Justine van de Beek 542916
Erasmus University Rotterdam
Master Social Inequalities
Supervisor: Renske Keizer
Second reader: Samira van Bohemen
Word count excluding references and appendix: 9747
21-6-2020

Beyond the absent breadwinner: mapping the paternal masculinities of Dutch highly involved fathers

Abstract
Traditionally, full-time breadwinning was centre stage within dominant notions of paternal masculinities – men's gendered identities within family life. This material aspect is becoming less self-evident in popular conceptions of what it means to be a good father. The alternative construction of men's identities when they do not conform to this element of traditional paternal masculinity however remains underexposed. This study thus examines how 12 part-time working Dutch fathers envision their paternal masculinities. It moves beyond previous work on this topic by focusing on a unique group of involved fathers, in a country that in terms of gender norms and policies still centres mothers as primary parents. The tension between this progressive group and traditional setting provides an interesting context for this study. It adds to the field of research on paternal involvement in the Netherlands by centring involved fathers' own narratives through qualitative interviews. The findings reveal that a majority of respondents constructed a gender-neutral narrative: these 'new' fathers rejected gendered notions of parenthood and childcare. This dominant narrative indicates the occurrence of inclusive masculinity within Dutch men's family lives: an expansion of the range of acceptable heteromasculine behaviour and the fading of boundaries between masculine and feminine behaviours and spheres. The findings underline the importance of taking fathers' underlying conceptions of paternal masculinities into account when researching and stimulating paternal involvement.

Keywords
Childcare, fatherhood, new father, paternal involvement, paternal masculinities

Introduction

In these past few decades, a 'female revolution' (Esping-Andersen & Billari, 2015) has taken place. Women have, in great numbers, entered the labour market and the educational system. Although barriers and inequalities remain, especially for those who are marginalized on the basis of other intersecting identity factors (Crenshaw, 1990), women have entered virtually all levels and sectors in society in a relatively short amount of time. Women have, thus, entered areas of society that were previously considered to be male-only.

However, the opposite movement has not occurred to the same extent. Men have not entered areas in society that were considered to be exclusively female in similar strength – also referred to as the 'stalled gender revolution' (England, 2010). Care tasks, such as housework and childcare, are still among the typically feminized unpaid work that men perform less and differently than women. Even though more paternal involvement is associated with better child well-being and development (Altintas & Sullivan, 2017; Keizer et al, 2020) and a more harmonious relationship in heterosexual couples (Carlson, Hanson & Fitzroy, 2016), men globally still perform two to three times less childcare than women, and take up less time-sensitive, routine childcare activities than women (Craig, 2006).

Some men form the exception to this rule. These forerunners in terms of paternal involvement will be the focus of this thesis. Their profile has recently been carved out more: having a female partner who works similar or more hours (Gracia & Esping-Andersen, 2015), high (couple) earnings and a high education (McLanahan, 2004) tend to predict paternal involvement. These characteristics enable paternal involvement, as fathers with these characteristics can afford to invest more time and effort into childcare. However, these characteristics do not guarantee paternal involvement.

Building onto existing research that points to the importance of fathers' own gender norms for their childcare involvement (Craig & Mullan, 2011), this thesis focusses its attention on precisely that. Specifically, it looks at the construction of these men's identities within family life – their paternal masculinities. Traditionally, full-time breadwinning was centre stage within dominant notions of paternal masculinities, which translated to fathers' activities mainly outside of the home. This material aspect of fatherhood still appears to be salient in popular conceptions of what it means to be a good father but is becoming less and less self-evident (Eerola & Mykkänen, 2013). The alternative construction of men's identities when they do not conform to this aspect of traditional paternal masculinity, has not been researched yet in the way this study does – among a unique group of involved fathers, in a particularly restrictive setting and using a qualitative method. Knowledge on the topic is therefore limited.

Eerola & Mykkänen (2013) have distinguished several types of paternal masculinities in Finnish first time fathers in heterosexual couples. However, a focus on specifically highly involved fathers was not employed in their study. This group is particularly interesting as they defy traditional paternal masculinity – a tension arises between their practice and general norms. Johansson (2011) conducted research among a minority of Swedish fathers who equally shared parental leave with their spouses, focusing on this tension. However, taking up leave after the birth of a child is temporary. Fathers may resume their working hours after taking up leave, thus not performing structural involvement. These fathers can once again conform to the breadwinner aspect of traditional paternal masculinity after taking up leave,

implying less tension between their practice and general norms. In this study, involvement is considered from a structural perspective: fathers who work part-time due to childcare. Moreover, Keizer (2015) conducted research on Dutch involved father's gender attitudes, contributing to an underexposed research field on paternal involvement in the Netherlands that focuses on men's own subjective ideas and attitudes rather than objective determinants such as working hours. For her research, she used survey data. This study aims to build on quantitative data on this topic by centring Dutch involved father's own narratives through qualitative interviews. In this way, it provides deeper insight into involved father's underlying attitudes and will contribute to the understanding of which fathers become involved and why. Taking the aforementioned beneficial effects of paternal involvement into mind, this increased understanding can guide policies that stimulate paternal involvement.

The Netherlands substantially differs in terms of policies and gender norms from Scandinavian countries, where most research on paternal masculinities has been conducted. In the Netherlands, fathers spend 27 minutes for every hour that Dutch mothers spend on childcare (The Fatherhood Institute, 2010). All OECD countries, except for Austria, are characterized by more involved fathers than those in the Netherlands. Upon till recently, fathers in the Netherlands were only granted 2 days of fully paid parental leave, as opposed to 16 weeks of fully paid leave for mothers. Motherhood ideology (Keizer, 2015), which centres women as primary parents, is particularly strong in the Netherlands. This makes the construction of paternal masculinities among highly involved fathers in this setting especially interesting. It begs the question of how they construct their identities when general gender norms do not match their performance of fatherhood. Might they reject gender differences altogether, or perhaps rather defend their masculine identities? Qualitative interviews with Dutch part-time working fathers are used to answer the following main research question:

"How do Dutch highly involved fathers envision their paternal masculinity?"

This paper is built up in the following way. First, a theoretical and historical background of paternal masculinities is given. Subsequently, the data and methods used in this study are described: 12 interviews were conducted, coded and analysed using the qualitative software Atlas.Ti. In the following section, the findings are illustrated. A discussion and reflection on these findings can be found in the final section of the article.

Theoretical framework

In what follows, the main theoretical concepts used in this study will be discussed. The concept of hegemonic masculinity provides a macro perspective on the construction of men's gendered identities. The notion of dominant masculinities then provides a meso perspective on men's identities within family life – their paternal masculinity. It provides a framework to delve into the historical shift from the traditional breadwinner towards contemporary notions of the father role. Lastly, expectations pertaining to the unique group of fathers analysed in this study will be formulated: in the Netherlands, given the normative cultural setting, involved fathers are likely to still defend their masculine identities by employing the notion of masculine care. A reflection on how the main concepts are used in this study is incorporated in each subsection.

