



Boyer, K., Dermott, E., James, A., & MacLeavy, J. (2017). Men at work? Debating shifting gender divisions of care. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 7(1), 92-98. DOI: 10.1177/2043820617691630

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1177/2043820617691630](https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820617691630)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Sage at <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2043820617691630>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/pure/about/ebr-terms.html>

Men At Work? Debating Shifting Gender Divisions of Care

Kate Boyer¹, Esther Dermott², Al James³ and Julie MacLeavy²

¹ Cardiff University

² University of Bristol

³ Newcastle University

Corresponding author: Julie MacLeavy, School of Geographical Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 1SS, UK.

Julie.macleavy@bristol.ac.uk

Abstract

In response to four commentaries on our paper ‘Regendering care in the aftermath of recession?’, we extend our discussion of the ongoing knowledge gap that prevails around shifting patterns of male work/care. Recognising the spatial limits of extant theories of male primary caregiving, we discuss first the need to attend to the variegated landscapes of male caregiving across the globe. Likewise, the theoretical stakes of expanding the focus of ‘mainstream’ analysis to take account of the situated experiences and knowledges of men and women in countries of the global South. We then consider the subjects of our research inquiry (the ‘who’ of contemporary fathering) and how different definitions of male primary caregivers may reveal or conceal patterns and shifts in male caregiving practices. Lastly we consider questions of scale and research methodology. Although our paper employs a national level analysis, we fully endorse the use of alternative scalar lenses and underline the need to analyse male care within the context of multiscale and interacting sites of normative change: from nation state, to community, to home, to the body.

Key words: men, fatherhood, social reproduction, Stay at Home Fathers, regendering care, work-life, geographical scale.

Word Count: 3039 (+references)

Introduction

Recent studies of the changing practices of fathers - which show men engaging in everyday tasks of childcare and housework to a greater extent than in the past - initially seemed to offer the realistic prospect of greater gender equality. However, such shifts have not (yet) led to the wholesale transformation of men’s and women’s responsibilities for childcare. As a consequence, much academic research has concentrated on describing and explaining the failure of societies to move significantly towards more gender equitable forms of work. This, in turn, has led to the relative neglect of households where men *do* take primary responsibility for social reproduction even though it is these arrangements which may offer the most useful insights into alternative, and more gender equal, work-lives.

In our paper, we sought to address the ongoing knowledge gap that exists around shifting patterns of male work/care and deliberately phrased our paper title as a question. Our discussion explored the multiple factors, motivations and institutions that are potentially facilitating a complex ‘regendering of care’ phenomenon (with a particular focus on the UK), and their relative significance in different place

contexts. We also sought to identify the role of economic crisis, labour market change, austerity and economic recovery in (re)shaping household decision making around gender divisions of care. And we emphasised the wider implications of these changes for repositioning the mainstream ‘work-life balance’ (WLB) research agenda, rooted in widespread social constructions of WLB as a ‘female only’ problem (and within that, almost the exclusive preserve of working mothers).

We view our work as part of a broader effort to challenge and disrupt the hegemonic normative idea that childcare should principally be the work of mothers. As neatly summarised by Gorman-Murray (2017), the aim is ‘to prompt more careful and critical spatial thinking on gendered divisions of care and their uneven geographies’. Here we engage with the core elements of our respondents’ invitations to continue the conversation in relation to: variegated geographical landscapes of male care giving; male primary caregivers as agents of change amidst stubborn societal and structural constraints on co-parenting and the regendering of carework; and the (dis)connections between multi-scalar sites of normative change: from nation state, to community, to home, to the body.

