I knew, would have received British citizenship through their parents if

those parents had been permanent residents at the time of their birth. Their parents had all qualified to live in the UK after five years on a working visa or through a previous partnership with a UK national, paid taxes, and had national insurance to use the National Health Service (NHS). All their households earned more than the £30,000 (after taxes and benefits) required for them to be classified as middle class rather than poor by the British government (Belfield et al. 2016). Yet these parents had found they were struggling to offer their children an appropriate “good childhood” in London and decided to send them to the Philippines to be raised by extended kin.

<B > Sent home temporarily

Siblings Rosa and Hansel stayed with their grandparents for a year while their parents, Alvin and Benilda, moved house and took up new jobs. Both the house move and the change of employment were intended to better support the children in London. Benilda and Alvin moved farther out into the Zone 6 suburbs, where they could find an affordable childminder so that Benilda could return to part-time nursing. Alvin would commute to his new nursing job—a promotion in grade—at an inner-city hospital. The family would live near other congregants from Alvin’s church who could step in for emergency babysitting. Their old flat, nearer to central London than the new one, was an easy commute to work, but was not at all suitable for children. It had no parks, no childminders, no playmates, and no helpful neighbors. The situation in Zone 6—double the transport fare—is better, but not ideal, because of the strain of commuting and the cost of childcare, but Alvin and Benilda persevere. Rosa and Hansel go to daycare. When they are at home and their parents are working, “aunties” from Alvin’s church

stand in for the extended family care they would have received from their Filipino kin, providing babysitting for minimal pay.

<B> Sent home indefinitely

When Aila and Sonny (above) sent Eric home to live with his grandparents and aunt, they set out an argument for their decision on Facebook. Over several months, before they flew home on vacation and to drop Eric off, they posted a series of photos. The photos show exhaustion etched on Sonny's face after overnight duty on the NHS for extra money, Aila on her way to do cleaning work with infant Eric held in an *oban* (shawl) on her back, Eric standing on the concrete in East London's very dirty and limited public park space, the grey, crowded streets of their neighborhood, and Eric watching TV from a bouncy chair in their equally crowded accommodation. In striking contrast to the ways other respondents used Facebook, Aila and Sonny were very publicly setting out their case for sending Eric home to live with his grandparents in the Philippines. Almost all their pictures of Eric in London show him red nosed, watery eyed, and listless, and, importantly, alone. He rarely got a chance to play with other children his age or run around outside. Instead, he spent much time confined to a pushchair, on the sidewalks or on the subway. He had continual upper respiratory infections. Aila, despite her nursing qualifications, was unable to prevent their recurrence, and Eric seemed to be constantly going to the doctor and taking antibiotics. His health was a primary concern in deciding to send him home. Aila and Sonny saved for a year and spent a month's vacation in the Philippines, settling Eric with the grandmother who had, herself, returned from work in the UK to care for

him. The entire visit was documented on Facebook for their Facebook friends.

His parents' post-return pictures of Eric in the Philippines tell a different story. Even though they are only visiting him twice a year, Sonny and Aila regularly post or share photos they take with Skype and photos sent on by email by Eric's caregivers—his grandmother, grandfather, aunts, and uncles, as well as visitors to the family. His post-return photos show Eric, when he is on his own, not only beaming into the camera, but enjoying his surroundings. He's running in the grass, petting a cat or dog, climbing a rock wall, walking on rice terraces, climbing a tree. There are themes of sensory stimulation, fresh air, exploration, and safety here. As well as photographs at the mall or in a restaurant, consuming Western-style burgers and French fries, Eric is shown learning to eat with his hands in Kankanaey style. These portrait-type photos contrast with previous images of a chronically ill, lonely, understimulated, housebound child living in London that appear earlier on the parents' timeline.