Hegemonic masculinity

Connell (2005) states that in any time there is a general form of hegemonic masculinity apparent which prescribes the ideal of gendered practices for men. Hegemonic masculinity here is not a stable, fixed term, but socially constructed and thus fluid. The concept of hegemonic masculinity lays bare that different kinds of masculinities are in power relations towards each other: those men who conform (more) to the ideal of hegemonic masculinity reap more social benefits than those who do not. Those beneath hegemonic masculinity in the masculinity hierarchy are referred to as subordinated or marginalized forms of masculinity (Brandth & Kvande, 1998) – they are rewarded less honour, prestige, and power or are even socially punished for their deviance (Coles, 2009). Hegemonic masculinity represents orthodoxy, or the maintaining of the status quo, whereas subordinated masculinity represents heterodoxy, the seeking of change (Coles, 2009). Subordinated masculinity challenges hegemonic masculinity, whereas hegemonic masculinity asserts its dominance and resists change. In this way, hegemonic masculinity is continuously contested and in flux.

Traits associated with hegemonic masculinity are among others heterosexuality and breadwinning. In Western society, income generating work is central to the masculine identity and strongly associated with hegemonic masculinity (Brandt & Kvande, 1998). This is reflected in the attitudes of Dutch men towards work, who prioritize full-time work over other aspects of life much more than Dutch women do (Portegijs & van den Brakel, 2018). Even though internally and externally stimulated, hegemonic masculinity prescribes an ideal, rather than describes actual behaviour.

Hegemonic masculinity mainly derives its meaning from what it is not. “'Masculinity' does not exist except in contrast with 'femininity'. A culture which does not treat women and men as bearers of polarized character types, at least in principle, does not have a concept of masculinity in the sense of modern European/American culture.” (Connell, 2005). The construction of hegemonic masculinity thus centres a distancing from femininity. Childcare in specific is according to gender constructivism theory explicitly marked as feminine (Evertsson, 2014). It is “traditionally linked to women and women’s work such that they can function as a means through which gender is manifested in a symbolic sense.” This may cause a tension in the experience of involved fathers, stemming from within and/or from the outside world.

The notion of hegemonic masculinity here serves as a lens to view the constructions of paternal masculinities among respondents. Will they reify an element of hegemonic masculinity by distancing themselves from femininity in childcare and in this way represent orthodoxy? Or will they challenge hegemonic masculinity, reject gendered notions of parenthood and childcare, and represent heterodoxy?

Paternal masculinity

Coles (2009) distinguishes the term dominant masculinity from hegemonic masculinity, the ideal construction for men in a specific field. One subfield of dominant masculinities is paternal masculinity, which appears in men’s family relations. From the nineteenth century onwards, the bourgeois ideology of 'separate spheres' became dominant. The domestic sphere was constructed as the realm of women, contrasted with the sphere of economic and political

action for men (Connell, 2005). Additionally, breadwinning was firmly attached to cultural conceptions of male parenting. Seccombe (1986) shows that the male breadwinner wage is a relatively recent creation and was far from universally accepted (Connell, 2005). He describes the deliberate move away from the family income towards the male breadwinner wage by trade unions as constructed in Britain in the mid 19th century. These cultural and economic developments led to the notion of the father within family live as a patriarch – radiating power, authority and status. Masculine honour was strongly tied to being a good provider, and this translated to fathers' activities mainly outside of the home (Brandth & Kvande, 1998). The good father, then, was largely absent to provide the family income. Although a change is visible, this material aspect of fatherhood still appears to be salient in contemporary notions of paternal masculinity (Yarwood, 2011; Eerola & Mykkänen, 2013).

Since the 20th century, this role has been complemented with a diversity of roles (Eerola & Mykkänen, 2013). The increasingly popular ideal of combining unpaid and paid work within fatherhood opens up new, alternative forms of paternal masculinities. One of these forms is the concept of the 'new father', in sharp contrast to the aforementioned mostly absent patriarch. The notion of the new father has especially gained traction as an ideal in Nordic countries and presumes a fundamental transformation of gender roles. The new father takes up a variety of childcare tasks, even those considered 'mother-like', such as nurture, early care, and comprehensive responsibility of the child (Eerola & Mykkänen, 2013). In this study, the concept of the new father is used to refer to attitudes - not behaviour as is central in aforementioned definition. It is used to indicate a contemporary type of father who largely rejects gendered notions of childcare and parenthood: he does not differentiate between feminine or masculine childcare tasks, and thus does not emphasize his unique masculine identity as a father.

This transformative idea of fatherhood is tied to an alternative form of masculinity than hegemonic masculinity proposes, namely, inclusive masculinity (Anderson, 2008). Inclusive masculinity describes a culture where boys and men are freer to show emotional intimacy. These men are less concerned or entirely unconcerned whether others perceive them to be gay, straight, masculine, or feminine. Accordingly, this will grant an expansion of acceptable heteromasculine behaviour and lead to the blurring of lines between masculine and feminine behaviours and spheres (Anderson, 2008). Taking Connell's (2005) contributions into mind again, inclusive masculinity here represents a subordinated masculinity that challenges hegemonic masculinity. Inclusive masculinity opposes key elements of hegemonic masculinity: among others, the distancing from femininity and homosexuality. Anderson (2008) uses this concept in the context of fraternities, but it may also prove fruitful to examine involved father's identities. Will they embody inclusive masculinity, thus not drawing boundaries between feminine and masculine childcare and rejecting gendered notions of parenthood in this sense? Or might they defend their masculine identities – reifying an element of hegemonic masculinity?

Masculine care

Given the normative setting of the Netherlands with its apparent motherhood ideology (Keizer, 2015), it is unlikely that Dutch part-time working fathers embody inclusive masculinity fully. Rather, involved fathers might mitigate a tension between their involved

fatherhood on the one hand, and the traditional ideal of paternal masculinity on the other hand, by clearly distinguishing between gendered childcare tasks. In most studies into fatherhood, it is apparent that fathers explicitly distinguish between maternal and paternal care (Eerola & Mykkänen, 2013). In this way, they reify an element of hegemonic masculinity by symbolically distancing themselves from femininity.

The concept of 'masculine care' comes to mind here. Promoting independence in children (Brandth & Kvande, 1998), for instance, is noted by fathers as a particular trait of their parenting style. Some fathers note that their female partners are too protective and overinvolved in regard to their children, and they contrast their own parenting style to this (Brandth & Kvande, 1998). Fostering an openness to the world, assertiveness and bravery and childcare activities such as rough and tumble play and taking the child for adventures outside of the home would in specific be activities tied to fathers (Paquette, 2004). This is also referred to as the notion of the 'unique father' (Pleck, 2010). As in the case of the new father, this notion is used in this study to refer to attitudes. Here, the unique father refers to a father who defends his masculine identity by employing the notion of masculine care. In this way, unique fathers draw boundaries between the feminine and masculine realm of childcare and parenthood. In a national setting that centres mothers as primary parents, this view is likely to still be salient, even among highly involved fathers who in their practice defy a traditional division of childcare.

