

Ann Buchanan • Anna Rotkirch
Editors

Grandfathers

Global Perspectives

palgrave
macmillan

Editors

Ann Buchanan
University of Oxford
United Kingdom

Anna Rotkirch
Heidelberg, Baden-Württemberg,
Germany

Palgrave Macmillan Studies in Family and Intimate Life

ISBN 978-1-137-56337-8 ISBN 978-1-137-56338-5 (eBook)

DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-56338-5

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016950069

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2016

The author(s) has/have asserted their right(s) to be identified as the author(s) of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Cover Design by Will Speed

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Macmillan Publishers Ltd. London

2

A New Niche? The Theory of Grandfather Involvement

David A. Coall, Sonja Hilbrand, Rebecca Sear,
and Ralph Hertwig

Introduction

Grandparents in contemporary industrialized societies invest substantial amounts of time, money and care in their grandchildren. For example, in the USA in 2007, 2.5 million grandparents were responsible for meeting

D.A. Coall (✉)

School of Medical Sciences, Edith Cowan University, Perth, WA, Australia
e-mail: d.coall@ecu.edu.au

S. Hilbrand

University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

Max Planck Institute of Human Development, Berlin, Germany

R. Sear

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

R. Hertwig

Centre for Adaptive Rationality, Max Planck Institute for Human
Development, Berlin, Germany

© The Author(s) 2016

A. Buchanan, A. Rotkirch (eds.), *Grandfathers*,

DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-56338-5_2

most of the basic needs of one or more of the grandchildren who lived in their household (US Census Bureau 2009). Across eleven European countries, 44 % of grandparents reported to have provided childcare for their grandchildren in the last 12 months without the parents present (Glaser et al. 2013). This involvement is considerable. With rapidly changing family structures and a concomitant change in the potential role of both grandmothers and grandfathers, research is now slowly moving from a strong focus on grandmothers to understanding also the specific roles grandfathers play. It is naive to lump all grandparents together in investigations, as is often done, or to focus only on maternal grandmothers or select the 'favourite' or most involved grandparent. This 'favouritism' in past research resulted in marginalization of the role of grandfathers (Mann 2007), even to the exclusion of grandfathers from research (Reitzes and Mutran 2004), and to 'grandparent' becoming synonymous with 'grandmother' (Harper 2005). We aim to make the first steps towards addressing this blind spot in theory and research. We do so by bringing together research from evolutionary biology, sociology, economics and psychology to suggest an interdisciplinary perspective on grandfathering.

Across industrialized nations, grandfathers make notable contributions to grandchild care that approach those made by grandmothers. In a sample of more than 35,000 people across ten European countries, 58 % of grandmothers and 49 % of grandfathers provided some care for their grandchildren during a 12-month period (Hank and Buber 2009). In one study, German grandfathers aged 55 to 69 years were observed to spend, on average, 12.8 hours each month supervising their grandchildren (Kohli et al. 2000). Like the investments of grandmothers, this notable investment of grandfathers has the potential to influence family function and grandchildren's health and well-being. At the same time, systematic differences between grandfathers and grandmothers are likely to influence grandfathers' involvement, the role they play and the consequences their behaviour brings. Such differences concern the timing of marriage, family formation, health and life expectancy, financial and social resources, life experiences and socialization (Szinovacz 1998a; Tran et al. 2009). Next, we examine grandfathers' care using the main theoretical perspectives. Then we use an the empirical example of sex and lineage

to show how the diverse theoretical perspectives, often seen as conflicting, can complement each other. Finally, we explore the new niche that grandfathers may occupy in families as a result of demographic and family structure changes.

Why Do Grandfathers Care?

Many grandfathers, in the immediate pre-grandparenthood stage, openly say to their families and friends that they do not understand what all of the fuss is around becoming a grandparent. Then, quite suddenly, with the arrival of their grandchild, there is a recognizable shift in grandfathers' views, often with an immediate connection and an element of surprise (St George and Fletcher 2014). As we will discuss subsequently, why this change takes place and why grandfathers invest in their grandchildren can be explored from many perspectives.

There are myriad dimensions that influence the role and impact grandparents have within families. These dimensions have been explored and documented by disciplines as diverse as sociology, economics, psychology and evolutionary biology (Coall and Hertwig 2010). Each of these disciplines has made substantial contributions that are crucial to understanding the role of grandparents. To date, each discipline, however, has worked largely in isolation, with little reference to, and benefit from, the others (Coall and Hertwig 2011). To achieve the greatest impact in this research area, it is time to join forces by simultaneously exploring grandparental investment on multiple levels. Next, we briefly turn to some of the basic theoretical approaches (for detailed reviews, see Coall and Hertwig 2010).

The Evolutionary Perspective

The broadest level of explanation highlights humans within an evolutionary context as cooperative breeders. According to the cooperative breeding hypothesis, a mother does not raise her children by herself but is helped by other members of her social group (Hrdy 2009). Although in

both traditional societies (generally low income, higher fertility, higher mortality with limited access to medical services) and contemporary industrialized societies (generally high income, low fertility, low mortality with wide access to medical services; many would be considered postindustrial), these helpers are not necessarily kin (Coall et al. 2014; Ivey 2000); one class of kin helper, often available and inclined to help, is that of post-reproductive adults—grandparents.

Within this predominantly anthropological literature, the focus has been on grandmothers. Williams (1957) initially proposed that menopause in humans was unique among animal species and therefore may be understood by an evolutionary perspective. He suggested that menopause has evolved because, at a certain age, the benefit of continued care to existing children (and grandchildren) outweighs the cost of further reproduction (mainly risks associated with childbirth). This thesis triggered numerous investigations into the influences of kin in general—and grandmothers in particular—on the survival of offspring in contemporary traditional and historical human populations.