The photos where Eric looks happiest are candid shots where he is playing outdoors with his stepbrother, cousins, and other neighborhood playmates. Like every well-socialized Kankanaey child, he has a neighborhood *barkada*—group of friends, many related—who play games with improvised toys. Older boys teach the younger ones how to behave, to settle disputes, to take turns, and to share—they “correct” them, as their elders explain it. This is a vital part of Kankanaey socialization, where parental discipline is reserved for more serious matters and the interpretation of day-to-day life rules is acquired by interaction in an age-hierarchy of children. To become a functioning adult, a child needs, not



adult contact, but contact with the next age group up. So Eric, aged 5, needs 7- to 9-year-olds to hang out with to ensure he learns his life lessons. Yet behind the photos, someone is responsible for making sure Eric is clean, tidy, and available to interact with his parents on Skype. Someone has to take a weekly photo and share it promptly on Facebook. This “platform being the message” of polymedia has implications for transnational families. There is an emergent media ecology where different generations use different platforms and require different content to raise children in the same extended family. Younger siblings/aunts on Snapchat and WhatsApp or Instagram want funny videos, grandparent caregivers want portrait photographs on Facebook, etc. The ability to make some of these transnational communications public (e.g., posting an album of “Skypeshots” on Facebook) establishes broader norms for parenting, childhood, and family relations.

Comments made by Aila and Sonny’s Facebook friends on Eric’s photos offer evidence of the transformation he has undergone, mentioning his happiness and commenting on health, toys, and space available back home. But the most engaged photos are those of young children with their stepsiblings, cousins, and other playmates. Comments here suggest that London living simply does not facilitate what people see as optimal socialization for children, because they lack safe access to their peer group and thus opportunities to engage in unstructured play with others. Eric may live out his school years in the Philippines or return to the UK. Sonny and Aila aren’t yet sure how their jobs and housing options will turn out. They’d love to have him with them, but only if they can earn enough to give him the best opportunities they can find for education, lifestyle, and comfort and provide consistent care.

<B> Sent home to be joined later

Grace, mother of one of the “London babies,” announced on Facebook her decision to rejoin her young child back home. James, her now 5-year-old son, was the oldest of the London babies, sent home because his parents could not find affordable childcare in East London or afford to cut their working hours. Grace participated in a comments exchange, below, on Marilyn’s Facebook profile page that reveals how other migrants responded to her news.

<EXT>

Grace: . . . goin’ home at last . . . missin’ my little James so much!!! Oh my!! I just realized I can’t manage to stay abroad ha ha

Marilyn: You can if there will be no choice. You can go a bit crazy but what is important is you can save your sanity. It’s hard though

Blanca: That’s very true older sister Marilyn, hah hah

Vicki: That’s true it’s hard, but we also need to, hah hah

Blanca: You check on Marilyn if she gained her sanity again

Vicki: Marilyn, did you gain your sanity, hah hah?

Blanca: Hee, hee, it's your fault Marilyn that you're discussing sanity so we're checking on you. Vicki, my friend, being nostalgic sometimes—that proves I'm normal and I'm still sane i</>

Blanca reacted to Grace's news by describing herself as "nostalgic" for her own daughter's younger days, this being "normal" and "sane." Later, Marilyn explained that this exchange expressed support for Grace, but acknowledged, with Vicki and Blanca, that other mothers' time for being physically co-present with their children had passed. Grace could afford to go home to James, having invested her savings in business in the Philippines and relying on her husband and other migrant family members to support her. Though the other women envied Grace, staying in the UK paid for the college fees that would give now-teenaged children the best chances in life.

Making this exchange available to all their Facebook friends suggested my respondents anticipated that their ongoing choice to remain in the UK would be discussed by others. Respondents with older children often expressed nostalgia for the early days of childhood. Like Marilyn, they often posted or shared photos of London babies they had babysat or visited, even when those children were back home, as well as photos of their own grown-up kids. While Grace returned home to parent James, the parents of the babies in the photograph have made different choices. As Coe et al. (2011) argue, children in migrant families exert agency, shaping the migration outcomes of their households in response to their perceived—and expressed—needs. Social media offered their transnational families new ways to shape, express, and understand the needs of absent children, showing that migrant parents were able to be "good" parents.

## <A> New norms for family, affect, and citizenship

Polymedia and social mobility go together; a social media presence is now a key marker of aspiration and accomplishment. As Nedelcu (2013) observes, social media enable migrants to continuously update their understandings of political belonging and social norms within the transnational family's public space. Thus my respondents' families now measure their migrants' success in London against norms for housing, education, and technology. Successful migrants move the family home from more remote settlements to Baguio City, send their children to fee-paying or "private" schools (where parents pay for tuition<sup>ii</sup>), and have reliable broadband for Skype and Facebook (McKay 2016). Looking at the more public side—social norms, rather than personal intimacies—show us, not what these relationships contain as content, but the front-channel performances people wish to make public. This publicness reveals additional norms for transnational family relations, belonging, and citizenship.