Data and methods

For this research on the paternal masculinities of Dutch highly involved fathers, 12 qualitative interviews were conducted with a length of on average 45 minutes. The theoretical framework served as a base from which sensitizing concepts were derived, a term coined by Blumer (1954) to refer to the use of concepts as 'a general sense of reference and guidance in approaching empirical instances' (Bryman, 2016, p. 388). Sensitizing concepts stand in contrast to definitive concepts, which would imply phenomena being fixed and only viewed through the indicators chosen for them. By using sensitizing rather than definitive concepts, the researcher can see the phenomenon that is being researched in more variety than just in the ways in which it already is common to us (Bryman, 2016, p. 388). The main sensitizing concepts that were drawn on in the interview guide are aforementioned notions of the traditional, unique and new father, and hegemonic and inclusive masculinity (specifically, attitudes towards what it means to be a good father, the importance of income deriving work and perceptions of gendered childcare and childcare tasks).

Purposive sampling was conducted, which means that the research question guided the selection of categories of people - highly involved Dutch fathers - to sample (Bryman, 2016 p. 416). Within purposive sampling, criterion sampling was employed, as the criterion for highly involved fathers chosen were fathers who work part-time due to childcare. This definition of high involvedness was chosen because working part-time is a more permanent choice than for example the uptake of leave by fathers. Respondents selected worked about 32 hours or less weekly. The definition of part-time in the Netherlands generally runs up to 34 hours weekly, but as enough responses on the initial call for part-time working fathers were received, it was possible to narrow down respondents on the basis of weekly working hours and focus on an even more unique group of fathers. To maintain homogeneity in the sample and enable a good

comparison between respondents, fathers in intact heterosexual couples, without a migration background, between the ages of 30 and 40 years old (the average age of becoming a father in the Netherlands is 34,2; CBS, 2019) and who have one child or more in the age category of 0 to 4 years were selected. Children are not yet attending school at this age, so there is relatively more childcare to be performed.

Furthermore, even though it was not a criterion, all respondents were higher educated: 3 followed higher vocational education (Dutch: HBO), and 9 have finished a university degree. Respondents' occupational fields differed: the music industry, (higher) education, media, academia and healthcare were among them. A resemblance in this regard is that only 2 of the respondents at the time of the research worked in a corporate setting. A majority of respondents lived in urban settings: the cities Amsterdam, Den Haag and Utrecht were respectively most occurrent as residential areas. Rather than representing a bias, these characteristics are in line with previous research showing an equal division of childcare tasks to be more common among highly educated couples (McLanahan, 2004), and a propensity of progressive dual-earner households (e.g. dual earner) to live in urban settings (Van Gent et al. 2019).

Respondents were approached through an online call, distributed on the researchers' personal social media accounts (Twitter and Facebook) and on several Facebook pages of Dutch organisations occupied with involved fatherhood (Papaklas, VDRS, Platform Vaderschap). Those who were interested to participate in the research were emailed with a short survey, to clarify that they conformed to aforementioned criterions. Those who fit the criterion profile were contacted for an interview appointment.

As for the interview method, semi-structured interviews were conducted, in line with the idea of sensitizing concepts. In a semi-structured interview, the researcher uses an interview guide with guiding questions or topics to discuss, but the interviewee has a lot of leeway in how to answer (Bryman, 2016, p. 471). There is thus more flexibility than in a structured interview setting: the researcher can change the direction of the interview, ask further relevant questions which were not included in the interview guide and listen to the respondent in a less constrained manner. The outset is nevertheless that interviews can be compared with one another, to ensure a level of consistency across them.

Prior to conducting the interviews, online informed consent forms were filled in by participants. Face-to-face interviews were not possible due to the Corona pandemic: interviews have been conducted and recorded through video calls via the software programme Skype. Respondents were asked to find a quiet space in their homes where they could talk freely. The interviews were conducted in Dutch so respondents could speak comfortably in their own language. The interviews were then transcribed through the website Otranscribe.com and were coded using the qualitative data analysis software Atlas.ti. Coding is a device to organize, label, compile and separate data (Bryman, 2016, p. 568), and in this research served as way to distinguish different kinds of constructions of paternal masculinities among Dutch highly involved fathers. A mix of initial coding, coding connected to the data, and focused coding, coding connected to patterns in the initial coding (Massengill, 2015) was used. For example, as the results will show, codes pertaining to negative fathering examples sprung from the data, whereas codes pertaining to the aforementioned notions of the new and unique father where created on the basis of the sensitizing concepts from the theoretical

framework. The goal of this research design was to reach theoretical saturation, which means that data collection has been sufficient enough for categories, in this case different perceptions of paternal masculinities, to be founded and confirmed (Bryman, 2016, p. 420). In regard to the ethics and privacy aspect of this research, readers are redirected to appendix A of this paper, the Erasmus University ethics and privacy checklist.

Findings

In this section, recurring findings on the paternal masculinities of the highly involved Dutch fathers in this study are discussed. In general, all respondents stated that they are just as competent in childcare as their female partners. They also all shared the perception of income deriving work in their lives as either equally important as childcare, or even subordinate to childcare. The word 'balance' was most occurrent throughout all interviews: respondents were adamant in balancing paid work and childcare. Although similar in several ways, respondents did differ in their construction of their paternal masculinities. Furthermore, when discussing the origins of their conception of paternal masculinity, negative fathering examples came up often. Restrictive phenomena to their involvement in and outside of family live were also recurrent. Respondents' assertiveness in this regard confirmed how their fluid conception of paternal masculinity motivated them to claim space as co-parents and resist pushback to their involvement.

The new father

Most respondents did not believe in the notion of 'a good father'. Upon being asked what it means to them, they mentioned a variety of ideas about what it means to be a good parent, such as spending quality time as a family and alone with their child(ren), being a role model, providing safety, trust, comfort and basic needs for their child(ren). For most, their notion of a good father was thus not distinguishable from their notion of a good mother. This is exemplified by Roel and Jasper respectively below:

"Actually, I don't see it [being a good father] as that different from being a good mother. The personality you bring along is a trait that you convey to your child. I think it depends on the characters of both parents, and not so much on the stereotype of what a father should be or what a mother should be, as far as I'm concerned."

"I try to think that way [believing in the notion of a good father] as little as possible because every parent is different, and everybody does it [parenting] in their own way. If I say, this is how I envision a good father, then it is as if I want to judge fathers by that standard, but of course it works differently for everyone."

This fluid conception of paternal masculinity, a lack of a static notion of what it means to be a good father, matches the concept of the new father. This contemporary type of father rejects gender differences in childcare. Several of these new fathers did describe differences in parenting behaviour as experienced in contrast to their female partners. However, they usually did not ascribe these differences to gender, but to differing character traits between them and their spouses, as Roel mentioned. Ruben also described this:

"If everybody just plays into their own strengths… you do it together, you never have the same weaknesses, and if so - your child is just unlucky, then you have two parents who can't do something. (laughing) Then they [parents] excel in other areas."

When respondents did ascribe differences in parenting behaviour to gender, they were quite nuanced about the explanations for these differences. They were inclined to sketch an ambiguous mix of nature and nurture, like Roel stated below:

"I think it is a combination [of nature and nurture in explaining the gender differences in childcare he observes]. There is something biological in it, but it is also reinforced by the environment that responds to it. People think: oh, apparently I am suited for this, or I am that, and so they will behave accordingly."

Another salient finding is that most fathers envisioned their involved fatherhood as a practice which could be *learnt*. Even if they believed there are to some extent differences between men and women in parenting practices, they believed these differences can be mitigated, or even overcome, by *training*. The malleable perception of their parenting competence is exemplified by the following quotes.