Variagated landscapes of male care

First, we highlighted the important contributions that previous work has made in theorising the uneven rise of male primary caregiving in North America (specifically the USA and Canada) alongside Scandinavia where studies have yielded important insights into the growth of more ‘democratic’ national models of childcare and fatherhood. To extend the empirical scope of these debates we offered an enlarged empirical focus on the UK, arguing that men in the UK have remained relatively under-researched within these debates. Through a particular focus on the aftermath of the 2008-09 recession and double dip of 2011-12, our analysis identified a series of challenges to established household gender divisions of work/care in relation to: economic restructuring, welfare spending cuts, rising costs of childcare, policy interventions which seek to culturally and numerically defeminise carework, and concerns over work-life balance in an ‘age of austerity’. Extending this geographical focus of analysis further, Gorman-Murray’s response focuses on the experiences of men in Australia (see also Winchester 1999, Cox 2014, Wright et al. 2016), and calls for further comparisons between urban areas and rural areas, between cities, regions, and nation-states. As Longhurst (2017) also identifies in her response, the aim should not be to privilege any one spatial scale. Rather, ‘comparative work between places, between scales and across scales could help, on the one hand, to map variations in geographies of male care giving, and on the other hand, to identify what kinds of economic, social and political processes enable and constrain gender-equal care work’ (Gorman-Murray 2017). We fully endorse these calls.

As part of this geographical comparison, it is also vital that future research expands the focus of ‘mainstream’ analysis beyond advanced capitalist ‘core’ economies to those in the global South (see also Longhurst 2017). This is important in order to recognise the spatial limits of theories of Stay at Home Fatherhood and male primary caregiving developed in Western settings, and thereby give voice to a wider variety of situated experiences and knowledges amongst men and women in countries of the global South. Examples of research that engages with fathers outside the empirical heartland ‘core’ economies of the UK, USA, Western Europe and Australia include studies in Vietnam, Costa Rica, and Mexico (e.g. Chant 2000, Willis 2005, Hoang and Yeoh 2011). This work (mostly located within a development studies tradition) has begun to ‘provincialise’ and de-essentialise over-generalised theories of male and female breadwinning and gendered divisions of care by exposing a wider variety of male work/care practices and masculinities in different household and community settings. Nevertheless, fathers in the global South remain marginalised as an empirical focus for study within ‘mainstream’

debates around fatherhood and work/care, which limits our understanding of these uneven geographies of transformation. Following Olds (2001), we still lack a truly global human geography (see also Peck 2015). Key research questions remain, therefore, around what different forms of 'Stay At Home Fatherhood', 'female breadwinning' and 'non-traditional' household structures look like if our theory-building process begins instead in the global South. How are different policy actors differently able to challenge societal barriers to male primary caregiving in order to promote more gender equal divisions of work/care in different locations? And what are the geographical possibilities for more gender equal divisions of work and care in the informal sector, for workers in the global South engaged in work that is not formally contractualised nor recognised by the state? In engaging with these questions and seeking 'to build theory in non-familiar places' (Raju 2006), the aim is to develop more cosmopolitan theories of fathering and the regendering of care - and in a manner that disrupts and challenges the mantra of 'west is best' that continues to define the 'mainstream' geographies of academic knowledge production. It also demands that we get better at engaging with migrant communities, in which practices of fatherhood and care learned in the global South are increasingly challenged and 'unlearned' in the global North (and indeed, whose members often maintain 'stretched' gender divisions of household care at a distance).

Agents of change? Societal and structural issues and the regendering of care work

Schwiter and Baumgarten's (2017) commentary on our article argues that an overly narrow focus on Stay-At-Home-Fathers (SAHFs) is misplaced. They suggest that a regendering of care may equally occur through other shifts in men's patterns of employment, such as the reduction in weekly hours spent in the labour market which has recently taken place in Switzerland. This comment raises an important question about how to define male primary care givers which goes beyond the technical issue of measurement. As we noted in our original paper, academic studies of SAHFs have used a number of different definitions of this term. They vary according to whether these men are not engaged in any paid work at all or do a small amount (measured either in time or financial contribution to the households), over what period of time the household arrangement should exist for men to be classified in this way, or indeed whether an assessment should be made using an 'objective' definition at all and should (or could) instead rely on a subjective one. The most easily discernible, discrete category - that of fathers who are not participating in the labour market and are instead wholly engaged in doing unpaid childcare - will significantly underrepresent the wider population of men who think of themselves as SAHFs, (as well as including others who do not identify in this way). John Adams, a prominent UK stay-at-home dad blogger (dadbloguk.com) noted that his (small) income from blogging would mean that he would not count in national statistics that are primarily concerned with capturing levels of economic activity (Adams 2015). Significant numbers of those men whom Schwiter and Baumgarten (2017) highlight as reconstructing their relationship to the wage-labour market in Switzerland through less than full-time employment and increased responsibilities as carers, may identify as primary caregivers even if they are not recognised as such in formal statistics. The myriad ways in which fathers simultaneously reconstruct their relationship to caregiving and the wage labour market in a Northern European context clearly holds the potential for changing societal norms around both the feminisation of care and expectations related to full-time working. We would simply suggest that while for individual couples and households any system which moves away from the Fraserian 'universal wage earner' model and towards something closer to the 'universal carer' model (Fraser 1997) may be transformative (and even potentially more sustainable in the long term than the switching of breadwinner and caregiver), there also remains genuine cultural significance in the image of fathers embracing the role of primary carer. As Gorman-Murray (2017) suggests in his commentary, SAHFs