One of the resultant lines of research has culminated in the *grandmother hypothesis*. The grandmother hypothesis proposes that grandmothers might have been the most knowledgeable, efficient and motivated helpers for reproducing mothers throughout human history (Hawke et al. 1998). They are considered by some to be the mothers' ace in the hole (Hrdy 2009), helping them to leave more children and grandchildren than mothers whose own mothers are no longer available to help.

The grandmother hypothesis is currently the most influential theory to explain why human female longevity extends beyond menopause and the extended human lifespan more generally. In their now classic study of the influence family members have on child survival, Sear and Mace (2008) reviewed forty-five studies investigating the effects of the presence versus absence of various kin. Their findings generally supported the beneficial influence of post-reproductive relatives, especially the maternal grandmother, in natural-fertility societies (these are generally high-fertility, high-mortality societies in which contraceptives are not used). Of the thirteen studies examining the influence of maternal grandmothers, nine (69 %) found that the presence of a maternal grandmother was associated with an increase in her grandchildren's probability of surviving the high-risk times of infancy and

childhood. Studies have been more inconsistent in their findings about the benefits of paternal grandmothers: depending on the investigation, having a paternal grandmother present had a positive (53 %), negative (12 %) or no (35 %) influence on child survival. Thus, although there is evidence in support of the grandmother hypothesis, it is not uniformly positive.

Is there evidence that a similar advantage of grandfathering might have influenced the evolution of the human life cycle? Sear and Mace (2008) found evidence that the presence of grandfathers painted a different picture compared to grandmothers. In 83 % (ten of twelve studies) of cases, the presence of maternal grandfathers was not associated with child survival, but in the remaining two studies, it had a positive association. In the case of paternal grandfathers, 50 % of studies had no effect (six of twelve studies), 25 % had a positive effect, and the remaining 25 % showed that the presence of the paternal grandfather was associated with reduced child survival.

To date, there does not seem to be strong evidence that caring by grandfathers provides an adaptive explanation for why grandparents exist, in the same way that caring by grandmothers may explain the evolution of post-reproductive women (often grandmothers). In a historical Finnish population (1714–1839), with a positive influence of grandmothers' presence on child survival (Lahdenperä et al. 2004), no association was found between grandfathers' presence and increased grandchild survival. Furthermore, no evidence was found that grandfathers who lived longer ultimately had more grandchildren (Lahdenperä et al. 2007, 2011). Males could remarry after being widowed (divorce was not permitted in this historical population) and, thus, could reproduce for a longer period of time. Yet, amongst men who remarried, the channelling of resources to their new family had such a large impact on the survival of children from the man's original family that the number of grandchildren they had actually fell after 50 years of age (Lahdenperä et al. 2011). Reductions in paternal investment are also seen in serially remarried families in industrialized nations (Tanskanen et al. 2014). These first findings provide little reason to assume that grandfathering would have been favoured by natural selection. This research, however, is still in its infancy, and the findings do not yet preclude benefits of grandfathering at the family and individual levels. We will see this shortly.

The Economic Perspective

Intergenerational transfers can take many forms. They can occur via inheritance, consist of financial or time transfers, and or be upward or downward. Possibly because of this variety, there is no overarching economic model of parental, let alone grandparental, investment. Nevertheless, most models rest on the utility maximization and rational choice framework, and many models of intergenerational transfers between family members have proposed the existence of two competing motives: altruism and self-interested exchange.

Children are expensive (Kaplan 1994), so why do parents shift so many of their resources to their children? According to Becker (1974) and Barro (1974), parents' welfare is partly a function of the welfare of their children and grandchildren. Specifically, the parent's utility function incorporates the child's likely lifetime utility. This would explain why parents shift resources to their children as a function of those children's quality (e.g. skills and abilities) and later use wealth transfers to equalize outcomes across children (redistributive neutrality). Successive generations are thus linked by recursive altruistic preferences. That is, parents care altruistically for their children, who then transfer resources to their children, and so on.

In the self-interested-exchange view, parents' transfers are part of a strategic bargaining between parents and children (Laferrère and Wolff 2006). Intergenerational transfers can be understood as investments through which parents try to secure their children's commitment in the future. Anticipating that when they become frail they will need help, parents invest now (e.g. education expenses, gifts, loans) and in the future (promise of inheritance) to increase the likelihood that their children will help them in their time of need.

There are a number of empirical challenges to both the altruistic and the self-interested-exchange views (Arrondel and Masson 2006). One problem with the altruistic view, for example, is that parents transfer most of their wealth through bequests, rather than earlier in the form of gifts, when children need them most. The self-interested-exchange view faces the problem that, although grandparents undoubtedly do invest

substantial amounts of resources in their grandchildren, there is little evidence that grandchildren consistently reciprocate. The few grandparents who do receive support from their grandchildren may derive a relatively larger benefit, but such cases represent a small minority (Hoff 2007).

The Sociological Perspective

The extended family first received scant attention within the sociological modernization paradigm and its emphasis on the nuclear family. In recent decades, demographic dynamics and the increasing fragility of state-funded pension schemes pushed the issues of intergenerational exchanges and intergenerational solidarity to centre stage. In studying these issues, sociologists have been predominately focused on structural factors (e.g. female participation in the labour force), social institutions (e.g. how wealth is taxed at death) and cultural values (e.g. family obligations and roles). Their investigations have produced a wealth of information on factors that clearly have consequences for patterns of grandparental investment but are consistently neglected by other fields (e.g. individual values and cultural norms). The potential value of this research in building a coherent picture of grandparenting has been limited because, currently, these diverse studies are not situated within an overarching theoretical framework, the lack of which is recognized by sociologists as limiting progress (Szinovacz 1998b).