"Basically, I do something and if it goes wrong, I solve it. […] If it has consequences for yourself, it's fine, but it's tricky if it has consequences for someone else. Suddenly, you're sitting somewhere in a warm playground and you don't have water with you… […] That's exactly the kind of thing that would happen to me. And that would never happen to my girlfriend. […] But it is also just a matter of practice, because if you just play a picture in your head in advance, like, okay, what will it look like, I will soon be in a hot playground, what do I need? Not because I'm too stupid to think of it or something, it's just that I am not used to it."- Victor

"Just like learning a musical instrument, you just have to put time into it. And then you automatically get better at it." – Roel

Essential in this malleable perception of their fatherhood seemed to be the character trait of self-efficacy: a sense of high behavioural control, or more specifically in this context an "individual's appraisal of his or her competence in a parental role" (Sevigny & Loutzenhiser, 2010, p. 179). Here, respondents' individual character and flexible perception of paternal masculinity intertwined. They perceived themselves to be in control of and competent in childcare because they did not believe in a static, essentialist conception of the father role, and vice versa.

Important to this sense of self-efficacy appeared to be the solo care that these fathers performed one or two days a week. Like Maarten describes below, he only felt confident in performing certain tasks he subconsciously perceived as women's tasks when forced to do them when he was at home alone with his child.

"Some things took some getting used to, I mean... I didn't have a picture of a father changing diapers beforehand in my head. […] Maybe in unconscious association I connected those [physical childcare tasks such as changing diapers] more to a woman, because of all the commercials and stuff... […] But if it is simply necessary to do it, then it happens automatically." - Maarten

Hugo also described how solo care was important to his sense of involvedness:

"My girlfriend breastfed. And then automatically, the mother spends much more time with the baby than you as a father, because you just cannot breastfeed. When you're both at home, you usually don't mess around with a bottle of breast milk from the freezer, which takes 20 minutes to warm up… So you have to, I guess, be forced to do that. And you mainly are when you are home alone with the baby."

The data also showed a new trait tied to the concept of the new father: active gender non-conformity in regard to the upbringing of their child(ren). In two cases, this was apparent. Hugo, for example, described how he likes to buy clothes for his children. He often consciously buys clothes in the girl's department for his son, as those clothes are a bit more neutral or different than 'a standard blue shirt with jeans'. Roel also tries to break with gender norms quite actively, and would like to inspire others to do the same:

"I have an intrinsic motivation to show the world, people around me, that things can be done differently. […] For example, we gave our son the last name of my wife. […] How striking it is that so many women still almost kind of self-evidently give up a part of their identity, as far as I am concerned. […] We came up with the solution that his official first name will be my last name, and then her last name is his last name, so you can still combine it, despite the fact that it is not allowed in the law."

These Dutch new fathers thus rejected gendered notions of childcare and parenthood. They did not believe in the static notion of the good father, if they encountered gender differences in childcare, they mostly attributed these to individual character differences and some of them even consciously employed gender non-conformity in the upbringing of their children. Their high sense of self-efficacy, likely stimulated due to the solo care they took up, was crucial to this gender-neutral conception. Through practice, they experienced they were just as competent in certain childcare tasks as their female partner. This then strengthened their already quite gender-neutral perception of parenthood. In this way, they exemplify the move towards inclusive masculinity: a culture in which acceptable heteromasculine behaviour is expanded and lines between masculine and feminine behaviours and spheres are blurred (Anderson, 2008).

The unique father

A minority of respondents did emphasize the specific importance of the father within family life. Stef and Ruben, for example, constructed being overprotective as a feminine characteristic. They both mentioned that they find it an especially masculine trait to teach

their child(ren) resilience: a sense of independence and self-confidence. In this way, they distance themselves from femininity and draw boundaries between the masculine and feminine realm of childcare tasks – reifying an element of hegemonic masculinity.

"Ooh he is going to stumble, and then she [female partner] has already almost caught him. Just drop him, that sounds very crude, but it is a playground... I mean there is all rubber underneath. If they trip, they will not break. […] I see that with my nephew who is incredibly pampered. […] If he hurts himself a bit, he cries for fifteen minutes… then you are not really very resilient." - Ruben

"What I generally see is that women might worry a bit faster about things, that men are a little easier in that sense, but there is also the other side of that... if I were alone, I would forget a thousand things that my girlfriend always remembers. You know, that would really be a mess. And on the other hand, I am a little easier in letting go, and saying things will be fine." - Stef

Furthermore, both Jielke and Jeroen mentioned they envision a specific role for themselves as the protector of the family, which seems to mainly entail a physical component.

"What I notice, when things get a little scary, then [daughter's name] often comes to me. When we are somewhere, and the situation is new or something […] she pulls a little closer to me, I guess. That sense of security we can of course both offer, but maybe it's also a bit of physical strength. Maybe that's where that sense of safety comes from. […] If [daughter's name] wants to learn to ride a bicycle, or she is now very much into roller skating, then [name female partner] says: go do that with daddy. If she tends to fall over or I have to hold her for a while, I'm quite big and in that sense maybe a little stronger, she might feel that." - Jielke

While Jielke mainly described this as something he experiences in practice, Jeroen seemed to construct his masculine identity on the basis of this aspect:

"The first few years my role is very different anyway, because they [mother and child] are in symbiosis and I am around as a protector of that symbiosis, to ensure that that bond is not unwantedly broken, and to get rid of as much threat as possible... That is my role, especially in the early years."

These respondents believed there are no differences in how *well* men and women perform parenthood but did believe in differences in *how* men and women perform parenthood. A gender difference narrative became apparent, which may act as a union between a more traditional norm setting and respondents' involved fatherhood. Ruben explicitly stated that a real man takes care of his child(ren), and not just in the material sense:

"I don't think caring for your children makes you less of a macho. […] You're not a real man if you don't take care of your family. Then you are just a loser. […] If you really take care of your family, you also take care of them physically. Then you also give your child a hug when he cries."

In this way, the ideal notion of paternal masculinity ('a real father…') is not rejected, but rather redefined and broadened to include respondents' involved fatherhood. Respondents who constructed this more static notion of paternal masculinity, seemed to believe more in *innate* gender differences than other respondents who attributed gender differences mainly to individual character differences. For instance, Jeroen described he believes in the saying that 'women come from Venus and men come from Mars'. Stef also described gender differences as quite innate:

"I do think that men and women have different qualities in that regard [childcare]. […] They perhaps look at things in a different way, communicate in a different way. I definitely think I have something to offer in that sense. […] Women have different qualities like being more caring, and men are more straightforward."

Still, these fathers' construction of the explanation for these differences was quite nuanced, as exemplified by for example Jeroen below who pointed to a mix of nature and nurture explanations:

"I work in a school with children… and you see from a young age that they are different. I don't mean by that... if you look at children's clothes, you see blue and pink clothes, and I hate it… there's a difference between what you develop because of society and what is different by nature. I believe that there is indeed difference by nature, but that as a society you should not push a girl in a girl's corner and a boy in the boy's corner. Girls might as well play with trucks, and a boy with Barbies."