Emerging norms for transnational families reveal migrant subjectivities shaped by nostalgia rather than ambivalence. Parents who have felt compelled to live apart from their children for extended periods of time are often described as ambivalent (Madianou 2012; see also Pratt 1997, 2012). As mothers, they feel conflicted about their desires to advance their careers and attain professional recognition or economic security at the same time as being a "good enough" parent. They regretfully choose to sacrifice their parenting, leaving their children behind in their sending country, yet question their choice. Here, because absent children are absent along a spectrum of vulnerability, precarity, and estrangement from parents, these

ambivalent feelings vary with the family context. Blanca, Marilyn, and Vicki were nostalgic because they live through time in long-distance social fields where all is mobile and nothing is long term. They might eventually return, much later or perhaps in the next year. Time had moderated their feelings, rapidly reshaping ambivalence into nostalgia. These vignettes also reveal how quickly migrants' strategies may shift. It is often unclear, as in Eric's case, whether sending a child home is a permanent or temporary measure.

New norms for assessing emotional states and child-rearing decisions in these families also emerge from polymedia practices. Respondents found evidence of the child's happiness in the form of interrelated and cross-cited Skypeshots, embedded videos, Facebook comments, status updates, and quotes from the child's conversations, shared among the wider family and friends group. Rather than worrying about intrusion and the children's privacy, parents were more concerned that their decisions to send the children home were justified and legitimated and their parenting assessed as "engaged" or "appropriate" by their networks. The dominant norm became to parent more publicly—making evident daily contact, not just milestones and birthdays. In this way, polymedia made decisions to send preschool children to kin in the Philippines understandable, even laudable. Though people in the wider community of migrants were nostalgic for the time of small, cuddly, and dependent babies and toddlers, they understood that older children needed green space, toys, and other children to socialize with more than an ever-present parent. Hence the nostalgia felt by Blanca, Marilyn, and Vicki led them to comment on photographs of the London babies back in the Philippines and support their parents.

Children's access to space for play and socialization has become a concern for transnational families and communities. Here, beyond the nuclear family, my data indicate a realm of personal life that takes family practices further in that it acknowledges extended-kin and nonfamily relationships (e.g., friends), as well as those that exist in imaginings and memories on which they draw. Sent-home children are being raised within these broader networks, and members of them assess parents' decisions on normative grounds other than intimacy. For Aila and Sonny, socio-spatial concerns drove their decision to send their son Eric home. Indeed, ideas about desirable play space and peer relations, not just family intimacies, informed all my respondents' notions of a good childhood. They connected these ideas to a healthy lifestyle and their obligation to develop their child's potential. These new norms may arise from migrants' engagement with public debates on child health in the UK. British government policies have increasingly sought to intervene in early childhood to produce a productive and adaptable workforce (Holdsworth 2013). While the importance of socio-spatial contexts tends to receive less emphasis than parental care in shaping the emerging embodied subjectivities of young children in public debates, the need for healthy spaces is acknowledged. My respondents, confronted by the vast difference between London spaces and those available for children in the Philippines, gauged that the benefits of living in the social spaces of "back home" and having polymedia contact would outweigh the strains of physical separation.

In transnational families, polymedia increasingly shapes the social reality experienced by migrants to blur distinctions between private and public spheres. My respondents did not experience social media as re-creating a divide between private and public, but as a space that folded public into

private and vice versa. Their family life was lived out in a public realm where polymedia undermined the fixed identities that are assumed in conventional family discourses. Parents were identified as their children's Facebook friends, while junior family members took the initiative in establishing WhatsApp groups for backchannel parenting discussions. These norms for transnational family life shape broader community practices of child-rearing and forms of citizenship.