One attempt towards creating an encompassing framework is the rational-grandparent model (Friedman et al. 2008). Echoing the self-interested-exchange view in economics, this model assumes that the driving force behind investments is grandparents' concern about how they will be provided for in old age. To reduce this uncertainty, grandparents preferentially invest in those grandchildren whose parents are most likely to reciprocate in the future. Although some explicit predictions of the model (e.g. that grandparents are indifferent to biological relatedness) conflict with evolutionary perspectives, the benefit of this model is that it provides a framework of testable predictions about how grandparental investment varies.

Explaining the Same Robust Grandparental Investment Pattern from Different Perspectives

As emphasized earlier, treating all grandparents, or even all grandfathers, as a homogeneous group is remiss. It neglects the enormous variability among grandparents and the variable circumstances under which they contribute to their families. Across disciplines and measures of grandparental care, support and closeness, perhaps the most robust pattern found in industrialized nations is this: maternal grandmothers invest the most in their grandchildren, followed by maternal grandfathers, then paternal grandmothers, with paternal grandfathers investing the least (Dubas 2001; Eisenberg 1988; Euler and Weitzel 1996; Hoffman 1980; Laham et al. 2005; Monserud 2008; Pollet et al. 2009; Uhlenberg and Hammill 1998). Across disciplines, however, different explanations exist for this pattern. Sociological theorizing holds that women are kin-keepers, tasked with holding kin groups together (Dubas 2001; Eisenberg 1988). Similarly, according to the sociological family systems theory, it is the gatekeeper role of the parent (middle) generation that encourages (or not) the grandparent–grandchild relationship (Chan and Elder 2000; Rossi and Rossi 1990). Consequently, when grandparent and parent are female (e.g. maternal grandmother), the bond between grandparent and grandchild will be stronger relative to both parties being male (e.g. paternal grandfather). This combination of social factors can produce the grandparental investment pattern described earlier.

Evolutionary perspectives attribute this association between grandparent type and involvement (discriminative grandparental solicitude [Euler and Weitzel 1996]) to sex-specific reproductive strategies and paternity uncertainty (see Table 1 in Coall and Hertwig 2010). The term *investment* is here used to denote all resources, care and time that a grandparent provides to a grandchild. Evolutionary theory does not predict grandfathers will invariably help their grandchildren simply because grandfathers are related to their grandchildren. Rather, according to Hamilton's rule (Hamilton 1964), helping is moderated by opportunity costs that may differ across types of grandparents (e.g. grandmother vs. grandfather), making some investment alternatives more valuable than others.

Theoretically, paternity uncertainty is also predicted to play a role. Whereas women are 100 % certain who their children are, males cannot be 100 % certain that they are the biological father of their children. Note that the use of the word *certain* in this context does not necessarily imply conscious thoughts and reflections. Grandparents with higher levels of certainty of their biological relationship to their grandchildren are assumed to invest more than those with lower levels of certainty. This assumption can explain why maternal grandmothers, certain of their relationships with their daughters and their daughters' relationship with their grandchildren, invest more than paternal grandfathers. Paternal grandfathers have two points of uncertainty between themselves and their grandchildren; they cannot be 100 % certain of their relationship with their sons or of their sons' relationship with their grandchildren (Euler and Weitzel 1996; Smith 1987). The fact that these patterns of grandparental investment may be confined to industrialized societies and are not always present in rural (Pashos 2000; Kaptijn et al. 2013) and more traditional populations means that there is some question over the actual impact of paternity uncertainty (Sear, in press)—also, cross-cultural estimates suggest that only around 2 % of children are being fathered by someone other than their putative father (Anderson 2006).

The notion of paternity uncertainty suggests that both maternal grandfathers and paternal grandmothers would invest an intermediate amount because they both have one point at which their relationship certainty with their grandchildren could be severed. In reality, however, maternal grandfathers invest significantly more than paternal grandmothers, for instance, in terms of frequency of face-to-face interactions and emotional closeness (Hoffman 1980). Several authors have addressed this limitation of paternity certainty by incorporating sex-specific reproductive strategies into their models of grandparental investment (Euler and Weitzel 1996; Huber and Breedlove 2007). Specifically, individuals are assumed to be more inclined to invest in female relatives than male relatives because an investment in female kin is more likely to be transformed into parental care, whereas resources invested in male kin may be used also for mating. Based on this logic, the higher investments of maternal grandfathers can be explained thus: they invest more in their daughters' children relative to paternal grandmothers, who invest in their sons' children (Euler and Weitzel 1996).

Thus, the combination of paternity uncertainty and sex-specific reproductive strategies predicts the often-found pattern of grandparental investment.

Finally, from a psychological perspective, it has been proposed that the robust grandparental investment pattern may result from the well-known differences in age and life expectancy between grandparent types (Tran et al. 2009). In a couple, the male is often older, marrying later and having children later. In turn, male offspring may also marry later. Thus, investment patterns may not be due to evolutionary or sociological explanations, but purely the result of grandfathers being older and potentially less healthy. The strength of an interdisciplinary perspective is illustrated here as these different fields of research have made, largely independently (Coall and Hertwig 2011), similar and broadly compatible predictions (Dubas 2001; Huber and Breedlove 2007), even though they focus on different levels of explanation (i.e. mechanistic versus adaptationist).

Complementary, Not Competing, Approaches

Perhaps the key variable considered in the evolutionary grandparental investment literature is biological relatedness. Evidence is emerging that the genetic relationship between grandparents and grandchildren is an independent predictor of high grandparental investment, even in contemporary European societies (Coall et al. 2014). The impact of biological relatedness is often seen as being incompatible with sociological and economic models of parental and grandparental investment. These models often assume that investment flows to those grandchildren (and their parents) who are more likely to reciprocate in times of need. If, however, non-biologically related individuals are less likely to reciprocate, as an evolutionary perspective would suggest, findings concerning the importance of biological relatedness will simultaneously support the predictions of the sociological, economic and evolutionary accounts.