However, the hegemonic masculine aspect of distancing from femininity was only occurrent among this group of unique fathers. It was most explicit when Ruben referred to his masculinity by stating he is neither a macho nor a sissy (Dutch: 'mietje'), the latter a derogatory term for homosexual men and/or men perceived as overly feminine. In a more subtle sense, these unique fathers reified heteronormativity. Heteronormativity according to Oswald and colleagues (2005) is the act of putting individuals in opposing, unambiguous camps separated on the basis of their gender and sexuality. Normative boundaries are drawn that separate 'real men' from 'real women', which also have implications for the notions of 'good' sexualities or 'good' families. Respondents who constructed a difference narrative, by highlighting the importance of the father and masculine care, composed a binary and a hierarchy. Motherhood and fatherhood, femininity and masculinity, are described as two sides of the same coin, they oppose and complement each other.

Roel, for instance, believed his child is balanced due to the fact that there are a mother and father present in his life. Similar to Jeroen he however also stated he believed in different masculine and feminine traits in all people, including people who are attracted to others of their own gender. Even though they both did not explicitly state they envision other families as the less than ideal situation, this seemed to follow from their construction as the intact heterosexual family as the most beneficial situation for a child. There was some tension there.

Jeroen, like Roel, stated he wishes a father and mother for every child. His views are best summarized by the quote down below:

"Of course, it is undesirable when a child is raised in a single parent family, for example with only a mother, which is more common than only with a father… then I wish for that child that their mother can also embody that male strength, that male piece that is missing by the absence of a father. […] And yes, we are very happy together and I am happy that we can also embody that in personal form, of just a man and a woman, in the upbringing of our daughter. […] I want every child to grow up in a family where very clearly the male and female strength are taught... and I also believe that that happens the best when that is just in the traditional role of a father and a mother."

This gender difference narrative reifies the traditional notion of the strong, tough and unique father. It employs the notion of masculine care, in the form of fostering resilience and taking up a protective role. By portraying the heterosexual intact family as the most ideal situation, some of these unique fathers also reify heteronormativity. In this way, the traditional ideal of paternal masculinity is not rejected but rather redefined by these fathers to include their practice.

Nevertheless, these respondents also showed elements of the new father in terms of rejecting other gender stereotypes. For example, they all noted they performed a variety of childcare tasks, also including those traditionally considered more 'mother-like' such as feeding their children by bottle, changing diapers and performing nurturing, skin-to-skin childcare. In this sense, the division between respondents who exemplify a gender-neutral narrative and those who employ a gender difference narrative is not a binary, but more like a scale. All respondents showed elements of the new father, whereas a minority of respondents also showed aspects of the unique father. This gender difference narrative may seem surprising given their unique fathering practice, however, this likely has to do with dominant norms in the Netherlands that foster the belief in (innate) gender differences in parenthood and childcare.

The importance of negative fathering examples

Another recurrent finding is that several respondents mentioned negative examples of other fathers they have encountered, which they reacted to in their own fathering behaviour. This points to the relational aspect of paternal masculinities: men relate, and in this case contrast, their own fatherhood to other fathers. In specific, in different degrees, respondents reacted against the lack of involvedness from their own fathers. Martijn, for example, felt his father mainly 'supported' his mother when she asked him to. Roel shared his experience: he described his father behaving like an on-call employee, in the service of his mother. He described how this motivated him to do differently below:

"It also has to do with my own upbringing. My father worked five days a week, and my mother was always at home. She only started working again when all three of us went to primary school. I noticed that my relationship with my father is different than with my mother, and I don't want that. I wanted [son's name] not to actually see the difference

between us. That background definitely played a role. And so, I am very happy to hear that the moment he is in his bed and he calls for one of us, there is no difference."

Most respondents only saw their fathers in the evenings during the week and in the weekends when they were young. In some cases, their fathers were quite emotionally present, yet their lack of investment in terms of time was seen as undesirable. Respondents emphasized they want to see their children grow up, especially in the early years. Olaf noted that the suicide of his father when he was a young child has stimulated him to be emotionally and physically present for his daughter – he reacts to the most literal sense of paternal absence. Ruben described a unique conversation he had with his own father whilst having a beer and watching soccer together ("as it goes, men amongst each other"):

"And he said, take it if you have the opportunity, take it! Because he actually regrets that he worked so incredibly much in our childhood, because, [he said] you miss so much, especially in those first years. When they go back to school, you miss nothing. But those first years… actually it is a shame."

Ruben also reacted to the aspect of emotional distance by his father in his own fathering behaviour:

"The house I live in now, I built a lot of it myself, and my dad built the whole house he lives in himself. He won't once say he's proud. […] And it's stupid, I'll speak to my mom, and she will say, well he came home, and he had great stories about what you had done again, and he's so proud! […] I do try to do that differently. If he [name of son] makes a nice drawing, I say wow, well done."

Other examples of full-time working fathers as negative examples were also mentioned, for instance by Stef:

"Once, friends of ours came over. And that guy has his own business, he works 6 days a week, he is gone at 7 o'clock [in the morning] and he comes home at half past 8 in the evening. He also has a young son. They came in and at one point, she gave their son to him and right away he started crying and calling out to his mother […] For me that was like: I don't want that. You also used to have this advertisement, like, who is that guy who prepares the meat on Sunday? I don't want to be like that."

As several respondents felt quite disconnected emotionally from their fathers and attributed this to their fathers' absence in their own youth or have encountered other examples of emotional distance between fathers and their children, they felt motivated to do differently. Other men's traditional performance of paternal masculinity in this sense was crucial to their own, alternative construction of paternal masculinity.

The external projection of the full-time breadwinner role

It is likely that due to the normative setting in the Netherlands, where gender norms and policies still centre the mother as the primary parent, restrictive phenomena to paternal involvement may be particularly strong. Both within the family life itself and outside, the expectation of the traditional father role was projected upon fathers. One of the restrictive factors that came up, was the influence of mothers:

"I noticed that, certainly in the beginning, sometimes when I sat with the baby, I did something wrong or I had to hold it differently or turn the head or what not. And then I did say: you know what, leave me be, you can do it your way, but then I'll do it my way. And then you notice that there are some tensions. […] The mother sometimes tries to extend the influence towards the father a bit, and then I find it is true that you do... you sometimes have to fight for it a little more than that it goes natural."

Hugo, here, describes maternal gatekeeping. This is the maternal practice of exerting direct control over fathering behaviour (McBride et al, 2005). It consists of reluctance to relinquish family responsibility, a rigid and differentiated conception of family roles and the desire for validation of the maternal identity. It is likely particularly salient in the Netherlands, where motherhood ideology is dominant (Keizer, 2015). Confirming the high sense of self-efficacy and associated assertiveness apparent among these involved fathers, Hugo described claiming his space as a full co-parent. He even literally phrased it as having to 'fight' for his position.