Sent-home children represent an “affective investment” (Faier 2013). Not only do they embody their parents' permanent ties to family and place in the Philippines, they also hold the possibility of migration for their caregivers. Thus, around each child absent from the UK there stretches a web of claims to citizenship through care, shaped by kin ties, citizenship law, migration regimes, long-term financial investment, and, most vitally, feeling. Entrusting a child to Philippines kin is even more powerful than the building of houses Faier (2013) describes. For Grace, sending James home first eased her return and then justified her taking up work and housing in her sending community. With James back home, she was in constant contact and virtually present, remitting money regularly for his care and supporting his caregivers, long before she arrived herself.

Polymedia facilitate this kind of affective investment. For my respondents, posting and tagging photographs of rituals—baptisms, birthdays, weddings, wakes, and funerals—as well comments on the exchange of gifts expressed reciprocity, cooperation, and obligatory kin exchange. Each photograph, video, Facebook post, text message, like, share, Skype call, or gift of goods was an investment of time and effort maintaining Kankanaey culture. Where people put in more time and effort than they received, my

respondents described it as *pa-utang*—where people repay a debt by giving more, indicating that the debtor wished to continue the exchange relationship. A sent-home child indebted migrant parents to caregivers and the broader community, ensuring lots of *pa-utang* would follow to smooth that child's formative years. Strengthening these relationships meant children would be raised “properly” and migrants could eventually return or retire to a better future in the Philippines (McKay 2012, 2016).

Polymedia thus allowed the Philippines to be the “better place” to raise children, becoming the channel through which positive global affect flowed. These flows incorporated nuclear families, extended kin, aunties, uncles, and fictive kin, too. All these extended persons were making their global personhood visible, not just by “friending,” but by being actively involved—and documenting that activity—in parenting or fostering or being an auntie or an uncle for repatriated kids, even if only through “liking” posted photos or sending the occasional gift.

Affective investment was not only virtual or nuclear family oriented. Godmothers, godfathers, uncles, aunts, cousins, grandparents, and friends were also enrolled in transnational family projects in material ways. Their support extended from expressing approval of parents' decisions, to sending birthday gifts for kids, to sending boxes of staples, such as clothing and food, or bringing them to the child's home. Such investments sustained small businesses or were redistributed to a much wider village-based network. Gifts from these networks would turn up in special celebratory meals or as hand-me-downs, both clothing and toys, making them investments in family social status. Thus polymedia, by making parents' wider networks present and meaningful to the child and the people in their immediate day-to-day household from a very young age, became a key part



of social mobility. Blanca's daughter, Sasha—a left-behind child—is a case in point.

When Blanca (in London) posted a photograph from her daughter's birthday celebration (in Baguio City) to Facebook, likes came from both her village of origin and from kin and friends in the UK, Germany, Spain, Canada, and the United States. Blanca had tagged some of these friends in her comments on the photo. Others picked up on friends' responses and chimed to wish Sasha happy birthday. Blanca followed up by thanking people for their greetings, phone calls, and gifts. She posted photographs of gifts of goods, particularly foodstuffs and clothing. These photographs were taken by Sasha and her aunt Nancy in the Philippines and emailed to Blanca. Blanca's expansive tagging practice drew others' attention to the scope of her family's friends network. Sasha may always have lived in Baguio City, but she had gifts and friends around the world, just like Eric, the London baby whose birthday party photograph was discussed above.

Facebook photographs represented Sasha in particular ways. One image showed Sasha doing chores at her grandparents' house in a pink knitted hat with a "London" logo on the front. Eric wore the same logo hat, in blue, to play outside on cold mornings. In group shots, Sasha's imported clothes marked her as different from her peers, while other photos and comments showed Sasha attending a fee-paying school. Sasha has overseas Filipino relatives and family friends and even non-Filipino friends on her friends list who engage with her daily life.

Even looking closely, it would be difficult to distinguish Sasha's Facebook presentation from Eric's, only that he's not yet old enough to have his own

profile. Not many people, apart from Sasha's grandparents, realize that her mother, Blanca, has overstayed her initial visa and is working cash-in-hand as an irregular migrant in the UK. Barring a regularization program in the unforeseeable future, Sasha will never have the chance to gain the British citizenship that Eric's birth conferred on him. Eric is a sent-home child while Sasha is left behind, but Sasha's Facebook presentation is curated in a way that conceals any differences in status and thus family futures.

Blurring the distinction between Sasha and Eric in terms of the potential returns to affective investment moves the argument towards another set of norms shaped by polymedia: those for citizenship.