Reciprocal altruism, often conceptualized as exchanges between unrelated individuals, is likely originally to have evolved in genetically related kin groups. The psychological traits that maintain a system of reciprocity in humans (e.g. guilt, trust, sympathy, gratitude [Trivers 1971]) are likely to be stronger between close kin, which in turn promotes close

kin as less risky partners with whom to reciprocate (Allen-Arave et al. 2008). A strong attachment between parent and child has been proposed as a proximate mechanism for parents to identify and favour caring for their biological children (Daly and Wilson 1980). A similarly strong attachment relationship may also be found when parents adopt a young child (Hrdy 2009). Likewise, quality grandparent–grandchild attachment relationships may provide a crucial proximate mechanism whereby grandparents identify and preferentially care for the children of their own children (Euler and Weitzel 1996; Kennedy 1990). Indeed, the many non-biological grandparents who *do* invest in step-grandchildren may do so because of particularly harmonious relationships between family members. Conversely, in some cases, biological grandparents may not invest owing to poor intergenerational relationships (Coall et al. 2014). Therefore, on balance, it is likely that investment in biological grandchildren improves inclusive fitness and is simultaneously more likely to be reciprocated. Consequently, our finding that high levels of investment are more likely to come from biological grandparents is not necessarily at odds with economic or sociological accounts of grandparental investment (Tanskanen et al. 2014).

Family Size, Birth Order and Availability of Other Kin Influence Grandfathering

Various factors are likely to influence investment by grandfathers and grandmothers, and yet they are not currently included in most analyses. The preponderance of the nuclear family in industrialized nations means concomitant changes in family size, birth order and availability of other kin. In traditional societies, larger families can recruit older siblings to provide resources for a family (Ivey 2000; Kramer 2002). In industrialized societies, in contrast, the impact of sibling help for childcare is likely to be low because siblings are so closely spaced (Sear and Coall 2011). However, in both cases, a larger family size, *ceteris paribus*, dilutes the resources available for each child (Blake 1987; Hertwig et al. 2002; Marks 2006) and grandchild (Coall et al. 2009; Leonetti et al. 2005; Uhlenberg and Hammill 1998).

Larger family sizes offer more investment options and invite preferential investment. In a study of 787 Australian university students, Laham et al. (2005) observed that the emotional bond grandchildren reported to their maternal grandfather or paternal grandmother depended on the availability of other kin. Moreover, the general finding that maternal grandfathers provide more investment to grandchildren than do paternal grandmothers only held when the paternal grandmothers had other children in whom to invest. This means that if a grandmother has both a son and a daughter, she tends to focus on her role as a maternal rather than a paternal grandmother. These findings extend to grandfathers as well. Using the Survey of Heath Ageing and Retirement across Europe data, Danielsbacka et al. (2011) found that when grandfathers had grandchildren via both a son and a daughter, they provided more childcare to their daughter's children (maternal grandfather) rather than their son's children (paternal grandfather).

Do Modern Grandfathers Fill a Novel Niche?

There is no doubt that the role of grandfathers is a work in progress. It will continue to evolve over time as social factors that influence it change (see also Chap. 3). To extend this timeframe further, we briefly consider traditional and contemporary industrialized societies. As was detailed earlier, evidence from traditional societies shows that fathers and grandfathers appear to have a smaller impact on child survival than do mothers and grandmothers (Sear and Mace 2008). This may be explained by the fact that women universally invest more effort in both parenting and grandparenting than men, at least in terms of direct childcare (see Kokko and Jennions 2008 for evolutionary explanations of why mothers tend to care more than fathers). Human males, more so than most other mammals, frequently invest heavily in parental effort. This investment can nevertheless vary quite substantially between men both within and across societies, because some men derive greater fitness benefits from investing more in mating rather than parenting. Similarly, the role of grandfathers may be more variable than that of grandmothers. There are some environments in which older men may still benefit from continued investment in mating,

acquiring a new spouse, for example, but other environments exist where it may pay older men to invest in parenting or grandparenting.

The empirical evidence confirms that the role of grandfathers is highly variable and contingent on the environment. For example, in those hunter-gatherer and horticulturalist societies where the male contribution to subsistence is substantial, men can continue to provide for their families into older age, so that grandfathers may provide valuable nutritional resources (Hooper et al. 2015; Kaplan 1994). In other societies, however, such as those agricultural societies where polygyny or serial monogamy is common, a high-ranking male may reserve the most valuable resources for himself and redistribute them elsewhere for other advantages, such as increased mating opportunities. This heightens competition for resources within the family and may explain the findings of certain studies indicating a negative impact on grandchild survival (Campbell and Lee 1996; Kemkes-Grottenthaler 2005).

Overall, the large body of literature on the involvement of fathers and their impact on child well-being suggests that fathers may be more consistently available, if not more important, in contemporary industrial than traditional societies (Amato and Rivera 1999; Lamb 2010; Sigle-Rushton and McLanahan 2004). One may thus hypothesize that grandfathers also fill new niches in families that may have appeared as investment in children has increased and family structures have changed. The role of the so-called competent provider mentioned earlier in traditional transitional societies may have diminished substantially in societies with small families and few children. However, it is being replaced by a more engaged grandpaternal role (Roberto et al. 2001). Clearly, the roles of fathers and, more pertinently, grandfathers have changed dramatically in contemporary developed societies (Sear and Coall 2011).

Among their other roles, grandmothers are seen to fill a void that opens up when fathers are absent owing to death, divorce or hunting (Konner 2010; Marlowe 2005; Scelza 2009). Consistent with this substitution role, it has been found that single-parent families in traditional populations actually have more helpers than dual-parent families (Sugiyama and Chacon 2005). The normative nuclear family system in contemporary industrialized societies means that men (both fathers and grandfathers) may benefit families by investing more in parenting and grandparenting.