Another barrier to involvement was also apparent in the data: several respondents experienced pushback in their (former) work environments. Only two respondents, Martijn and Jasper, at the time of the research still worked in a corporate setting. For Jielke, the resistance to his paternal involvement in his former work environments was among the reasons for him to switch to a non-corporate job. Jasper transitioned into another corporate job, but one with a less restrictive work culture. Below, Martijn, Jasper and Jielke describe their difficulty in negotiating their paternal involvement in their (former) jobs in a commercial setting:

"It wasn't easy [negotiations with his employer about working less]. They pulled and pushed quite a bit to prevent that. But I was willing to quit if necessary. I did not say that explicitly, but I think they felt it, that it's worth so much to me. So, I was like, if you don't facilitate that, then it ends." – Martijn

"To be allowed to work 4 instead of 5 days, that was really… I really had to pull out all the stops for that. The CEO of the research department [at a large, international company] found it very difficult because he did not recognize the importance at all, he has children and only saw them in the weekends, but barely during the week." – Jasper

"I remember when I worked at [name company], and then for example on Thursday, I had soccer at 7 o clock in the evening. I would leave for work in the morning around 6 o clock, then I was at the office around 8, because it was just very busy. And then at 6 o clock in the evening, I got up and packed my things and I was looked at like oh, you're leaving already? It felt very, very bad. […] You have been there all day, you have a child at home, you have to

cook quickly, you have to go soccer... and people are like oh yeah, but you know, you work at [name company], you are busy, make sure you finish your work, then go home. […] Then I thought to myself: this is not the world I want to live in." - Jielke

The (former) employers described by respondents projected their expectation of the full-time working breadwinner on respondents. Here, a tension developed, as respondents rejected this element of traditional paternal masculinity. For two of the respondents, this tension was even a motivation for them to pursue other jobs. Respondents thus consciously sought out other social subgroups in which their conception of paternal masculinity was considered acceptable. They switched to other settings in which dominant masculinities were constructed differently. This can be perceived a strategy to evade the tension that their paternal involvement and the normative setting of the Netherlands bring forth. Furthermore, respondents' assertive attitude both inside and outside family live when their space as a co-parent was questioned, flows naturally from their fluid conception of paternal masculinity. Were they to believe in a static, traditional conception of the father role, they likely would have not resisted maternal gatekeeping and restrictive work environments in this manner.

Discussion

The aim of this study was to map how part-time working Dutch fathers envision their paternal masculinities. There are two main narratives that respondents constructed: a gender difference and a gender-neutral narrative. A minority of fathers constructed a gender difference narrative. They employed the notion of masculine care: fostering resilience and taking up a protective role were particularly mentioned as the terrain of the father. This gender difference narrative reifies the notion of the tough father, and by drawing boundaries between feminine and masculine childcare, reifies hegemonic masculinity. Most fathers, however, constructed a gender-neutral narrative: they rejected gendered notions of childcare and parenthood. By doing so, they exemplify inclusive masculinity, a culture in which the range of acceptable heteromasculine behaviour is expanded and lines between masculine and feminine behaviours and spheres are blurred (Anderson, 2008). The difference between these groups' perceptions of paternal masculinities likely had to do with their belief in innate gender differences. The former group constructed a more essentialist view of gender differences in parenthood, whereas the latter group attributed gender differences mainly to individual characteristics or narrated an ambiguous mix of nurture and nature explanations. However, the unique fathers in this study also exemplified elements of the new father. These groups thus relate to each other in the sense of a scale, not a binary.

The gender difference narrative, apparent even among highly involved fathers, as expected matched dominant gender norms and policies within the Netherlands which reify gendered notions of childcare and parenthood. This narrative can be perceived as a strategy to mitigate a tension between these fathers' involvedness and a wider setting that still considers childcare as mainly the mother's realm. By employing a gender difference narrative, respondents defend their masculine identity – arguably a more standard attitude in the wider national setting than those of respondents who fully reject gendered notions of parenthood and childcare.

The gender-neutral narrative as exemplified by most respondents is definitely not standard in the Dutch context. It was also not standard in their own upbringing, as narrated in respondents' recurrent statements about how they contrast their own fatherhood to their fathers' more traditional performance of childcare (or rather, lack thereof). Even though their attitudes are not standard in the national setting, the fathers in this study did not feel especially unique or different in their social circles. Other fathers in their surroundings either also performed similar amounts of childcare or did not express explicit negative judgment towards them. This may seem surprising, given how they defy national gender norms. Coles (2009) however provides the tools to understand why these fathers did not feel different: as social groups differ by among other things class culture, race, ethnicity, sexuality and their intersections, masculinity is constructed differently in each of them. It can also be considered a strategy to surround oneself with other fathers who construct similar forms of paternal masculinities, in a wider setting that may generally not be welcoming to it. This was most explicit when fathers in this study who worked in corporate settings described the push back to their paternal involvement. They then consciously sought out other environments that defined a different kind of dominant masculinity (Coles, 2009).

The focus of this thesis was on attitudes, not on actual behaviour. In the interviews, respondents' attitudes and behaviour were not always clearly separated. For instance, when asked about their perceptions of which childcare tasks fathers might be better suited for, many respondents started describing the variety of childcare tasks they take up. This indicates how closely linked views and behaviours are. Yet, as other research indicates, self-reported involvement and actual behaviour tend to differ from each other (Hoving, 2020). The way that respondents describe their behaviour when asked about their attitudes is remarkable as it indicates most respondents did not have very explicit gendered attitudes pertaining to childcare. Their inclination to describe objective behaviour without clear gender demarcations confirms their pragmatism and dominant gender-neutral attitude.

Some possible limitations should be noted. The interviews were conducted online due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Even though this online method also meant no travel time to respondents and thus increased flexibility, it also may have influenced the rapport, the relationship between respondent and researcher that encourages the respondent to want to participate in and persist with the interview (Bryman, 2016, p. 218). Bryman (2016) notes it is easier to achieve rapport in the context of a face-to-face interview, when the interviewer is able "to offer obvious visual cues of friendliness such as smiling or maintaining good eye contact". Most of the interviews in this study were conducted in video form - with the exception of two interviews due to respondents' internet connection issues, who were then continued in audio form. This means some level of visual cues were possible, even though perhaps less comprehensive as in real life. Respondents however seemed very open and often times disclosed information on quite vulnerable topics (e.g., suicide of parent, illness of partner or child). Minor technical errors occurred, however, none of them were obstructive to the research.

Furthermore, social desirability may have played a role in respondents' truthfulness. Respondents were selected through an online call, published on the researchers' own social media accounts and those of organisations associated with involved fatherhood. This could have nudged the respondents towards a more gender-neutral and progressive narrative, as this

is the prevalent public view represented by the researcher and aforementioned organizations. This could mean that less fathers may have been open about believing in the notion of the unique father.

The findings of this study emphasize the importance of the construction of father's gendered identities, their paternal masculinities, when researching paternal involvement. How men envision their role as fathers is crucial in terms of their involvement in childcare, yet much existing literature delves into objective determinants such as working hours or educational attainment rather than men's own subjective ideas and attitudes (Keizer, 2015). Other research on paternal masculinities (Johansson, 2011; Eerola & Mykkänen, 2015) was set in Scandinavian countries, whereas this study focused on involved father's identity construction in a particularly restrictive setting – the Netherlands. Likely due to this normative setting, respondents noted restrictive phenomena even though not explicitly being asked about it. The appearance of the gender difference narrative, even among this unique group of involved fathers, likely also has to do with the research setting. In the Netherlands, the belief in (innate) gender differences in childcare is fostered through general gender norms and policies.