both epitomise and embody a shift away from patriarchal masculinity; and this visibility may be an important marker even when it is not wholly embraced by individual fathers.

This leads to a broader question raised in the commentaries by Scwiter and Baumgarten, Gorman-Murray, and Locke, as to the relative societal and structural issues that impair or support coparenting and the regendering of care work in general. Locke (2017) is right in noting that the UK has witnessed relatively low levels of parental leave take-up by fathers since its introduction in 2015. There is some consensus that this in large part reflects the importance of financial considerations and hence that policies which aim to really shift caring responsibilities need to offer realistic financial remuneration for undertaking unpaid work. However, this is far from the whole picture. Financial explanations can be presented as rational post-hoc explanations for ‘traditional’ gendered divisions of labour as behaviours and identities are adjusted to each other (see Himmelweit and Sigala 2004). Thus, as we suggest in our original paper, it is *disruptions* to the organisation of paid and unpaid work and care in households (including financial arrangements) which may prompt the adoption of less stereotypically gendered roles. Indeed, it is our view – also in line with Locke’s (2017) call to consider economic factors within a larger social framework – that ‘the economic’ must be considered as socially, spatially and temporally situated rather than operating as a stand-alone set of explanatory factors. Consequently, economic crisis and recession may provide only a partial prompt for gender reconfigurations of paid work and care.

Multiscalar and interacting sites of normative change: from nation state, to home, to the body

In seeking to explore the spatially uneven effects of labour market restructuring, welfare state retrenchment, and shifting social constructions of acceptable masculinity in facilitating versus constraining more equitable gender divisions of household care following the 2008-09 recessionary period, we looked to the scale of the nation to illustrate the relationship between the contemporary development of more equitable gender divisions of household care and wider public policy. Our argument was that the recent UK recession offers the potential for either an entrenchment of gender roles in paid and unpaid work or for a regendering of parents’ financial and caring responsibilities. It is, as Gorman-Murray (2017) notes, in times of crisis when ‘external pressures on workplaces and employment conditions provide fissures through which new gendered expectations and practices might emerge’. By focusing on the scale of the nation we sought to foreground the role of the state and public policy in changing expectations around men’s contribution to household work and childcare. Drawing from evidence in the UK we saw an emergent shift in policy: from a primary focus on supporting women’s work around an assumed majority burden of childcare, to measures that sought to facilitate and encourage men to increase their share of childcare in order to aid the pursuit of improved labour market positions amongst women. We acknowledged the role of policy in sustaining the upward trend in male caregiving by making childcare aspirational to men, and encouraging employers to make possible non-traditional working arrangements (e.g. destigmatisation of part-time) for men as an important part of this process (see also Dermott and Miller 2015). Locke (2017) suggests that a deeper exploration of shared parental leave could provide us with additional insights. Certainly the formulation of parental leave in the UK as ‘transferable maternity leave’ - meaning that the default position grants leave entitlement to the mother – reflects an ongoing conservative strand in prioritising the role of mothers over fathers. This indicates the way in which the political context and underlying principles behind specific policies need to be taken into account.