For caregivers of sent-home children, care for a British-born child is a way to claim closeness to kin in the UK and belonging by proxy. Caregivers leverage their care into family visit visas, recommendations for courses to apply for, places to stay, employers, etc., and pursuing personal migration projects. For example, after six months as Eric's caregiver, his aunt Caroline came to visit her brother Sonny in London. Caroline arrived on a family visit visa looking for a possible university course. She returned to the Philippines to save up for her future studies. Having British children at home encourages would-be migrants to consider their own pathway to belonging in Britain. Children's returns foster a feeling of entitlement among caregivers and facilitate chain migration. Kin involved in raising returned children exchange their care for an anticipated flow of personal opportunities. Similar opportunities appear to open up around left-behind children like Sasha. Sasha's aunt Teresita also came to London on a tourist visa to visit Blanca, her sister-in-law, intending (officially) to visit some other relatives. Teresita stayed on for two years, working as a housekeeper, then returned to the Philippines to invest her savings in a small business of

her own. However, there are very real differences in status and future family possibilities here. Caroline's visit was in compliance with UK immigration rules and she may yet return to study. Teresita overstayed, and as an irregular migrant, won't be able to reenter the UK for at least five years.

Transnational families use social media to smooth over these distinctions. Blurring key differences in status and possibility is a way to perform and produce social mobility. This strategy of acting "as if" the family is transnationally successful is a preliminary step in negotiations with other institutions governing migration—kinship groups, community, church congregations, activists, and governments—to attain higher status. For example, when birthday gifts and gatherings began to be presented globally and publicly on Facebook, as Eric's first birthday was, these gifts became more important to send and acknowledge and the events became more vital to attend, even virtually. Families organized similar kinds of birthday celebrations for sent-home and left-behind children. They typically rented a hall or restaurant for extended kin and friends, offering a special meal and then recording the food and attendees with photos in a separate Facebook album. This practice replicated the birthday celebrations first held for British-born children in London. On Facebook, family and friends overseas were also tagged in or shared the images, so their comments and emoticon or meme responses become part of the event. Thus all children absent from their parents appeared as if they were mobile, middle class, and being reared in anticipation of reunion with their parent(s) abroad.

The lack of distinction between sent-home and left-behind children demonstrates norms and expectations established for citizenship through

performance. Many of the new gradations of citizenship emerging with migration rely on this “fake it ‘til you make it” strategy. In this approach, migrants append citizenship to themselves through performances of virtue, establishing a substantive claim to belonging in their host country. They then hope this claim will be recognized through regularization or successful appeals to government to change their status from temporary sojourners or irregular workers to permanent residents (McKay 2016). Transnational families similarly use polymedia to position children back home as prosthetic persons who express family citizenship status through the ways they are represented. The ways children are shown to be reared indicates apparently successful attempts to secure financial stability and economic security in transnational families. Thus we can read Blanca’s own prosthetic citizenship, expressed in her curation of Sasha’s social media presence, as a kind of situated transnationalism intended to shape local institutions (Kilkey and Merla 2014) in ways that garner more social support intended to help her extend her stay in the UK and secure her daughter’s future.

Here, we see how polymedia expands the flexible border mobility available to the already affluent or the highly skilled (Ong 1999; Ley 2010) to incorporate a much larger group of migrants. Perhaps an even more significant group of migrants and families are attempting to open up this space for themselves by acting as if they will become such flexible citizens themselves on SNS. These people know that borders are there for the poor and unskilled, while the wealthy pass unimpeded, so the obverse must be true: Those who pass unimpeded must be wealthy or on their way. In this context, performing “as if” becomes evidence of a family’s social mobility in advance.

## <A> Conclusion

Migrants with transnational families seek out the best of the UK and the Philippines for their child and their family. On Facebook, my respondents shared evidence that low-wage jobs in central London in a period of austerity offer very poor circumstances in which to parent. Even those who were on the correct pathway to British citizenship—with working visas, sufficient wages, good employment records, etc.—were unable to raise children with a recognizable “good childhood” in the UK. Thus children needed to go to the Philippines and take up their Philippine citizenship to do that. These mobile children become a way of hedging the bets in migrants’ trajectories, maintaining their citizenship by contribution back home in the Philippines while keeping options open in the UK. In turn, these choices opened up new ways of thinking about the situation and the futures of children in the left-behind category for transnational families.

Of course, these strategies will likely shift over time. While parenting via polymedia with twice-a-year visits may be preferable to child-raising in low-wage London, further questions will emerge. These dilemmas will be about where migrants’ money goes farthest and where the networks of support for older children are strongest. Sent-home children are back home because conditions in receiving countries were not conducive to child-raising or parenting. They’ve come back to what is agreed to be a better place. But will the children themselves come to accept that choice, or see it as an imposition? Will this experience of parenting and extended-family living have eventual emotional costs for the parents and children? Will parents’ circumstances change? Will parents be able to reconsider? Indeed,

it may be the adolescents who were originally distance-parented who will become those who are brought back to the UK to rebuild quotidian parenting in new ways. So this may be a mobile generation of children, able to have the best of both countries their parents inhabit. It will also drive entry into the UK informal labor market in particular ways—likely towards irregularity, where strategic and capable workers can earn £37,000 untaxed (McKay 2016). The conditions of austerity and wage restraint in the UK have seen migrants shift towards shorter-term work rather than migration and eventual settlement.

While this future plays out, children will continue to remain central in, not absent or occluded from, the wider family migration project. Children's returns will thus have important implications for citizenship and the social construction of a "good childhood" transnationally. The idea that children will have the most desirable childhood in particular physical and economic settings that may not be where their biological parents live will be increasingly compelling for transnational families. Movement of children for a "good childhood" will then see further gradations of citizenship arise, accompanied by new, polymediated strategies for creating and performing family and national belonging. For transnational families, both their long-term strategies and their geographical separations become something more—and something different—from what they were in the offline-only world. Polymedia opens up ways in which representing children and childhood can shift Ong's (1999) flexible citizenship towards popular and prosthetic variations.

The same is no doubt true for other groups of transnational migrants and their long-distance parenting strategies and family forms. Further research

will undoubtedly help to unpack how polymedia is shifting what are dynamic norms for this “good childhood” and, in particular, changes in the specific roles of mothers, fathers, and extended family in providing it. This opens up into a new research agenda, where scholars acknowledge and track how the “left behind” and the “sent home” are increasingly able to shift migration streams and change places. For parents of these absent children, providing a good childhood and offering their child social mobility increasingly relies on representing their child as if they will undoubtedly become this new global kind of citizen.

### Acknowledgements

With all the usual caveats, the author would like to thank her respondents in London and the Philippines, her collaborators on the SSHRC Canada project “Southeast Asian Women, Family, and Migration in the Global Era” (2013–2017)—Leslie Butt, Nicole Constable, Lisa Mitchell, and Monika Winarnita—and two anonymous reviewers for Global Networks for their comments. Alongside funding from SSHRC Canada to support collaborative work, her initial research was funded by an AHRC UK project, “In the Footsteps of Jesus and the Prophet” (2007–2009), led by Pnina Werbner at Keele University, and then a Mellon Foundation/Indiana University Press “Framing the Global” Fellowship (2011–2015), with additional fieldwork in the Philippines supported by an ASEASUK British Academy Small Grant (2012–2015).

### References

- Appadurai, A. (2003) 'Archive and aspiration', in J. Brouwer and A. Mulder (eds.) *Information is alive*, Rotterdam: V2\_Publishing/NAI Publishers, 14–25.
- Appadurai, A. (2016) 'Aspirational maps: On migrant narratives and future citizenship', Berlin: *Eurozine*, posted 19 February, 2016, based on a lecture at the Berlin Institute for Integration and Migration, 4 November, 2015, available at:  
<http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2016-02-19-appadurai-en.html>.
- Asis, M. (2006) 'Living with migration: Experiences of left-behind children in the Philippines', *Asian Population Studies*, 2 (1), 46–67.
- Asis, M. (2008) 'The Philippines', *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 17 (3–4), 349–78.
- Baldassar, L. (2016) De-demonising distance in mobile family lives: co-presence, care circulation and polymedia as vibrant matter, *Global Networks* 16 (2), 145–63.
- Baldassar, L., Nedelcu, M., Merla, L. and R. Wilding (2016) ICT-based co-presence in transnational families and communities: challenging the premise of face-to-face proximity in sustaining relationships, *Global Networks* 16 (2), 133–44.
- Belfield, C., J. Cribb, A. Hood and R. Joyce (2016) *Living standards, poverty, and inequality in the UK: 2016*, London: Institute for Fiscal Studies, available at: <http://www.ifs.org.uk>.
- Coe, C., R. Reynolds, D. Boehm, J. Hess and H. Rae-Espinoza (2011) *Everyday ruptures: Children, youth and migration in global perspective*, Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Elliot, A. and J. Urry (2010) *Mobile lives*, London: Routledge.
- Faier, L. (2013) 'Affective investments in the Manila region: Filipina migrants in rural Japan and transnational urban development in the



- Philippines', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 38, 376–90.
- Holdsworth, C. (2013) *Family and intimate mobilities*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jocano, L. (1998) *Filipino social organization: traditional kinship and family organization*, Manila: PUNLAD Research House.
- Katigbak, E. (2013) 'The emotional economic geographies of translocalities: The Philippines 'Little Italy'', PhD diss., National University of Singapore.
- Kilkey, M. and L. Merla (2014) 'Situating transnational families' care-giving arrangements: The role of institutional contexts', *Global Networks*, 14 (2), 210–29.
- Ley, D. (2010) *Millionaire migrants: Trans-Pacific life lines*, Oxford: Blackwell-Wiley.
- Madianou, M. (2012) 'Migration and the accentuated ambivalence of motherhoods: The role of ICTs in Filipino transnational families', *Global Networks*, 12 (3), 277–95.
- Madianou, M. (2016) 'Ambient co-presence: transnational family practices in polymedia environments', *Global Networks*, 16 (2), 183–201.
- Madianou, M. and D. Miller (2012) *Migration and the new media*, London: Routledge.
- Madianou, M. and D. Miller (2013) 'Polymedia: Towards a new theory of digital media in interpersonal communication', *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 16 (2), 169–87.
- McKay, D (2007) 'Sending dollars shows feeling: Emotions and economies in Filipino migration', *Mobilities* 2 (2), 175–94.

- McKay, D. (2010) 'On the face of Facebook: Historical images and personhood in Filipino social networking', *History and Anthropology*, 21 (4), 483–502.
- McKay, D. (2012) *Global Filipinos*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- McKay, D. (2016) *Archipelago of care*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Miller, D. and D. Slater (2000) *The internet*, Oxford: Berg.
- Nedelcu, M. (2012) 'Migrants' new transnational habitus: Rethinking migration through a cosmopolitan lens in a digital age', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38 (9), 1339–56.
- Nedelcu, M. (2013) '(Re)thinking transnationalism and integration in the digital era: A shift towards cosmopolitanism in the study of international migrations', in O. Soderstrom, D. Ruedin, S. Randeria, G. D'Amato and F. Panese (eds.) *Critical mobilities*, Abingdon: Routledge, 153–75.
- Ong, A. (1999) *Flexible citizenship*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Parreñas, R. S. (2005) *Children of global migration*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Poeze, M., E. Dankyi and V. Mazzucato (2016) 'Navigating transnational childcare relationships: Migrant parents and their children's caregivers in the origin country', *Global Networks* (19 pp, prepublication version), doi: 10.1111/glob.12135.
- Pratt, G. (1997) 'Stereotypes and ambivalence: The construction of domestic workers in Vancouver, British Columbia', *Gender, Place, and Culture* 4 (2), 159–78.
- Pratt, G. (2012) *Families apart*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Scott, W. (1993) *Looking for the prehispanic Filipino*, Manila: Cellar Book Shop.

Vertovec, S. (2004) 'Cheap calls: The social glue of migrant transnationalism', *Global Networks* 4 (2), 219–24.

Yeoh, B. S. A., T. Lam, M. Asis, K. Su, E. Graham and L. Jordan (2012) 'Transnational families and the family nexus: Perspectives of Indonesian and Filipino children left behind by migrant parents', *Environment and Planning A*, 44 (4), 793–815.

---

<sup>ii</sup> Original Facebook comments thread in Kankanaey, translated by Marilyn. Nostalgia appeared in English in the original.

<sup>ii</sup> Parents who send children to state schools pay for books, supplies, and school activities, but do not pay directly for tuition.