The findings also indicate that inquiry into individual character traits such as self-efficacy, mainly employed in psychology research, could provide new insight into which men are likely to perform paternal involvement. Respondents perceived themselves to be competent in childcare because they did not believe in a static, essentialist conception of the father role, and vice versa. Self-efficacy has been connected to paternal involvement before (Trahan, 2018; Kwok et al, 2012), but as this study indicates should be combined with inquiry into fathers' gendered attitudes as they seem to interact with one another.

The generational shift as narrated by respondents in contrast to their own fathers imply a change in the construction of fathers' gendered identities in the Netherlands. However, this study was conducted among a unique subgroup of Dutch fathers, thus it cannot identify general societal trends. To provide further inquiry into this possible shift in identity construction among Dutch fathers, further longitudinal research on the paternal masculinities of a randomly selected group of Dutch fathers is recommended to enable external validity – generalization to the population (Bryman, 2016).

Paternal involvement is proven to be beneficial for children and their parents. Even though other circumstances such as their socio-economic background, partner characteristics, policies pertaining to fatherhood and societal gender norms absolutely matter, in the end men *themselves* should feel intrinsically motivated to play an active role in their children's upbringing. This study indicates they are only likely to when their fluid perception of paternal masculinity persuades them to. It underlines the value of incorporating paternal masculinities into research and policies pertaining to paternal involvement.

Policy recommendations

This study has several implications for policies pertaining to paternal involvement in the Netherlands. This study shows that when fathers have a fluid perception of paternal masculinity and a high sense of self-efficacy, they feel confident in their parenting skill and will claim their full space as co-parents. It is thus recommended that the Dutch government employs a strategy of awareness raising campaigns, in particular by focussing on the role of

fathers in the upbringing of their children and tackling masculinity norms that underly a static and distant conception of the father. This has prior been done in Scandinavian countries surrounding the uptake of leave: the Swedish government has held national and regional campaigns, spreading information about and stimulating shared responsibility between parents (Almqvist & Duvander, 2014).

Furthermore, the part-time working fathers in this study were able to be as involved as they are in their children's lives due to their financial circumstances: their beneficial socio-economic characteristics provided a baseline for further involvement. This underlines an issue concerning paternal involvement: only a relatively prosperous group of fathers can perform involved fatherhood in the Netherlands (Van de Beek & Van Weegberg, 2020). Considering the positive effects of paternal involvement on child well-being and development and relationship quality between parents, this selective freedom should be considered undesirable by the Dutch government and in specific the Dutch Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.

As of 2022 the Dutch government, per EU recommendations, will guarantee a similar number of weeks of parental leave for fathers as they have in place for mothers - 16 weeks (Rijksoverheid, 2020). However, the financial compensation of parental leave for mothers and their partners is not equal at all (Van de Beek & Van Weegberg, 2020). Only one full work week will be fully compensated ('birth leave'), whereas 5 weeks will be compensated at 70% ('partner leave'), and the remaining 9 weeks at 50% ('parental leave'). This will reify socio-economic cleavages among groups of fathers: those less affluent will be less able to take up leave. The Dutch government here also reifies a traditional division of childcare among men and women by still favouring the mothers' parental role through unequal compensation. It is recommended that the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment equalize the financial compensation of parental leave for both parents. In this way, the Dutch government will no longer in their policies favour women's role in childcare above men's and will no longer favour prosperous families above those less affluent.

References

Almqvist, A. L., & Duvander, A. Z. (2014). Changes in gender equality? Swedish fathers' parental leave, division of child care and housework. *Journal of family studies*, *20*(1), 19-27.

Altintas, E., & Sullivan, O. (2017). Trends in fathers' contribution to housework and childcare under different welfare policy regimes. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, *24*(1), 81-108.

Anderson, E. (2008). Inclusive masculinity in a fraternal setting. *Men and masculinities*, *10*(5), 604-620.

Blumer, H. (1954). 'What is Wrong with Social Theory?', *American Sociological Review*, 19, 3–10.

Brandth, B., & Kvande, E. (1998). Masculinity and child care: The reconstruction of fathering. *The sociological review*, *46*(2), 293-313.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford University Press.

Carlson, D. L., Hanson, S., & Fitzroy, A. (2016). The division of child care, sexual intimacy, and relationship quality in couples. *Gender & Society*, *30*(3), 442-466.

CBS. (2019). Leeftijd vader bij geboorte kind stijgt. Retrieved from https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2019/24/leeftijd-vader-bij-geboorte-kind-stijgt

Coles, T. (2009). Negotiating the field of masculinity: The production and reproduction of multiple dominant masculinities. *Men and Masculinities*, *12*, 30-44.

Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Craig, L. (2006). Does father care mean fathers share? A comparison of how mothers and fathers in intact families spend time with children. *Gender & society*, *20*(2), 259-281.

Craig, L. & Mullan, K. (2011). How mothers and fathers share childcare: A cross-national time-use comparison. *American Sociological Review*. 76(*6*), 834-861.

Crenshaw, K. (1990). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*, 1241.

Eerola, P., & Mykkänen, J. (2013). Paternal Masculinities in Early Fatherhood. *Journal of Family Issues.* 36(12), 1674–1701.

Evertsson, M. (2014). Gender Ideology and the Sharing of Housework and Child Care in Sweden. *Journal of Family Issues,* 35(7), 927–949.

England, P. (2010). The Gender Revolution. *Gender & Society,* 24(2), 149–166.

Esping-Andersen, G., & Billari, F. C. (2015). Re-theorizing family demographics. *Population and Development Review*, 41(1), 1–31.

Gracia, P., & Esping-Andersen, G. (2015). Fathers' child care time and mothers' paid work: A cross-national study of Denmark, Spain, and the United Kingdom. *Family Science*, *6*(1), 270-281.

Hoving, D. (2020, May 25th). Vaders doen sinds coronacrisis meer in huis, zeggen ze. Retrieved from https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2020/05/25/vaders-doen-sinds-coronacrisis-meer-in-huis-zeggen-ze-a4000711

Johansson, T. (2011). The construction of the new father: How middle-class men become present fathers. *International review of modern sociology*, 37(1), 111-126.

Keizer, R. (2015). Which men become involved fathers? The impact of men's own attitudes on paternal involvement in the Netherlands. *International Review of Sociology*, 25(3), 359-372.

Keizer, R., van Lissa, C. J., Tiemeier, H., & Lucassen, N. (2020). The Influence of Fathers and Mothers Equally Sharing Childcare Responsibilities on Children's Cognitive Development from Early Childhood to School Age: An Overlooked Mechanism in the Intergenerational Transmission of (Dis) Advantages?. *European Sociological Review*, *36*(1), 1-15.

Kwok, S. Y., Ling, C. C., Leung, C. L., & Li, J. C. (2013). Fathering self-efficacy, marital satisfaction and father involvement in Hong Kong. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *22*(8), 1051-1060.

Massengill, R. (2015). Writing sociology. A guide for senior theses. New Haven, CT: Department of Sociology, Yale University. Retrieved from EUR Canvas

McBride, B. A., & Mills, G. (1993). A comparison of mother and father involvement with their preschool age children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *8*(4), 457-477.

McBride, B.A. et al. (2005). Paternal identity, maternal gatekeeping, and father involvement. *Family Relations*, 54, 360–372.