Longhurst’s (2017) and Locke’s (2017) commentaries raise important issues about our use of scale, highlighting the ways in which experiences of male primary caring are cross-cut and shaped by various

kinds of social difference (including sexual orientation, class, race, and cultural background) and the potential of male primary caring to destabilise gender binisms. While our aim in the paper was to provide a broad-brush view of societal-level trends, we agree with Longhurst and Locke that analysis at the scale of the nation must be enriched by understandings of the many and varied ways that male caring is differently experienced ‘on the ground’. We are cognisant of the extent to which place-based norms of masculinity and gender relations mediate on-the-ground responses to government policy. Indeed, our paper pointed towards the role of different labour market histories, industrial heritage and local geographies of recession and recovery in moderating productive and social reproductive identities and household relations. Adopting a focusing on intimate geographical scales importantly allows the analytical capture of lived experiences of men negotiating non-traditional masculinities of work/care and their familial relationships. This has value because it opens up important questions around gender performance that are relevant to our conversation about male work/care. Toward this end, alongside the writing of this paper we have over the last three years collectively supervised three PhD students (Eleni Bourantani at University of Southampton; Robert Stephenson at Queen Mary, University of London and Alex Dimmock at University of Bristol)¹ whose work has helped advance knowledge in this vein through nuanced analyses of different aspects of men’s embodied and affective experiences of primary caring. Our paper is intended to compliment and extend these finer-grain analyses in so far as experiences of caring for young children – and decisions about who will do this work – are not solely private matters decided by individual families. Rather, they are made within a context of policy and labour market opportunities (or lack thereof) and shifting and geographically-variable normative understandings about masculinity and fathering.

In a similar vein, we advocate for further attention to be paid to the processes through which productive and reproductive identities are constructed through bodies in order to make sense of the lived experiences of male caregivers. Longhurst’s (2017) commentary pushes us to consider how parenting work is attached to particular sexed and gendered bodies and to trouble dualisms such as man/woman and father/mother (see also Aitken 2000; Longhurst 2008). She asks: are Stay At Home Fathers’ fathering children, mothering children or both? And do ‘men who mother’ have the potential to shift hegemonic understandings of maternities, and if so how? In recognising the performance of care as an embodied practice we welcome the provocation to think deeply about the way bodies are sexed and gendered, as well as the ways built form and other material actants within parenting assemblages (prams, baby bags and suchlike) anticipate female bodies.

Longhurst’s (2017) argument for research that seeks to examine the regendering of care at the scale of bodies, homes and communities in order to provide ‘a deeper understanding of the emotions and affects that surround caregiving’ is compelling. Who can parent, who can work, and who can stay at home are underwritten by definitions of masculinity, which are informed by sexual, racial and class identifications, and this affects the identities to which different parents subscribe, as well as the work they perform in their parenting role. For example, there is evidence to suggest that heterosexual married men and women in household circumstances that contradict ‘normal’ expectations of gender “compensate” for this arrangement by either increasing or decreasing their contribution to household task in accordance with traditional gender roles (Brines 1994; Greenstein 2000; Bittman et al 2003; cf. Sullivan 2011). This underlines the need closely to examine the relationship between care and paid work responsibilities and how they are negotiated at a familial and household level within the context of

¹ Two of us have recently moved institutions. Boyer from University of Southampton to Cardiff University and James from Queen Mary, University of London to Newcastle University.

multiscalar and interacting sites of normative change (from nation state, to community, to home) in a manner that takes into account the emotions and affects of caregivers.

One means of doing this is through in-depth qualitative research. In the course of querying the potential of men's increased role in young-child caring, Longhurst's (2017) commentary is enriched by autobiographical references to her partner's experience of being a stay at home father 25 years ago. We suggest that this retrospective view provides just the kind of rich insight that makes big-picture analyses such as ours particularly salient. At that time (and place) Longhurst and her partner's decision was very uncommon. In the contemporary UK it is not: or at least it is much less so. Unlike for Longhurst's partner in the early 1990s, many towns and cities in the UK now have support networks and dedicated groups for dads, and in some places male primary caring is not even particularly remarkable. While the geographies of male primary caring are still highly variable, we nevertheless suggest that these practices have exciting potential as a means of challenging and de-naturalising essentialised gender binisms that reflexively posit young-child (and other forms of) caring as women's work.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we are very grateful to Andrew Gorman-Murray, Abigail Locke, Robyn Longhurst, Karin Schwiter and Diana Baumgarten for their careful and critical engagement with our paper, and hope that it will help to foster new interdisciplinary debate and dialogue around the future of work, gender inequalities of work and care, and the regendering of care in the aftermath of recession.

References

- Adams, J. (2015) It's official: stay at home dads do not exist, Dadblokuk.com, 20th July, <http://dadblokuk.com/its-official-stay-at-home-dads-do-not-exist/>
- Aitken SC (2000) Fathering and faltering: "Sorry, but you don't have the necessary accoutrements", *Environment and Planning A*, 32: 581-598
- Bittman M, England P, Folbre N, Sayer L and Matheson G (2003) When does gender trump money? Bargaining and time in household work. *American Journal of Sociology*, 109: 186-214
- Brines J (1994) Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100: 652-688
- Chant S (2000) Men in crisis? Reflections on masculinities, work and family in north-west Costa Rica. *The European Journal of Development Research* 12(2): 199-218.
- Cox R (2014) Working on masculinity at home. In: Gorman-Murray A and Hopkins P (eds) *Masculinities and Place*. Farnham: Ashgate, 227-238.
- Dermott E and Miller T (2015) More than the sum of its parts?: Contemporary fatherhood policy, practice and discourse. *Families, Relationships and Societies* 4(2): 183-195.
- Fraser N (1997) *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*, London, Routledge

- Gorman-Murray A (2017) Caring about male care giving: spaces, subjectivities and regendering care. *Dialogues in Human Geography*.
- Greenstein TN (2000) Economic dependence, gender, and the division of labor in the home: A replication and extension. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62: 322-335
- Himmelweit, S and Sigala M (2004) Choice and the Relationship between Identities and Behaviour for Mothers with Pre-School Children: some implications for policy from a UK study. *Journal of Social Policy* 33(3):455-478
- Hoang L A and Yeoh B (2011). Breadwinning wives and “left-behind” husbands: Men and masculinities in the Vietnamese transnational family. *Gender and Society* 25(6): 717-739.
- Hochschild A (1989) *The Second Shift*. London: Penguin
- Locke A (2017) Regendering care or undoing gendered binaries of parenting in contemporary UK society. *Dialogues in Human Geography*.
- Longhurst R (2008) *Maternities: Gender, Bodies and Space*, New York, Routledge
- Longhurst R (2017) Reflecting on regendering care at different scales: Bodies-home-community-nation. *Dialogues in Human Geography*.
- Olds K (2001) Practices for ‘process geographies’: a view from within and outside the periphery. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 19: 127-36.
- Peck J. 2015. Cities beyond compare? *Regional Studies* 49(1): 160-182.
- Raju S (2006) Production of knowledge: looking for ‘theory’ in ‘familiar’ places. *Geoforum* 37: 155-58.
- Ranson, G. (2010) *Against the Grain: couples, gender and the reframing of parenting*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- Schwiter K and Baumgarten D (2017) Stay-at-home fathers on the wane – in comes daddy-day! Changing practices of fathering in German-speaking countries. *Dialogues in Human Geography*.
- Sullivan O (2011) An end to gender display through the performance of housework? A review and reassessment of the quantitative literature using insights from qualitative literature. *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, 3 (1): 1-13
- Willis K (2005) Latin American urban masculinities: Going beyond ‘the macho’. In: van Hoven, B. and Horschelmann, D. (eds) *Spaces of Masculinities*. Abingdon: Routledge, 87-109.
- Winchester H P M (1999) Lone fathers and the scales of justice: renegotiating masculinity after divorce, *Journal of Interdisciplinary Gender Studies* 4(2): 81-98.

Wright A, Crettenden A and Skinner N (2016) Dads care too! Participation in paid employment and experiences of workplace flexibility for Australian fathers caring for children and young adults with disabilities. *Community, Work and Family* 19(3): 340-61.