The ever-increasing investment in children in contemporary industrialized societies means nuclear families require heavy investment from vertical kin in the absence of support from broad, horizontal kin networks. This also restricts men's mating opportunities given that polygyny is not permissible and serial monogamy comes with the high costs of investing in multiple families. Further, with the advent of social security systems, grandfather availability, after retirement, has potentially increased, especially for the investment of time, such as childcare. Therefore, as with fathering, grandfathering may now become a more important resource for families, providing grandfathers with the opportunity to carve out their own new niche.

Consistent with this high-investment niche, research literature shows that grandfathers are becoming actively involved and engaged with their grandchildren and that they make a difference in their grandchildren's lives. Crucially, this represents a movement away from the traditional view of grandfathers as passive, remote and disengaged (Roberto et al. 2001). Tinsley and Parke (1987) investigated measures of physical and mental development as a function of the frequency of grandparent—grandchild contact with seven-month-old infants and their families. Each grandparent was observed playing with the infant, in the infant's house, for 5 minutes, and the interaction was assessed throughout. Grandfathers who were rated as highly responsive and highly playful had infants with higher Bayley Scales of Infant Development and both raw and adjusted Physical Health Index scores (Tinsley and Parke 1987). Although engaging play may be a universally positive influence, other outcomes, such as education, may be more nuanced. Scholl Perry (1996) investigated the influence of grandparental investment on academic achievement and found that social distance to grandfathers, but not grandmothers, was associated with grade point average. Specifically, a larger social distance between students and their paternal grandfathers was associated with a higher grade point average. Conversely, a *smaller* social distance to maternal grandfathers was associated with higher grade point averages. The scarcity of this evidence highlights the need for further investigation into the emerging role grandfathers are playing (see also Chap. 4). There is also reason to speculate that the availability of the grandfather niche may not be equally distributed across demographic groups. Lower

socio-economic groups experience higher rates of single motherhood, less father involvement (Nettle 2008) and more reliance on kin other than the father (Thomese and Liefbroer 2013) and receive less paid childcare. Therefore, through choice or necessity, this new grandfather niche may be more common in lower socio-economic areas.

Grandfather Niche: Single-Teenage-Mother Families

We have suggested that grandfathers have found a new niche, which may be especially prominent in low-resource family environments, such as single-parent families and families living in poverty. For example, in studies that focus explicitly on single-parent families, a resident grandfather can have a significant influence on grandchild development. In a study of sixty-six multigenerational, teen-mother families in the city of Detroit, Michigan (USA)—with biological fathers absent and grandchildren between 1 and 2 years of age—higher levels of grandfather nurturance were associated with the children being more likely to comply with their mothers' requests. Moreover, higher levels of grandfather involvement substantially reduced negative effects in grandchildren. These effects were robust and remained after adjustment for socio-economic status, grandmother's occupation, hours of grandmother employment, grandfather's age and hours of grandfather employment (Oyserman et al. 1993). Interestingly, there was no evidence of grandmother effects in this sample. Perhaps in these father-absent, single-mother, multigenerational households the grandfather assumes the father-figure role, thereby overshadowing the grandmother role. This finding also demonstrates that grandfathers are rising to the challenges associated with difficult low-resource family environments (Roberto et al. 2001). This role could also represent an emerging niche for grandfathers that traditionally might have been the domain of the maternal grandmother.

The evidence that the influence a grandparent has during times of need is larger than in times of plenty has been established. However, the question of whether grandparents intentionally direct their resources where the need is greatest has received less attention. Need is an important

new variable that is emerging in the grandparental investment literature (Roberto et al. 2001; Thomese and Liefbroer 2013). It is also a variable that is not entirely dealt with by the predominant, utility-based models detailed earlier and is likely to benefit from consideration of evolutionary perspectives (Hooper et al. 2015). Need and responses to need are likely to be important in single-parent families and stepfamilies, which are often resource poor, especially in terms of social capital (Sear and Coall 2011).

Step-Grandfather Niche: Increasing Prevalence

With increased rates of divorce and remarriage in industrialized societies, the changing roles of grandparents may be most salient for grandfathers. Falling rates of marriage and high rates of divorce and remarriage cause the proportion of non-kin, including grandparents, in families to increase. In 2009, for instance, the US marriage rate was 6.8 per 1000 people, with a divorce rate of 3.4 per 1000 people (Tejada-Vera and Sutton 2010). After separation, 25 % of women, who are more likely to have custody of their children, will re-partner within 2 years and remarry within 5 years (McNamee and Raley 2011). Therefore, males are increasingly likely to marry into existing families, forming new families and becoming stepfathers and step-grandfathers.

Quality relationships between grandchildren and their biological grandparents across nuclear, stepparent and single-parent families have been associated with an improved emotional health of grandchildren (Ruiz and Silverstein 2007). Moreover, maintaining quality contact with paternal grandparents, who are often alienated during remarriage and stepfamily formation, is beneficial to the behavioural adjustment and mental health of both grandparents and grandchildren (Attar-Schwartz et al. 2009; Bray and Berger 1990; Drew and Silverstein 2007). The role that non-biological grandparents (e.g. a stepfather or the stepfather's parents) play in childcare and grandchildren's development has, in contrast, received little attention. This, in turn, has resulted in calls to introduce genetic relatedness into interdisciplinary studies of grandparental investment (Kaptijn et al. 2013). Using the Survey of Heath, Ageing and Retirement across Europe, Coall et al. (2014) found that, whilst biological grandparents were more

likely to provide frequent informal childcare for their grandchildren, non-biological grandparents, who are typically step-grandparents, still invested in their grandchildren and were more likely to invest on a monthly basis or less frequently. Crucially for this chapter, non-biological grandparents were significantly more likely to be grandfathers. This study provides initial evidence that the role of step-grandparents is more likely to fall on grandfathers. At increasing rates in the future, grandfathers will experience this new and challenging role in stepfamilies and blended families.

Summary of Grandfather Effects in Industrialized Societies

Like fathers, in contrast to traditional societies, grandfathers in contemporary industrialized societies can have an equal if not greater impact on grandchild development than grandmothers. The effects grandparents have on grandchild development are generally of a small magnitude; however, some of the greatest effects have been found for grandfathers (Radin et al. 1991). The fact that these associations are found across grandchild ages, study designs and diverse populations and generally take into account a range of potential confounding variables adds strength to these findings. Although the direction of the causal association cannot be established from these studies, the ability in longitudinal studies to adjust for variables, including earlier markers of grandchild development (e.g. Pittman 2007), suggests that grandparents may have an actual causal impact. Moreover, like the compelling ethnographic data from traditional societies, these findings are supported by qualitative analyses that show that it is not the grandparent–grandchild relationship per se that makes a difference; rather, it is what grandparents actually *do* with their grandchildren that is crucial (El Hassan Al Awad and Sonuga-Barke 1992; Botcheva and Feldman 2004; Griggs et al. 2010; Coall and Hertwig 2011). In contemporary industrialized societies, the child outcomes of interest have changed, and studies are now exploring social well-being and cognitive development rather than child survival. However, the evidence that grandparents, including grandfathers, have a positive influence on grandchild development is growing, as is the evidence that

grandfathers may be actively assuming new niches within families, especially during trying times of divorce, remarriage and economic hardship.

Acknowledgements RS was funded by the European Research Council, Starting Grant 263,760, during the writing of this chapter.

References

- Allen-Arave, W., Gurven, M., & Hill, K. (2008). Reciprocal altruism, not kin selection, maintains nepotistic food transfers on an Ache reservation. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 29, 305–318. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2008.03.002.
- Amato, Paul R., & Rivera, Fernando. (1999). Paternal involvement and children's behavior problems. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61(2), 375–384.
- Anderson, K. G. (2006). How well does paternity confidence match actual paternity? Evidence from worldwide nonpaternity rates. *Current Anthropology*, 48, 511–518.
- Arrondel, L., & Masson, A. (2006). Altruism, exchange or indirect reciprocity: What do the data on family transfers show? In S. C. Kolm & J. M. Ythier (Eds.), *Handbook of the economics of giving, altruism and reciprocity, volume 2: Applications, Handbooks in economics 23* (pp. 971–1053). Amsterdam: North-Holland/Elsevier.
- Attar-Schwartz, S., Tan, J.-P., Buchanan, A., Flouri, E., & Griggs, J. (2009). Grandparenting and adolescent adjustment in two-parent biological, lone-parent, and stepfamilies. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 23, 67–75.
- Barro, R. J. (1974). Are government bonds net wealth? *Journal of Political Economy*, 82, 1095–1117.
- Becker, G. S. (1974). A theory of social interactions. *Journal of Political Economy*, 82, 1063–1093.
- Blake, J. (1987). Differential parental investment: Its effects on child quality and status attainment. In J. B. Lancaster, J. Altmann, A. S. Rossi, & L. R. Sherrod (Eds.), *Parenting across the life span: Biosocial dimensions* (pp. 351–375). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Botcheva, L. B., & Feldman, S. S. (2004). Grandparents as family stabilizers during economic hardship in Bulgaria. *International Journal of Psychology*, 39, 157–168.

- Bray, J. H., & Berger, S. H. (1990). Noncustodial father and paternal grandfather relationships in stepfamilies. *Family Relations*, 39, 414–419.
- Campbell, C., & Lee, J. Z. (1996). A death in the family: Household structure and mortality in rural liaoning: Life-event and time-series analysis 1792–1867. *The History of the Family*, 1(3), 297–328. doi:10.1016/S1081-602X(96)90026-3.
- Chan, C. G., & Elder, G. H. (2000). Matrilineal advantage in grandchild–grandparent relations. *The Gerontologist*, 40(2), 179–190.
- Coall, D. A., & Hertwig, R. (2010). Grandparental investment: Past, present and future. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 1–59. doi:10.1017/S0140525X09991105.
- Coall, D. A., & Hertwig, R. (2011). Grandparental investment: A relic of the past or a resource for the future? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 93–98. doi:10.1177/0963721411403269.
- Coall, D. A., Meie, M., Hertwig, R., Wänke, M., & Höpflinger, F. (2009). Grandparental investment: The influence of reproductive timing and family size. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 21, 455–463.
- Coall, D. A., Hilbrand, S., & Hertwig, R. (2014) Predictors of grandparental investment decisions in contemporary Europe: Biological relatedness and beyond. *PLoS ONE*, 9(1), e84082. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0084082. Open Access: <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0084082>.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1980). Discriminative parental solicitude: A biological perspective. *The Journal of Marriage and Family*, 42, 277–288. doi: 10.2037/351225.
- Danielsbacka, M., Tanskanen, A., Jokela, M., & Rotkirch, A. (2011). Grandparental child care in europe: evidence for preferential investment in more certain kin. *Evolutionary Psychology* 9(1), 3–24.
- Drew, L. M., & Silverstein, M. (2007). Grandparents' psychological well-being after loss of contact with their grandchildren. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21, 372–379.
- Dubas, J. S. (2001). How gender moderates the grandparent–grandchild relationship: A comparison of kin-keeper and kin-selector theories. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22, 478–492. doi:10.1177/019251301022004005.
- Eisenberg, A. R. (1988). Grandchildren's perspectives on relationships with grandparents: The influence of gender across generations. *Sex Roles*, 19, 205–217. doi:10.1007/BF00290155.

- El Hassan Al Awad, A. M., & Sonuga-Barke, E. J. S. (1992). Childhood problems in a Sudanese city: A comparison of extended and nuclear families. *Child Development*, *63*, 906–914. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1992.tb01670.x.
- Euler, H. A., & Weitzel, B. (1996). Discriminative grandparental solicitude as reproductive strategy. *Human Nature*, *7*, 39–59. doi:10.1007/BF02733489.
- Friedman, D., Hechter, M., & Kreager, D. (2008). A theory of the value of grandchildren. *Rationality and Society*, *20*, 31–63. doi:10.1177/1043463107085436.
- Glaser, K., Price, D., Gessa, G. D., Ribe, E., Stuchbury, R., & Tinker, A. (2013). Grandparenting in Europe: Family policy and grandparents' role in providing childcare. Report for Grandparents Plus. http://www.grandparentsplus.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Grandparenting-in-Europe-0613_Electronic.pdf. Accessed 27 July 2015.
- Griggs, J., Tan, J.-P., Buchanan, A., Attar-Schwartz, S., & Flouri, E. (2010). "They've always been there for me": Grandparental involvement and child well-being. *Children and Society*, *24*(3), 200–214.
- Hamilton, W. D. (1964). The genetical evolution of social behaviour (I and II). *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *7*, 1–52. doi:10.1016/0022-5193(64)90038-4 and 10.1016/0022-5193(64)90039-6.
- Hank, K., & Buber, I. (2009). Grandparents caring for their grandchildren: Findings from the 2004 survey of health, ageing and retirement in Europe. *Journal of Family Issues*, *30*, 53–73.
- Harper, L. (2005). Epigenetic inheritance and the intergenerational transfer of experience. *Psychological Bulletin*, *131*, 340–360.
- Hawke, K., O'Connell, J. F., Blurton Jones, N. G., Alvarez, H., & Charnov, E. L. (1998). Grandmothering, menopause and the evolution of human life histories. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*, *95*, 1336–1339.
- Hertwig, R., Davis, J. N., & Sullo way, F. J. (2002). Parental investment: How an equity motive can produce inequality. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*, 728–745.
- Hoff, A. (2007). Patterns of intergenerational support in grandparent–grandchild and parent–child relationships in Germany. *Aging and Society*, *27*, 643–665.
- Hoffman, E. (1980). Young adults' relations with their grandparents: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, *10*, 299–310.
- Hooper, P. L., Gurven, M., Winking, J., & H. S., K. (2015). Inclusive fitness and differential productivity across the lifespan determine intergenerational

- transfers in a small-scale human society. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1803), 2014–2808.
- Hrdy, S. B. (2009). *Mothers and others: The evolutionary origins of mutual understanding*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Huber, B. R., & Breedlove, W. L. (2007). Evolutionary theory, kinship, and childbirth in cross-cultural perspective. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 41, 196–219. doi:10.1177/1069397106298261.
- Ivey, P. K. (2000). Cooperative reproduction in Ituri forest hunter-gatherers: Who cares for Efe infants? *Current Anthropology*, 41, 856–866. doi:10.1086/317414.
- Kaplan, H. S. (1994). Evolutionary and wealth flows theories of fertility: Empirical tests and new hypotheses. *Population and Development Review*, 20, 752–791.
- Kaptijn, R., Thomese, F., Liefbroer, A. C., & Silverstein, M. (2013). Testing evolutionary theories of discriminative grandparental investment. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, 45, 289–310. doi:10.1017/S0021932012000612.
- Kemkes-Grottenthaler, A. (2005). Of grandmothers, grandfathers and wicked step-grandparents: Differential impact of paternal grandparents on grandoffspring survival. *Historical Social Research*, 30(3), 219–239.
- Kennedy, G. (1990). College students' expectations of grandparent and grandchild role behaviors. *Gerontologist*, 30, 43–48.
- Kohli, M., Künemund, H., Motel, A., & Szydlik, M. (2000). *Grunddaten zur Lebenssituation der 40–85 jährigen deutschen Bevölkerung. Ergebnisse des Alters-Survey [Basic data on the living situation of 40 to 85 year old Germans: Result of the age survey]*. Berlin: Weißensee.
- Kokko, H., & Jennions, M. D. (2008). Parental investment, sexual selection and sex ratios. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 21, 919–948.
- Konner, M. (2010). *The evolution of childhood: Relationships, emotion, mind*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kramer, K. L. (2002). Variation in juvenile dependence: Helping behavior among Maya children. *Human Nature*, 13, 299–325.
- Laferrère, A., & Wolff, F. C. (2006). Microeconomic models of family transfers. In S. C. Kolm & J. M. Ythier (Eds.), *Handbook of the economics of giving, altruism and reciprocity, volume 2: Applications, Handbooks in Economics 23* (pp. 889–969). Amsterdam: North-Holland/Elsevier.
- Laham, S. M., Gonsalkorale, K., & von Hippel, W. (2005). Darwinian grandparenting: Preferential investment in more certain kin. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 63–72.

- Lahdenperä, M., Lummaa, V., Helle, S., Tremblay, M., & Russell, A. F. (2004). Fitness benefits of prolonged post-reproductive lifespan in women. *Nature*, *428*, 178–181.
- Lahdenperä, M., Russell, A. F., & Lummaa, V. (2007). Selection for long lifespan in men: Benefits of grandfathering? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *274*, 2437–2444.
- Lahdenperä, M., Lummaa, V., & Russell, A. F. (2011). Selection on male longevity in a monogamous human population: Late-life survival brings no additional grandchildren. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *24*(5), 1053–1063.
- Lamb, M. E. (Ed.) (2010). *The role of the father in child development*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Leonetti, D. L., Nath, D. C., Hemam, N. S., & Neill, D. B. (2005). Kinship organization and the impact of grandmothers on reproductive success among the matrilineal Khasi and patrilineal Bengali of northeastern India. In E. Voland, A. Chasiotis, & W. Schiefenhövel (Eds.), *Grandmotherhood: The evolutionary significance of the second half of female life* (pp. 194–214). New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Mann, R. (2007). Out of the shadows?: Grandfatherhood, age and masculinities. *Journal of Aging Studies*, *21*(4), 281–291.
- Marks, G. N. (2006). Family size, family type and student achievement: Cross-national differences and the role of socioeconomic and school factors. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *37*, 1–24.
- Marlowe, F. W. (2005). Who tends Hadza children? In B. S. Hewlett & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Hunter-gatherer childhoods: Evolutionary, developmental and cultural perspectives* (pp. 177–190). New Brunswick: Aldine.
- McNamee, C. B., & Raley, R. K. (2011). A note on race, ethnicity and nativity differentials in remarriage in the United States. *Demographic Research*, *24*, 293–312. doi:10.4054/DemRes.2011.24.13.
- Monserud, M. A. (2008). Intergenerational relationships and affectual solidarity between grandparents and young adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *70*, 182–195.
- Nettle, D. (2008). Why do some dads get more involved than others? Evidence from a large British cohort. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *29*(6), 416–423.
- Oyserman, D., Radin, N., & Benn, R. (1993). Dynamics in a three-generational family: Teens, grandparents, and babies. *Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 564–572.
- Pashos, A. (2000). Does parental uncertainty explain discriminative grandparental solicitude? A cross-cultural study in Greece and Germany. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *21*, 97–109.

- Pittman, L. D. (2007). Grandmothers' involvement among young adolescents growing up in poverty. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 17(1), 89–116.
- Pollet, T. V., Nelissen, M., & Nettle, D. (2009). Lineage based differences in grandparental investment: Evidence from a large British cohort study. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, 41, 355–379.
- Radin, N., Oyserman, D., & Benn, R. (1991). The influence of grandfathers on the young children of teen mothers. In P. K. Smith (Ed.), *The psychology of grandparenthood: An international perspective*. UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Reitzes, D. C., & Mutran, E. J. (2004). Grandparenthood: Factors influencing frequency of grandparent–grandchildren contact and grandparent role satisfaction. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 59B, S9–S16.
- Roberto, K. A., Allen, K. R., & Blieszner, R. (2001). Grandfathers' perceptions and expectations of relationships with their adult grandchildren. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22(4), 407–426.
- Rossi, A. S., & Rossi, P. H. (1990). *Of human bonding: Parent–child relations across the life course*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Ruiz, S. A., & Silverstein, M. (2007). Relationships with grandparents and the emotional well-being of late adolescent and young adult grandchildren. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63, 793–808. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2007.00537.
- Scelza, B. A. (2009). The grandmaternal niche: Critical caretaking among Martu Aborigines. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 21, 448–454.
- Scholl-Perry, K. (1996). Relationships among adolescents' ego development, their academic achievement, and the amount of their contact with and social distance from grandparents. Pace University, New York. Dissertation Abstracts International, DAI-B 57/08, p. 5391. (AAT 9701161).
- Sear, R., & Coall, D. A. (2011). How much does family matter? Cooperative breeding and the demographic transition. *Population and Development Review*, 37(Suppl.), 81–112.
- Sear, R., & Mace, R. (2008). Who keeps children alive? A review of the effects of kin on child survival. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 29, 1–18.
- Sigle-Rushton, W., & McLanahan, S. (2004). *Father absence and child wellbeing: A critical review* (pp. 116–155). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Smith, M. S. (1987). Evolution and developmental psychology: Toward a socio-biology of human development. In C. Crawford, M. Smith, & D. Krebs (Eds.), *Sociobiology and psychology: Ideas, issues and applications* (pp. 225–252). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- St George, J. M., & Fletcher, R. J. (2014). Men's experiences of grandfatherhood: A welcome surprise. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 78(4), 351–378.

- Sugiyama, L. S., & Chacon, R. (2005). Juvenile responses to household ecology among the Yora of Peruvian Amazonia. In B. S. Hewlett & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Hunter-gatherer childhoods: Evolutionary, developmental and cultural perspectives* (pp. 237–261). New Brunswick: Aldine.
- Szinovacz, M. E. (1998a). Grandparents today: A demographic profile. *The Gerontologist*, *38*, 37–52.
- Szinovacz, M. E. (1998b). Research on grandparenting: Needed refinements in concepts, theories, and methods. In M. E. Szinovacz (Ed.), *Handbook on grandparenthood* (pp. 257–288). Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Tanskanen, A. O., Danielsbacka, M., & Rotkirch, A. (2014). Multi-partner fertility is associated with lower grandparental investment from in-laws in Finland. *Advances in Life Course Research*, *22*, 41–48. doi:10.1016/j.alcr.2014.04.003.
- Tejada-Vera, B., & Sutton, P. D. (2010). Births, marriages, divorces, and deaths: provisional data for 2009. National Vital Statistics Report 58: 25. www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr58/nvsr58_25.pdf. Accessed 6 Aug 2014.
- Thomese, F., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2013). Child care and child births: The role of grandparents in the Netherlands. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *75*(2), 403–421. doi:10.1111/jomf.12005.
- Tinsley, B. J., & Parke, R. D. (1987). Grandparents as interactive and social support agents for families with young infants. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, *25*, 259–277.
- Tran, U. S., Fisher, M. L., & Voracek, M. (2009). Spousal age differences and sex differences in life expectancy are confounders of matrilineal biases in kin investment. *Basic Applied Social Psychology*, *31*, 295–303. doi:10.1080/01973530903316773.
- Trivers, R. L. (1971). The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *Quarterly Review of Biology*, *46*, 35–57. doi:10.1086/406755.
- Uhlenberg, P., & Hammill, B. G. (1998). Frequency of grandparental contact with grandchild sets: Six factors that make a difference. *The Gerontologist*, *38*, 276–285.
- US Census Bureau. (2009, July 13). Grandparents Day 2009: September 13. Facts for Features, CB09-FF.16. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/facts_for_features_special_editions/cb09-ff16.html.
- Williams, G. C. (1957). Pleiotropy, natural selection, and the evolution of senescence. *Evolution*, *11*, 398–411. doi:10.2307/2406060.