McLanahan, S. (2004). Diverging destinies: How children are faring under the second demographic transition. *Demography*, 41(4), 607-627.

Oswald, R. F., Blume, L. B., & Marks, S. R. (2005). Decentering heteronormativity: A model for family studies. *Sourcebook of family theory and research*, 143-165.

Paquette, D. (2004). Theorizing the father-child relationship: Mechanisms and developmental outcomes. *Human Development*, 47, 193–219.

Pleck, J. (2010). Fatherhood and masculinity. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (5th ed., pp. 27-57). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Portegijs, W. & Van Den Brakel, M. (2018). *Emancipatiemonitor 2018.*

Rijksoverheid. (2020). Retrieved from https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/ouderschapsverlof/documenten/kamerstukken/2019/05/13/kamerbrief-europese-richtlijn-inzake-betaling-ouderschapsverlof

Seccombe, W. (1986). Patriarchy stabilized: the construction of the male breadwinner wage norm in nineteenth-century Britain. *Social History*, *11*(1), 53-76.

Sevigny, P. R., & Loutzenhiser, L. (2010). Predictors of parenting self-efficacy in mothers and fathers of toddlers. *Child: care, health and development*, *36*(2), 179-189.

The Fatherhood Institute. (2010). The fatherhood report 2010–11: the fairness in families index.

Trahan, M. H. (2018). Paternal self-efficacy and father involvement: A bi-directional relationship. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *19*(4), 624.

Van de Beek, J. & Van Weegberg, B. (2020, May 19th). Ook vader met minder poen moet betrokken kunnen zijn. Retrieved from https://www.trouw.nl/opinie/ook-vader-met-minder-poen-moet-betrokken-kunnen-zijn~b58e22af/

Van Gent, W., Das, M., & Musterd, S. (2019). Sociocultural, economic and ethnic homogeneity in residential mobility and spatial sorting among couples. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, *51*(4), 891-912.

Yarwood, G. A. (2011). The pick and mix of fathering identities. *Fathering* (*9)*, 150-168.

Appendix A: Ethics and privacy checklist

INSTRUCTION

This checklist should be completed for every research study that is conducted at the Department of Public Administration and Sociology (DPAS). This checklist should be completed *before* commencing with data collection or approaching participants. Students can complete this checklist with help of their supervisor.

This checklist is a mandatory part of the empirical master's thesis and has to be uploaded along with the research proposal.

The guideline for ethical aspects of research of the Dutch Sociological Association (NSV) can be found on their website (http://www.nsv-sociologie.nl/?page_id=17). If you have doubts about ethical or privacy aspects of your research study, discuss and resolve the matter with your EUR supervisor. If needed and if advised to do so by your supervisor, you can also consult Dr. Jennifer A. Holland, coordinator of the Sociology Master's Thesis program.

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Project title: "It is just a matter of practice", mapping the paternal masculinities of Dutch highly involved fathers

Name, email of student: Justine van de Beek, 542916jb@student.eur.nl

Name, email of supervisor: Renske Keizer, keizer@essb.eur.nl

Start date and duration: April – June

Is the research study conducted within DPAS YES

If 'NO': at or for what institute or organization will the study be conducted?
(e.g. internship organization)

PART II: TYPE OF RESEARCH STUDY

Please indicate the type of research study by circling the appropriate answer:

1. Research involving human participants. YES

   If 'YES': does the study involve medical or physical research? NO
   Research that falls under the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act (WMO) must first be submitted to an accredited medical research ethics committee or the Central Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (CCMO).

2. Field observations without manipulations that will not involve identification of participants. NO

3. Research involving completely anonymous data files (secondary data that has been anonymized by someone else). NO

PART III: PARTICIPANTS

Where will you collect your data?

I have collected my data through online qualitative interviews via Skype, which I have recorded, transcribed and coded.

What is the (anticipated) size of your sample?

12 respondents.

What is the size of the population from which you will sample?

Not applicable (purposive sampling, qualitative research).

1. Will information about the nature of the study and about what participants can expect during the study be withheld from them? NO
2. Will any of the participants not be asked for verbal or written 'informed consent,' whereby they agree to participate in the study? NO

3. Will information about the possibility to discontinue the participation at any time be withheld from participants? NO

4. Will the study involve actively deceiving the participants? NO
   Note: almost all research studies involve some kind of deception of participants. Try to think about what types of deception are ethical or non-ethical (e.g. purpose of the study is not told, coercion is exerted on participants, giving participants the feeling that they harm other people by making certain decisions, etc.).

5.	Does the study involve the risk of causing psychological stress or negative emotions beyond those normally encountered by participants? `	NO
6.	Will information be collected about special categories of data, as defined by the GDPR (e.g. racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, trade union membership, genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a person, data concerning mental or physical health, data concerning a person's sex life or sexual orientation)?	YES
7.	Will the study involve the participation of minors (<18 years old) or other groups that cannot give consent?	NO
8.	Is the health and/or safety of participants at risk during the study?	NO
9.	Can participants be identified by the study results or can the confidentiality of the participants' identity not be ensured?	NO
10.	Are there any other possible ethical issues with regard to this study?	NO

If you have answered 'YES' to any of the previous questions, please indicate below why this issue is unavoidable in this study.

6: The interviews consisted of questions about views on fatherhood and masculinity. These are philosophical beliefs and also contain data about sexual orientation.

What safeguards are taken to relieve possible adverse consequences of these issues (e.g., informing participants about the study afterwards, extra safety regulations, etc.).

Respondents were informed through a comprehensive informed consent form, which they all read and signed, and any information that could identify respondents in publications has been anonymized (including their own names and those of people around them they have mentioned). The only document that identifies respondents' pseudonyms to their actual names and personal information has been stored separately and securely on the researchers' computer and cannot be accessed without a password.

Are there any unintended circumstances in the study that can cause harm or have negative (emotional) consequences to the participants? Indicate what possible circumstances this could be.

No.

Part IV: Data storage and backup

Where and when will you store your data in the short term, after acquisition?

I have stored the data on my personal computer which is secured by a password, and which automatically backs up the data to my secured Google Drive account.

Who is responsible for the immediate day-to-day management, storage and backup of the data arising from your research?

I am.

How (frequently) will you back-up your research data for short-term data security?

My secured Google Drive account daily automatically backs up all of my computer data.

In case of collecting personal data how will you anonymize the data?

I have removed respondents' names and other personal data from the text transcription, and I have kept the only document tying their names to the data secure and separate.

PART VI: SIGNATURE

Please note that it is your responsibility to follow the ethical guidelines in the conduct of your study. This includes providing information to participants about the study and ensuring confidentiality in storage and use of personal data. Treat participants respectfully, be on time at appointments, call participants when they have signed up for your study and fulfil promises made to participants.

Furthermore, it is your responsibility that data are authentic, of high quality and properly stored. The principle is always that the supervisor (or strictly speaking the Erasmus University Rotterdam) remains owner of the data, and that the student should therefore hand over all data to the supervisor.

Hereby I declare that the study will be conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the Department of Public Administration and Sociology at Erasmus University Rotterdam. I have answered the questions truthfully.

Name student: Justine van de Beek	Name (EUR) supervisor: Renske Keizer
Date: 21-6-2020	Date: