

“A father doesn’t just have to pay the bills [and] be all manly”: Constructions of fathering
among adolescents in a low-income, high-violence community in Cape Town

Rebecca Helman

HLMREB001

A minor dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the
degree of Master of Arts in Psychological Research

Faculty of the Humanities

University of Cape Town

2015

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature: _____

Date: 16th February 2015

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Associate Professor Debbie Kaminer, from the University of Cape Town, for supervising this project. This project would not have been possible without her guidance, support and encouragement.

I would like to thank my friends for all their help and support throughout this challenging journey, particularly Lucienne Argent and Daniel Hart for not letting me give up hope when things looked dim. To my family, thank you for your continued love and support, and particularly to Glynis and Shelia Lloyd for their help editing and general encouragement. I would also like to thank my father, who has shown me every day the importance of fathering.

I would like to thank the National Research Foundation for their generous contribution to funding this project. Without funding this research would not have been possible.

I would also like to thank Lane Benjamin for her guidance and support, as well as all those at Community Action towards a Safer Environment (CASE) who made this project possible.

Finally, I would like to thank my participants, who so courageously and willingly shared their stories with me. Your contribution has enable a deeper understanding of fathering within the context of South Africa.

ABSTRACT

In light of research which suggests that father involvement is associated with positive outcomes for children, including emotional, social and financial benefits, the high rate of father absence in South Africa has been interpreted as a ‘crisis’ of fatherhood (Ratele, Shefer, & Clowes, 2012). However, there is a lack of research that explores fathering and fatherhood from the perspective of South African children. This study aimed to investigate the ways in which a group of nine female and five male adolescents in an urban, low-income community of Cape Town discursively construct the roles and responsibilities of fathers in their community. Using Photovoice methodology, participants produced photographs of ‘fathering in my community’ and then participated in a photo-elicitation interview. The interview transcripts were subjected to a discourse analysis to identify discursive constructions of fatherhood. Consistent with previous research which has been conducted with fathers, participants drew on hegemonic discourses which positioned fathers as financial providers and protectors, and mothers as ‘natural’ care-givers and nurturers. Fathers were predominantly represented as failing to fulfil their roles and responsibilities. However, there were also instances in which participants resisted these dominant discourses through drawing on a discourse of ‘involved’ fathering which positioned fathers as nurturers and carers. Participants also discursively constructed a form of non-biological ‘social father’ who could fulfil some fathering roles. In light of these findings it appears that there is a need to challenge rigid and inflexible hegemonic constructions of fathering (and masculinity more generally), and to elaborate contesting versions of fatherhood, in order to make alternative, more fluid subject positions available to men as fathers.

Keywords: *fatherhood, fathering, masculinity, adolescents, South Africa*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	2
ABSTRACT.....	3
CHAPTER 1: AN INTRODUCTION.....	6
1.1 FATHERS, FATHERHOOD AND FATHERING.....	6
1.2 ABSENT FATHERS.....	7
1.3 FATHER ABSENCE IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT.....	9
1.4 SOCIAL POLICY ON FATHERING.....	10
1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES.....	11
1.6 STRUCTURE OF THESIS.....	11
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
2.1 FATHER INVOLVEMENT AND CHILD WELL-BEING.....	12
2.1.1 Comparative studies.....	12
2.1.2 Father involvement and child outcomes.....	13
2.1.3 Limitations of research on father involvement and child well-being.....	16
2.2 CONSTRUCTIONS OF FATHERING.....	17
2.2.1 Father as moral protector.....	19
2.2.2 Father as provider.....	20
2.2.3 Natural mothering.....	22
2.2.4 Involved fathering.....	24
2.3 THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT OF FATHERING.....	28
2.3.1 Traditional fathering roles.....	28
2.3.2 Social fathering.....	30
2.3.3 Shifts in traditional constructions of fathering.....	31
2.4 CHILDREN’S PERSPECTIVES ON FATHERING.....	33
2.5 SUMMARY.....	34
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	36
3.1 AIMS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	36
3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN.....	36
3.3 PARTICIPANTS.....	39

3.4 DATA COLLECTION.....	40
3.5 DATA ANALYSIS.....	44
3.6 PROCEDURE.....	45
3.7 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	47
3.7.1 Consent.....	47
3.7.2 Confidentiality.....	47
3.7.3 Risks and benefits for participants.....	48
3.7.4 Issues concerning secondary participants.....	49
3.8 SUMMARY.....	49
CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS.....	50
4.1 ‘NATURAL’ MOTHERING.....	50
4.2 FATHER AS ‘PROVIDER’.....	62
4.3 FATHER AS ‘MORAL PROTECTOR’.....	73
4.4 ‘ABSENT’ FATHERS.....	84
4.5 SOCIAL FATHERS.....	93
4.6 SUMMARY.....	98
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	100
5.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	100
5.2 LIMITATIONS.....	104
5.3 REFLEXIVITY.....	106
5.3.1 On the ‘inside’.....	106
5.3.2 On the ‘outside’.....	107
5.4 DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND PRACTICE.....	108
5.5 CONCLUSION.....	109
REFERENCES.....	111
APPENDIX A: ASSENT FORM.....	128
APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM.....	130

CHAPTER 1: AN INTRODUCTION

Traditionally women have been regarded as primary caregivers for children. This notion can be seen to have “fostered the implicit assumption that father-child relationships had little impact on children’s development” (Cabrera, Tamis-LeMonda, Bradley, Hofferth, & Lamb, 2000, p. 127). Historically much psychological research has therefore investigated the mother-child relationship, whilst paying little attention to the relationship between fathers and their children. However, the past three decades have seen a recognition that fathers impact on their children’s development in a number of important ways. This has resulted in an increased research (and public policy) interest in fathers and the ways in which they interact with their children. Of particular concern has been the phenomenon of absent fathers (Morrell, 2006), with the absence of men (both physically and emotionally) from the lives of their children being seen as resulting in a crisis of ‘fatherless families’ (Lupton & Barclay, 1997). The crisis of the ‘fatherless family’ has been regarded as a particularly important issue within the South African context as rates of father absence in this country are alarmingly high (Richter et al., 2012). In light of high rates of father absence, social policies in various parts of the world have attempted to promote father involvement. However, within the South Africa context, these types of policies remain limited.

1.1 Fathers, fatherhood and fathering

Traditionally, a father has been understood to be a man who impregnates a woman, with the biological happening being the sole criteria for fatherhood (Morrell, 2006). However, it has been argued that this definition does not adequately capture “the complex and contradictory landscape of contemporary fathering” (Miller, 2011, p. 10). In a context where scientific procedures (for example artificial insemination) have made the creation of human life possible, shifts are occurring in the definitions of fatherhood (Morrell, 2006). It has been argued that in contemporary society, the term ‘father’ may refer to the man who contributed biological material (even though he may remain unknown to his child), a man who occupies the same household as a child but is biologically unrelated, as well as a man who is legally regarded as the father but does not live with the child (Lupton & Barclay, 1997). In light of the fact that, more than ever before, children are likely to be born outside of marriage and not live in the same household as their fathers, there is a need to reconceptualise who fathers are and what roles they occupy (Bachrach & Sonenstein, 1998; Richter, 2006).

While the term ‘father’ refers to an individual man, the term ‘fatherhood’ refers to “the wider social context in which fathering¹ takes place” (Miller, 2011, p.6). Fatherhood can be understood as a social role which men occupy in relation to children. Mkhize (2006) argues that fatherhood is interwoven with an individual’s role and position in society. However, fathering is not merely the behaviour of individual men, but a multilateral process which involves men and children, as well as mothers, extended families, and the broader society in which this behaviour occurs (Doherty, Kouneski, & Erickson, 1998). The conceptualisation and enactment of fathering by men do not occur apart from cultural and social processes, but rather they are shaped by and through these processes (Lupton & Barclay, 1997; Marsiglio & Pleck, 2005). In light of this, fathering practices are socially constructed and constantly in flux (Datta, 2007; Morrell & Richter, 2006). Therefore, fathering is “constantly being shaped and reshaped according to cultural contexts, work and family relations” (Brandth & Kvande, 1998, p. 295).

1.2 Absent fathers

Father absence has come to be regarded as problematic for children and particularly for boys (Ratele et al., 2012) and substantial public, academic and political attention has been directed towards fathers who are seen as not fulfilling their required roles (Coley, 2001). These fathers have come to be regarded as ‘deadbeat dads’, shirking their fathering responsibilities in the absence of a legitimate reason (Sorensen & Zibman, 2001). These men are seen to be emotionally disconnected from their children and as failing to provide them with financial support (Presbury, Benson, McKee, Fitch, & Fitch, 1997). Therefore, father absence can be conceptualised both as a physical absence, as well as an emotional absence (Swartz & Bhana, 2009).

It has been predominantly low-income, minority fathers who have been constructed as failing to fulfil their responsibilities to their children and families (Coley, 2001). This is perhaps due to the fact that these fathers often do not comply with sanctioned notions of the nuclear family, with many of these men living apart from their children and not being married to their children’s mothers. Implicit in the construction of these fathers as ‘deadbeat’ is the assumption that because they do not live with their children they are not involved in their children’s lives in any way (Way & Gillman, 2000). In the United States African-American men, in particular,

¹ In the context of this study the term fathering will be used to refer to the enactment of fatherhood in the lives of children rather than to the biological act of reproducing a child

have been portrayed as irresponsible fathers (Taylor, Leashore, & Toliver, 1988). Jones (2010) notes that a public perception exists of African-American men as “undependable, prone to engage in violent, corrupt behaviours and/or physically absent due to abandonment or incarceration” (p. 105). It has been argued that men’s failure to fulfil their paternal obligations is often seen to be as a result of irresponsibility (Glikman, 2004). Although this may be true in some cases, there are a number of other reasons for men’s absence. These include “constructions of male identities which prohibit close contact with (especially young) children; a lack of skills and information; insufficient economic opportunities which enable men to combine the role of being both fathers and providers, and inadequate policies, programmes, laws and social incentives which promote father attachment to, and support of, their children” (Datta, 2007, p. 99).

In contrary to the discourse of ‘absent fathers’, there is evidence to suggest that low-income fathers are actively involved in their children’s lives, even in situations in which these men do not live in the same household as their children. In a study conducted with non-resident, African-American fathers, Jones (2010) found that these men were involved and invested in their children’s lives. Non-resident, young fathers in low-income neighbourhoods in the United States were also found to be involved in not only providing for their children, but also in the daily care of their children (Glikman, 2004). Similarly, it was found that adolescent girls in low-income neighbourhoods in the United States still saw their fathers as available and involved in their lives, despite living apart from them (Way & Stauber, 1996). However, despite the existence of this evidence, the discourse of ‘deadbeat dads’ continues to shape the way in which particular groups of fathers are viewed.

The discourse of ‘deadbeat dads’ can be seen to have a number of important implications for men as fathers. It positions individual men as choosing to disengage from their paternal responsibilities, without taking into account structural factors which may prevent men from fulfilling certain roles in their families. ‘Deadbeat dads’ are “problematized, pathologised and blamed” for their failure to fulfil their obligations as fathers (Henwood & Procter, 2003, p. 339). Therefore, this discourse, rather than promoting productive change and helping to facilitate positive father involvement, can be seen to alienate certain groups of fathers (Presbury et al., 1997). It has also been argued that the negative stereotyping of certain groups of fathers, may prevent the development of positive fathering identities among these groups. For example, in a study conducted with low-income, African-American teenage fathers, it was found that due to the fact that African American men were not portrayed positively in the context of the

family by popular media, participants found it difficult to imagine themselves being successful fathers (Allen & Doherty, 1996). In light of these implications, there is a need to interrogate constructions of fathers as ‘deadbeat’, in order to explore alternative subject positions that men can take up in the lives of their children and families.

1.3 Father absence in the South African context

Research suggests that paternal absence is particularly high in South Africa in comparison to other parts of the world (Posel & Devey, 2006). Data collected in 2009 indicate that 38% of children live only with their mother. However, this number varies according to race with 41% of ‘black’ children, 31% of ‘coloured children’ living apart from their fathers in comparison to 10.7% of ‘Indian’ children and 12.4% of ‘white’ children² (Statistics South Africa, 2010). These differences can be understood within a historical context of migrant labour, racialized systems of land ownership, as well as unemployment and poverty, which have resulted in (particularly ‘black’) men living apart from their children (Makusha, Richter, & Bhana, 2013). Qualitative research which has been conducted with families also suggests that fathers are absent from the lives of their children (Langa, 2010a; Montgomery, Hosegood, Busza, & Timæus, 2006). This research has demonstrated that even in situations where fathers are involved in the care of their children, men continue to be characterised as irresponsible and absent (Montgomery et al., 2006). Therefore, negative images of fathers, and black fathers in particular, can be seen to be pervasive (Richter, 2006).

Although there is evidence to suggest widespread absence and neglect on the part of fathers, it has been argued that it is essential not to “underestimate[e] the actual and potential contribution, interest and impact of non-resident and low-income or unemployed fathers” (Richter, 2006, p. 63). A number of studies have demonstrated that despite the fact that fathers do not live with their children and may no longer be involved with their children’s mothers, they continue to play an important role in their children’s lives. For example, ‘black’ and ‘coloured’ fathers from low-income communities in Cape Town and Durban were found to be involved in both the financial and the emotional care of their children (Swartz & Bhana, 2009). Similarly, young low-income fathers in Cape Town were also found to participate in the daily care of their children even when they lived apart from the children’s mothers (Enderstein &

² The terms ‘coloured’, ‘black’ and ‘white’ were racial categories used under the system of apartheid in South Africa to classify people according to their race. The placing of these terms in inverted commas is used to indicate that these categories are socially constructed. The term ‘coloured’ referred to a racial group which was regarded as being ‘in between’ ‘black’ and ‘white’ in the racial hierarchy (Adhikari, 2005).

Boonzaier, 2013). In light of this, fathers can be seen to be challenging notions of men as irresponsible, absent ‘deadbeat dads’.

1.4 Social policy on fathering

Perhaps in response to the high rates of father absence, in an attempt to engage men more actively in their children’s lives, a number of innovative changes have taken place in state policy in various parts of the world (Morrell & Richter, 2006). These include changes to systems of paternal leave. For example, since January 2002, fathers in France have been able to take up to eleven days of paternity leave for the birth of a single child and eighteen days for multiple births (Hosking, 2006). In Iceland mothers and fathers are able to take up to six months of leave following the birth of a child (Morrell & Richter, 2006). In Sweden a father may take up to four-hundred and fifty days of paid paternity leave (Hosking, 2006).

However, it has been argued that “South Africa’s law and policies with regard to fathers have not yet followed the lead taken by social welfare states in the north” (Morrell & Richter, 2006, p. 3). This was reflected in the recent case of Hendri Terblanche, a father whose twins were born prematurely in November 2014. Mr. Terblanche took issue with the fact that fathers are allowed three days family responsibility leave per year, with no provision being made for paternity leave (Jackman, 2014). While some changes have taken places within the South African legal system (for example the passing of the Natural Fathers of Children Born Out of Wedlock Act of 1997, which grants guardianship, as well as custody and access rights to fathers of extra-marital children) (Gallinetti, 2006), the legal system and social policies in South Africa remain predominantly father-unfriendly (Morrell & Richter, 2006).

In light of this, it can be argued that within the South African context, the concept of fathering is fraught with ambiguity (Smit, 2004). This is due to the fact that men are confronted with the inconsistency between laws and social policies which prevent them from being involved in their children’s lives in particular ways, on the one hand, and the discourse of ‘deadbeat dads’ which problematizes and pathologises them on the other. There is, therefore, a need to investigate the ways in which fathering roles are defined, expressed and negotiated within this particular context (Marsiglio, Amato, Day, & Lamb, 2000). This is important because “men... have the potential, through involved and affectionate care to make a major contribution to children’s relief” (Richter, Manegold, Pather & Mason, 2004, p.4). However, in order to enable this to occur, there is a need to move beyond seeing men as merely irresponsible, problematic, neglectful, and irremediable (Richter et al., 2004).

1.5 Research objectives

This study aims to investigate the ways in which adolescents in an urban, low-income community of Cape Town construct fathers' roles and responsibilities. The discourses which participants draw on to construct fathering in particular ways, as well as the implications of these discourses, will be examined.

1.6 Structure of Thesis

Chapter Two will review literature which has been conducted on fathering. The first part of the chapter reviews quantitative research which has sought to investigate the relationship between father involvement and positive child outcomes. The second part of the chapter reviews qualitative research which has examined the ways in which fathering is constructed (predominantly from the perspective of fathers themselves). The third part of the chapter reviews research which has been conducted on fathering within the South African context. Chapter Three outlines the aims of the research study, as well as the research design employed in this study. This chapter situates the study within a feminist post-structuralist framework, and describes Photovoice methodology. The data collection and analysis procedures, setting and participants, as well as the ethical considerations are also discussed in this chapter. Chapter Four explores participants' constructions of fathering and discusses the implications of these. Finally, Chapter Five provides a summary of the findings and considers them in light of previous literature. The limitations of the study are also discussed and suggestions are made for future research. Finally, the practical implications of the study's findings are considered.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on father involvement and child outcomes has positioned fathers as essential in the lives of their children. This is further supported by research investigating the ways in which father's obligations, roles and responsibilities are constructed, which has revealed that fathers continue to be regarded as having specific roles to play in their children's lives, which include providing, protecting and (more recently) nurturing. While there has been significant research which has explored the ways in which men (and to a lesser extent women) construct fathering, there has been a lack of research which has investigated children's perspectives. Through supplementing research which has been conducted with fathers with research which focuses on the perceptions of children, understandings of fathering in the South African context are likely to be advanced.

This chapter will provide a review of the research, which has been conducted both in South Africa and internationally, on fathering. Firstly, quantitative research which has examined the relationship between father involvement and child outcomes will be reviewed. Thereafter, the chapter will review qualitative research which has examined the ways in which men (and women) construct fathering. Finally, research on fathering in the South African context will be reviewed.

2.1 Father involvement and child well-being

It has been argued that one of the primary reasons that fathers and fatherhood have been of interest is the association between father involvement and positive child outcomes (Dermott, 2008). It has been assumed that father involvement is an important contributor to healthy development for children (Coley, 2001). In light of this, research has sought to identify, define and measure the involvement of fathers in the lives of their children (Lewis & Lamb, 2004).

2.1.1 Comparative studies

Much research has sought to investigate the 'unique' ways in which men, as fathers, contribute to positive child outcomes. This research has investigated differences in the ways in which mothers and fathers interact with their children. Fathers have been reported to engage in more stimulating styles of interaction with infants (Lamb, 1976; Yogman, 1981). In both France and Switzerland, men were found to be more instructive towards children than women (Lewis & Lamb, 2004). In the United States, father's styles of play have been found to be more stimulating and unpredictable than mother's (Dickson, Walker, & Fogel, 1997; Lamb, 1977).

Despite these findings, other research has suggested that parental differentiation may not be so pronounced (Lewis & Lamb, 2004). For example, in Germany and Sweden, fathers were not found to engage in different play activities from mothers (Best, House, Barnard, & Spicker, 1994; Lamb, Frodi, Frodj, & Hwang, 1982). In fact, Lamb (2010) notes that “as far as influences on children are concerned... very little about the gender of the parent seems to be important” (p. 5). However, it has been argued that there is limited psychological research which seeks to demonstrate similarities in the ways mothers and fathers parent. While comparative research often acknowledges that mother’s and father’s parenting behaviours are alike in many ways, findings still tend to focus on the differences that were found (Lupton & Barclay, 1997). Therefore, through a preoccupation with gender differences, comparative studies can be seen to perpetuate narrow conceptualisations of the roles fathers and mothers play in their lives of their children (Lamb, 2010).

2.1.2 Father involvement and child outcomes

Studies which have investigated the association between father involvement and child outcomes have identified a number of ways in which father involvement may benefit children. These can be broadly categorised into four areas: emotional, cognitive, financial, and social benefits.

According to Bowlby’s (1969) attachment theory, forming secure attachment relationships with caregivers is important for facilitating the healthy development of infants. Through forming a secure attachment, infants develop a secure base from which they can explore the world. This exploration leads the child to develop a positive ‘internal working model’ of the self (Bretherton, 1985). This internal working model is important for the development of children’s later relationships and facilitates cognitive, social and emotional development (Flouri, 2005; Pleck, 2007). While historically the mother-child relationship has been seen as the primary attachment relationship, research on father-child attachment suggests that children with secure attachments with their fathers show more independence and social competence and less anxiety than children with insecure attachment relationships with their fathers (Verschueren & Marcoen, 1999). Amato and Gilbreth (1999) argue that feeling loved and cared for by their fathers strengthens children’s sense of emotional security. In a meta-analysis of sixty-three studies conducted with children of non-resident fathers, they found that feeling close to their fathers was positively associated with children’s well-being. Similarly, in a study conducted with two-parent families in Britain, there was a positive association between father

involvement and children's self-esteem (Welsh, Buchanan, Flouri & Lewis, 2004). Low father involvement was also found to significantly contribute to low levels of life satisfaction among adolescent boys (Flouri & Buchanan, 2002). While paternal accessibility is likely to promote a sense of security in children, it has been argued that abandonment by a father may be experienced as emotionally distressing (Cabrera et al., 2000). In a qualitative study conducted with adolescent boys in a township in Johannesburg, all the participants spoke about the pain caused by not knowing their fathers (Langa, 2010a).

Research suggests that father involvement may also have cognitive benefits for children. Marsiglio and Day (1997) argue that fathers may provide children with human capital, including "skills, knowledge and traits that foster achievement" (p. 2). In a study conducted with British youth, a significant association was found between adolescents' educational attainment and father involvement, after controlling for the influence of mother involvement (Flouri & Buchanan, 2004). Similarly, in a study conducted in South Africa, boys who lived in households in which fathers were present had higher levels of academic achievement than boys who lived in households in which fathers were absent (Mboya & Nesengani, 1999).

Father involvement may also benefit children by means of financial capital. Economic contributions from fathers may increase children's standard of living, as well as improve their health, well-being, and educational attainment through providing food, shelter, and educational resources such as books and computers (Amato & Gilbreth, 1999). Richter (2006) notes that generally men are likely to be better paid than women, and therefore can make more meaningful contributions to household income. In light of this, fathers are largely responsible for determining the economic status of their children (Marsiglio et al., 2000). Economic disadvantage is more likely to occur in the context of single mother households and has been found to be correlated with poor educational and psychological functioning (Cabrera et al., 2000). In their meta-analysis, Amato and Gilbreth (1999) found that non-resident fathers' payment of child support was positively related to children's academic success, as well as to fewer externalising problems. In South Africa, it has been found that households in which fathers are present are financially better off than households in which fathers are absent (Desmond & Desmond, 2006).

Father involvement can also be seen to benefit children by means of social capital. Marsiglio and colleagues (2000) argue that fathers can contribute to positive child outcomes through their connections to other community members and organisations. If fathers maintain contact with

other care providers in their children's lives (e.g. teachers, coaches and neighbours) it is easier for these networks to share information, as well as to provide supervision and guidance to children (Marsiglio et al., 2000). It has also been argued that in traditionally patriarchal societies men tend to have access to more community resources, prestige and status than women (Richter, 2006). In many communities, by being acknowledged and supported by their father, children may have social value conferred upon them, enabling membership to extended family and community circles (Richter et al., 2012). In a study conducted in Botswana it was found that "[c]hildren... [were] disadvantaged when they belong[ed] to a household without access to the social position, labour and financial support that is provided by men" (Townsend, 2002, p. 270).

Research further suggests that fathers' involvement in the lives of their children does not only directly benefit children but also has indirect benefits for children through the effect this involvement has on children's mothers. When fathers are absent there is no co-parent (Cabrera et al., 2000). Women who do not have emotional or financial support from their children's fathers are more likely to experience stress. In a study conducted by Richter and colleagues (2011), women who were in supportive and healthy relationships with men experienced lower level of family stress, were less likely to have mental health problems and reported greater levels of satisfaction with their roles as mothers. It has also been argued that father absence may result in social isolation due to the fact that single mothers and children may be subject to social disapproval and a lack of social support (Cabrera et al., 2000).

Although research has identified situations in which father involvement is beneficial for children, situations in which father involvement may be harmful to children have also been identified. A study conducted in New Zealand found that fathers who engaged in drug-use and criminal behaviour were more likely to engage in poor parenting and therefore it was not in the interest of these children to have contact with their fathers (Jaffee, Caspi, Moffitt, Taylor, & Dickson, 2001). In a study conducted in South Africa, children whose fathers gambled, drank alcohol, and were abusive, identified these behaviours as extremely upsetting and an indication that their fathers did not love and respect them (Richter & Smith, 2006). This research, which highlights that in some instances father involvement may be harmful rather than beneficial to children, suggests that it is the quality of the father involvement which is important, rather than the mere presence of the father in the life of the child. This is further supported by findings from a study conducted with children in Ireland, where intimate communication and

commitment (on the part of the father) were identified by children as being important in facilitating positive father-child relationships (Nixon, Greene, & Hogan, 2012).

While research which has been conducted on father involvement has identified a number of positive benefits for children, there is also evidence which suggests that fatherhood may be associated with positive benefits for fathers. Morrell (2006) argues that fatherhood gives meaning to men's lives and opens up opportunities for emotional engagement, which may not be as readily available to men as they are to women. A number of qualitative studies which have been conducted with fathers suggest that fatherhood provides men with purpose, encourages them to be positive role models for their children and protects them from engaging in risk-taking behaviours (Allen & Doherty, 1996; Jones, 2010). In light of this, the fostering of positive father-child relationships can be seen to have potential benefits for both men and children.

2.1.3 Limitations of research on father involvement and child well-being

Although research on father involvement has identified a number of positive benefits for children (and fathers), this research can also be seen to have a number of limitations. Firstly, it has been argued that much of the research which has been conducted oversimplifies the complex relationships which exist between father involvement and positive child outcomes (Silverstein & Auerbach, 1999). Pleck (2010) notes that father-absent and father-present households differ in various socio-demographic characteristics (e.g. ethnicity and socioeconomic status) which have been shown to be associated with child well-being. He also notes that father absence, in many cases, is likely to be the result of divorce or separation, therefore there are likely to be differences in levels of parental conflict in father-present and father-absent households. Parental conflict has also been found to be associated with child outcomes. These characteristics can therefore be seen as 'selection factors' which may potentially account for the differences in child outcomes that have been observed (Pleck, 2010). Research suggests that when these selection factors are controlled for associations between father involvement and child well-being "become smaller, sometimes statistically insignificant" (Sigle-Rushton & McLanahan, 2002, p. 127). Therefore, independent associations between paternal involvement and child well-being are not as strong and consistent as often represented in the father-involvement literature.

Secondly, it has been argued that the research which has been conducted on paternal involvement and child well-being are "framed in a range of assumptions about what families

should look like and gendered assumptions that fathers play a significant and different role to mothers” (Ratele et al., 2012, p. 554). Studies on father involvement which compare father-present and father-absent households serve to position fathers as essential to children’s well-being and, therefore, to idealise family structures in which fathers are present. In contrast, non-nuclear families, in which fathers are absent, are positioned as harmful to children’s well-being and thus demonised and devalued (Ngobeni, 2006; Ratele et al., 2012).

Thirdly, research on father involvement has predominantly been conducted in the high-income countries, within the context of nuclear families. Richter (2006) argues that this is problematic in light of the fact that the nuclear family is not normative in most contexts. There have also been limited attempts to explore the experiences of alternative family structures (e.g. gay and lesbian families) and how these families are able to contribute to positive child development (Ratele et al., 2012; Silverstein & Auerbach, 1999). The research which has been conducted with these types of families demonstrate normal social and psychological development for children (Silverstein & Auerbach, 1999). In light of this, it is perhaps more accurate to see fathers as being important, rather than essential, for children’s well-being (Pleck, 2010).

Finally, Lupton and Barclay (1997) note that research on father involvement and child well-being can be seen to confine “the experience of fatherhood to an individualised, largely asocial context, with little recognition of the ‘external world’ and relationships beyond the mother-father-infant triad” (p. 47). They argue that this research has failed to explore the ways in which fatherhood is conceptualised, negotiated and enacted, due to a preoccupation with the ways in which father involvement supposedly influences positive child outcomes.

In light of these limitations there is a need to more fully explore the social nature of fathering, that is the context in which fathering occurs. Plantin, Månsson and Kearney (2003) note that there is an increasing research focus on men’s perspectives on fatherhood, which seeks to investigate the ways in which fatherhood is constructed within the context of everyday relationships and practices. It is to this research that we now turn.

2.2 Constructions of fathering

Research which has been conducted on male parenting has demonstrated multiplicity in the ways men perceive and conduct their roles as fathers. In light of this, “fatherhood has more and more come to be considered a social construction that is shaped in an interplay between a number of surrounding relations and structures in men’s lives” (Plantin et al., 2003, p. 4). The

notion of fatherhood as a social construction is further supported by research which suggests that understandings of the obligations, roles and responsibilities of fathers have undergone numerous changes in the past century. It has been argued that these changes are related to shifts which have occurred in family life, gender relations and the economy (Coley, 2001; Smit, 2008). Both historical and social science literature have documented the changes that have occurred in the norms and expectations of 'good' fathering during the course of the twentieth century (Lupton & Barclay, 1997). Cabrera and colleagues (2000) note that these changes have resulted in expanding understandings of fathering, both in research and in the public arena more generally. In light of this, there now exist a "plurality of ways in which fathers can be fathers - how they can interpret and construct their own versions of the paternal role" (Dudová, 2006, p. 558). Despite the existence of plurality, clear patterns have emerged regarding fathering roles. These include protecting and guiding, providing, and more recently, nurturing. It has also been argued that fathering is not defined in isolation from mothering (Doherty et al., 1998). In fact, traditional notions of fathering and mothering have to a large extent been constructed in opposition to one another. The following section will explore constructions of fathers as protectors, providers and nurturers, as well as the construction of mothers as 'natural' carers.

Research has also sought to investigate the ways in which masculinity is constructed in relation to fathering. Mkhize (2006) argues that "fatherhood is intertwined with the process by which men come to an understanding of who they are ... [it] does not occur in a vacuum... [but] is informed by the dominant discourses of what it means to be a man in one's society" (p. 186). Therefore, fatherhood can be seen to be "interconnected with the social production and reproduction of masculinities" (Mkhize, 2006, p. 186). Within a social constructionist framework, it has been well established that masculinities exist as social and cultural identities which are shaped in a process of contestation between rival understandings of what it means to be a man (Morrell, 2001). Within this system there exist certain masculinities which hold more power than others; these are what Connell (1995) refers to as 'hegemonic masculinities'. Men experience significant pressure to conform to these established roles and norms (Datta, 2007). Traditionally hegemonic masculinities have been constructed in opposition to femininity (Connell, 2000). For example, men are understood to be "active, strong, independent, powerful, dominant and aggressive, with masculinity signalling being in control... [in contrast] women... are seen as passive, weak, dependent, powerless, subordinate and nurturing" (Adams & Coltrane, 2005, p. 232). It has been argued that fathering and fatherhood are central to constructions of appropriate masculinities (Datta, 2007). The act of fathering a child can be

seen to symbolise sexual virility which is a vital masculine marker, as is the fulfilment of other fathering roles (for example, the role of financial provider) (Datta, 2007; Hunter, 2006). There is a growing research interest in the production of masculinity within the context of ‘involved’ fatherhood, as this is seen as a potential site for the transformation of hegemonic masculinities (Chopra, 2001; Finn & Henwood, 2009).

2.2.1 Father as moral protector

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries fathers were seen as being primarily responsible for “moral oversight and moral teaching... [and] ensuring that children grew up with an appropriate sense of values, acquired primarily from the study of religious material like the Bible” (Lamb, 1986, p.5). Linked to this, fathers have traditionally been regarded as responsible for enforcing rules and administering discipline (Marsiglio & Day, 1997). This role has been seen to be particularly important in the lives of male children. During the twentieth century there existed a particular concern that in the absence of a father figure to serve as a model for masculinity, boys were vulnerable to homosexuality and delinquency (Lupton & Barclay, 1997).

More recent research suggests that providing moral protection is still strongly associated with notions of ‘good’ fathering. A study which was conducted with mothers and fathers in four low-income communities in the United States found that fathers were seen as being responsible for providing children with moral guidance (Summers et al., 1999). Similarly, in another study African-American fathers in a low-income area identified teaching children right from wrong as a key responsibility for fathers to fulfil (Glikman, 2004). In Finland, both men and women spoke about fathers needing to be strict and act as a disciplinarian (Perälä-Littunen, 2007). Middle-class fathers in Australia also positioned discipline as an essential component of ‘good’ fathering (Lupton & Barclay, 1997). Implicit in the discourse of father as moral guide is the notion that a man occupies a position of authority within the household (Maqubela, 2013). It is through this (unquestioned) authority that the father is able to administer guidance and discipline. For example, in Botswana it was found that men did not question their father’s right to discipline them using physical punishment (Datta, 2007).

Research also suggests that fathers continue to be regarded as having a particularly important role to play in relation to their sons. The idea that a boy needs his father is a strong discourse in both the academic literature on fathering, as well as public perceptions more generally. Men and women in Finland reported that a ‘good’ father should provide a model of manhood for his

son and that the relationship between father and son was more important than the relationship between mother and son (Perälä-Littunen, 2007). Men in Botswana positioned fathers as being especially important for the socialisation of their sons (Datta, 2007). Boys were seen as needing to be in the presence of their father in order to learn how to be a man. In light of this, the absence of a father, particularly during adolescence, was constructed as a problematic for boys. There is a lack of research which has investigated the importance of fathers for daughters. It could be argued that this is a result of the existence of strongly gendered ideas about parenting. Women and men continue to be regarded as having different temperaments, abilities and personality structures (Connell, 1987). Therefore, fathers continue to be regarded as being more closely connected to and important in the lives of their sons, while mothers are considered to be the more influential parents in the lives of daughters.

In light of the dominance of the ‘father as protector’ discourse, fathers are positioned as being solely responsible for providing guidance and discipline to their children. This can be seen to have important consequences for families in which fathers are absent. The implicit assumption is that in the absence of a father figure to instil discipline and provide guidance, children are likely “to be undisciplined and delinquents” (Datta, 2007, p. 106). Therefore, the capacity of alternative family structures (for example, single-mother households) to provide children with guidance and discipline is undermined (Ngobeni, 2006).

2.2.2 Father as provider

Industrialisation has been identified as a key factor which has shaped expectations and norms of fathering (Lamb, 1986). The process of industrialisation (coupled with urbanisation) resulted in a transition from agricultural and home-based industries to factories (Coley, 2001). This resulted in men being required to venture out of the home in order to engage in paid labour (Hosking, 2006). The father, therefore, became responsible for the financial support of the family (Bernard, 1981). Men were expected to be hard-working and to spend the majority of their time at work in order to meet the financial needs of their families (Bernard, 1981). Therefore, work became a key component of masculinity, with the ability to provide for the family being strongly related to masculine honour (Brandth & Kvande, 1998).

It has been argued that the ‘father as provider’ discourse, through which men are positioned as being solely responsible for fulfilling their family’s financial needs, remains dominant (LaRossa, 1988). Research which has been conducted in a variety of contexts has demonstrated

that provision continues to be central to the way in which fathering is constructed. In research which has been conducted with middle-class men preparing for fatherhood in England and Australia, participants discussed the ability to fulfil the role of economic provider in their children's lives as being an important facet of fatherhood (Dermott, 2008; Lupton & Barclay, 1997). Similarly, middle-class divorced fathers in the Czech Republic also identified providing as a key aspect of their role as fathers (Dudová, 2006). Research with low-income fathers in the United States has also found that these men feel pressure to work in order to be considered 'good' fathers (Glikman, 2004; Wilkinson, Magora, Garcia, & Khurana, 2009). However, it is not only fathers who draw on a father as provider discourse. In a qualitative study conducted with three generations of men and women in Finland, the ability to provide for the family was considered to be an important aspect of good fathering (Perälä-Littunen, 2007). Boys between the ages of eleven and fifteen in a peri-urban community in Ghana identified the father as being responsible for providing the family with material resources (Adomako Ampofo & Boateng, 2007). Similarly, middle-class mothers in Australia also positioned breadwinning as the responsibility of the father (Lupton, 2000). In an analysis of a Canadian newspaper series, fathers were found to frequently be associated with breadwinning (Wall & Arnold, 2007). Taken together the research suggests that strong expectations exist, among fathers, mothers and children across cultures and socio-economic groups, as well as in public discourse, for fathers to provide for their families.

In light of these strong expectations, Christiansen and Palkovitz (2001) argue that "a father's failure to meet his family's needs through economic provision may have severe negative effects" (p.96). Fathers who are unemployed or underemployed may find it difficult to experience their fathering identities positively due to their failure to fulfil the provider role which is strongly associated with 'good' fatherhood and hegemonic masculinity (Marsiglio & Pleck, 2005). In a study conducted with young low-income fathers in the United States, participants discussed experiencing a failed sense of self due to being unable to provide adequately for their families (Glikman, 2004). There is also evidence to suggest that in contexts where men do not have access to legitimate economic opportunities, and feel enormous social pressure to provide for their families, they may engage in criminal activities in order to be able to fulfil the role of providers and thus be regarded as good fathers (Wilkinson et al., 2009). Research also suggests that when men deviate from their roles as providers, this may be met with disapproval. In a study conducted with stay-at-home fathers in Canada, Doucet (2004) reported that each of the fathers "referred in some way to the weight of community scrutiny

and how he felt social pressure to be earning” (p. 288). In light of this, the father as provider discourse can be seen to prohibit alternative ways of being a father.

Bernard (1981) argues that implicit in the notion of the father as provider is that he is required to meet the family’s material needs. Therefore, the provision of care and emotional support remain beyond the obligations of the father and are regarded as the mother’s responsibility. This can be understood within a context in which “the male subject is normatively positioned as rational, autonomous and in control of himself [with] anything which is emotional... seen as being out of control and so weakness: attributes more closely associated with women’s lives” (Miller, 2011, p. 182). Daly (1996) notes the ‘father as provider’ discourse continues to shape men’s decisions about family life. In her study with middle and working class men she found that family time was often regarded by men as a residual commitment, with work being given primacy. In Finland, men who assumed responsibility for breadwinning were found to have limited engagement in childcare and housework (Kaila-Behm & Vehviläinen-Julkunen, 2000). Similarly, in Botswana work commitments were used as justification by men for their limited involvement with their children (Datta, 2007). In light of this, the father as provider discourse can be seen to legitimate distance between fathers and their children as fathers are positioned as belonging outside of the home in the world of work. In contrast to fathers, mothers have traditionally been positioned inside of the home, as the ones responsible for the care of the children.

2.2.3 Natural mothering

While the process of industrialisation can be seen to have moved fathers outside of the home and into the world of work, this process can also be seen to have restricted mothers to the domestic sphere (Macleod, 2001). It has been argued that from the later eighteenth century onwards mothers have been regarded as primarily responsible for ensuring the health and ‘normal’ development of their children (Lupton & Barclay, 1997). During the course of the twentieth century it became widely assumed that the maternal-child relationship was immensely significant for the child’s healthy psychological and emotional development later in life (Lupton & Barclay, 1997). Through these discourses the mother has been constructed as essential in the life of a child. Motherhood has also traditionally been perceived as “natural for women, the desire for it inevitable and central to the construction of normal femininity” (Gillespie, 2000, p. 223). Therefore, mothering has been constructed as a biological and instinctive process for women, with women being seen to ‘naturally’ be able to mother. This

can be seen to be closely linked to traditional constructions of femininity, through which women are ‘naturally’ regarded to be emotional and caring (Dermott, 2008). In light of this, a discourse of ‘natural mothering’ has emerged, through which women are positioned as instinctively being able to meet their children’s needs.

A key component within this discourse of ‘natural mothering’ is the notion of bonding. The work of Bowlby (1969) which asserted the importance of the attachment between the mother and child in the promotion of the child’s healthy and normal development, has been used to “naturalise the assumption that mothers are the best care-givers for their children” and therefore that mothers should be the ones who spend the majority of their time caring for children (Lupton & Barclay, 1997, p. 42). In light of the emphasised importance of the formation of a ‘bond’ between the mother and child at birth and the constant presence of the mother in the child’s life, ‘good’ mothers have come to be regarded as those who are constantly available and attentive towards their children (Macleod, 2001).

There is sufficient evidence which suggests that despite shifts which have occurred in women’s involvement in paid employment, idealised images of motherhood continue to persist and motherhood continues to be regarded as a key component of femininity (Maher & Saugeres, 2007). Lupton and Barclay (1997) argue that even in a context where women work part or full-time, they are still likely to be regarded as the most important parent for children and to be responsible for more of the childcare and household tasks than their partners. This is what Hochschild (1998) refers to as the ‘second shift’. For example, in dual-earner Mexican American families, women were regarded as being “innately better equipped to deal with home and children” and therefore tended to take on the majority of these tasks (Coltrane, 1998, p. 522). Dermott (2008) found that middle-class fathers in Britain discussed their wives strong maternal ‘instincts’ and used this as justification for mothers carrying out the majority of child caring. In Finland, both men and women regarded mothers as being closer to children than fathers, with the bond between the mother and the child been used as justification for this (Perälä-Littunen, 2007). In a study with middle-class mothers in Australia, it was found that mothers regarded their childcare responsibilities as inevitable and as an essential component of ‘good’ mothering (Lupton, 2000). The same level of responsibility and participation was not required of the children’s fathers. In Botswana, men predominantly defined women in relation to motherhood, thereby establishing an automatic connection between women and children (Datta, 2007). In terms of public representations of mothering, Clowes (2006) argues that during the course of the twentieth century, childcare and baby manual have increasingly been

targeted at women. In an analysis of a Canadian newspaper series, Wall and Arnold (2007) found that a large percentage of articles and photographs feature women participating in child-care activities such as feeding, cooking, supervising, and taking care of injuries. In light of this, through discourses of ‘natural mothering’ and ‘bonding’, women continue to be positioned as principally responsible for the care of children.

Men and women can therefore be seen to be negotiating parenting within a context in which mothers continue to be regarded as more primary for children’s development. In light of this, it has been argued that there is often little space left for men in terms of taking up child-care roles (Lupton & Barclay, 1997; Miller, 2011). As a result of this, “men may feel excluded (or indeed be excluded) from a domain that has been intimately associated with women and their ‘natural’ capacities to care... in this domain men may feel that they lack the ‘natural’ skills or competencies to participate competently or ‘appropriately’” (Miller, 2011, p. 42). Despite evidence which suggests that it is primarily mothers who are responsible for the day-to-day care of children, there is also increasing evidence which suggests that men are taking on more care-based roles in the lives of their children.

2.2.4 Involved fathering

Lamb (1986) argues that from the mid-1970s onwards, nurturing and caregiving came to be considered central components of ‘good’ fatherhood. This can be seen to represent a shift towards regarding fathers as “psychologically able to participate actively in a range of child care activities” (Lupton & Barclay, 1997, p. 44). Prior to this, fathers were generally regarded as lacking the intuitive and instinctive ability to nurture and care for children, which has traditionally been associated with women. The new ‘involved’ father was seen as needing to be emotionally engaged, present in the home and involved in the lives of his children, as well as in household tasks (Dudová, 2006; Henwood & Procter, 2003). In many ways, therefore, this model of fathering can be seen to mirror traditional notions of mothering. The shift to more caring notions of fatherhood have occurred alongside a shift in conceptualisations of masculinity. During the 1980s there was the emergence of the ‘new’ man. Dermott (2008) notes that the ‘new’ man “was in touch with his feminine side... not only accepting the principle of equality, exemplified... by a willingness to take on [women’s] work but also an openness towards recognising and expressing emotion defined as typically feminine” (p. 65). In light of this, emotions and emotionality became more acceptable components of masculinity.

Central to the discourse of involved fathering is an emphasis on fathers engaging emotionally with, as well as caring for their children (Miller, 2011). In research with middle-class fathers in both Sweden and England, men described wanting to foster ‘close’ relationships with their children (Dermott, 2008; Plantin et al., 2003). These relationships were characterised by emotional openness, intimacy, and tenderness. Similarly, in low-income communities in the United States, both men and women positioned fathers as needing to be present and available (emotionally and physically) to children (Summers et al., 1999). In an analysis of a Canadian newspaper series, Wall and Arnold (2007) also found evidence of the involved father discourse. From the 1980s onwards fathers, rather than being presented as distant breadwinners as they were from the 1950s until the 1970s, were represented in a variety of media as “more emotionally involved, more nurturing and more committed to spending time with [their] children” (Wall & Arnold, 2007, p. 510).

A key theme which has been highlighted in the involved fathering literature is the notion of ‘being there’. Daly (1996) notes that spending time with children has become an essential component of ‘good’ fathering. However, it has been argued that men and women continue to spend time with children in different ways. While men are more likely to engage in fun activities and outings with their children, women are more likely to be responsible for the everyday care of children (Hochschild, 1998). This is supported by research which has been conducted with fathers. Middle-class fathers in England and Australia both constructed shared activities with their children as being important for developing close and loving relationships (Dermott, 2008; Lupton & Barclay, 1997). Low-income fathers in the United States also reported that they engaged in enjoyable activities with their children, however when it came to more routine child-care responsibilities men tended to claim that they were incompetent (Summers et al., 1999). While fathers in Australia spoke about ‘being there’ for their children; this did not seem to include engaging in caring activities such as putting the child to sleep, bathing the child or changing the child’s nappies (Lupton & Barclay, 1997). Therefore, while there is evidence to suggest that fathers may be embracing an involved fathering discourse, by engaging and spending more time with their children, this engagement appears to be limited to ‘fun’ activities. Even in contexts where men do engage more fully in care work (for example stay-at-home fathers) there is evidence to suggest that they actively seek to distinguish their caring as masculine and different from that of mothers (Doucet, 2004). Similarly research suggests that men have failed to take on a more equal share of household chores, despite the fact that many women now share in the task of providing for the family. In Australia, none of

the middle-class fathers interviewed described participating in domestic tasks such as cooking and shopping (Lupton & Barclay, 1997). Similarly, in Mexican American households, many husbands 'helped out' when they were assigned tasks by their wives but they tended to regard these tasks as their wife's chores (Coltrane, 1998).

The failure of men to embrace everyday childcare and household chores can perhaps be understood in relation to the continued power of hegemonic notions of masculinity. Wall and Arnold (2007) argue that to a large extent, caring for and nurturing (particularly young) children continues to clash with constructions of hegemonic masculinity. It has been argued that in order to conform to these constructions of masculinity men must "guard against imputations of being soft or feminine and thus tend to avoid domestic tasks and family activities that are considered 'women's work'" (Coltrane, 1998, p. 520). In a study conducted with men in Botswana, it was regarded as 'unnatural' for men to participate in housework, therefore, men were discouraged from participating in childcare and other household chores by other men (Datta, 2007). Brandth and Kvande (1998) argue that "there are no gains for masculinity in doing housework" (p. 307). In Ghana, adolescent boys identified cooking and cleaning as feminine work and through not engaging in these types of activities they signified their masculinity (Adomako Ampofo & Boateng, 2007). While to a large extent childcare and housework continues to be regarded as 'unmasculine', there is also evidence to suggest that in some contexts masculinity is being reconstructed to include more caring and nurturing elements. In Norway, for example, men's ability to take care of their children was regarded with admiration by their friends and colleagues (Brandth & Kvande, 1998). Similarly, in Sweden men were able to integrate aspects of involved fathering into their male self-image (Plantin et al., 2003). In light of this, it appears that the discourse of involved fatherhood is beginning to unsettle and challenge hegemonic constructions of masculinity in certain contexts (Finn & Henwood, 2009).

It has been argued that the discourse of involved fathering tends to be associated with white, middle-class men (Finn & Henwood, 2009; Henwood & Procter, 2003). Morrell (2006) notes that in contexts in which there is material security as a result of reliable and adequate income, fathers are likely to be expected to engage in more emotional and caring ways with their children. However, there is also research which suggests that the involved fathering discourse may also have salience in less materially secure circumstances. In a study conducted with low-income fathers in urban neighbourhoods in the United States, it was found that fathers regarded the ability to provide emotional support to their children as particularly important (Glikman,

2004). Therefore, in contexts in which men cannot fulfil traditional expectations regarding fathering, the involved fathering discourse may represent a particularly important resource.

The increasing power of the involved fathering discourse has a number of important implications. Firstly, LaRossa (1988) argues that this discourse not only encourages and facilitates greater involvement of fathers in their children's lives, but it also facilitates a greater awareness and sensitivity towards mothers' experiences. Therefore, men may come to appreciate the vital importance of caring work (Doucet, 2004). This is likely to promote a more equitable environment in which men relieve women of the full burden of caring for children. Secondly, the discourse of involved fathering can be seen to promote alternative constructions of masculinity. Dermott (2008) notes that "fatherhood has the potential to encourage positive masculinity which moves away from reasserting... male dominance" (p. 66). In light of this it is important to investigate the extent to which the discourse of involved fathering is being taken up.

From the evidence presented above it is clear that a variety of conceptions of father's roles coexist (Lamb, 1986). While, to some extent there appear to be shifts towards more equitable parenting, with men taking up the discourse of involved fathering, more traditional fathering roles of protecting and providing continue to hold sway. This can be understood within a context in which deeply embedded gendered discourses continue to shape understandings of fathering (Dermott, 2008).

In sum, research which has been conducted internationally has demonstrated that specific discourses continue to shape father's obligations, roles and responsibilities. These include discourses of protecting, providing and nurturing. This research has also documented how, to a large extent, fatherhood continues to be constructed in opposition to motherhood. However, there is evidence of shifts occurring in constructions of fatherhood and masculinity with men increasingly taking on more caring and 'feminine' roles. The research on fathering in the context of South Africa can be seen to be more limited than that which has been conducted internationally. However, there is increasing recognition that this research is not only important for promoting positive father involvement within the context of the family, but it can also enrich understandings of how masculinity is constructed. These understandings are undoubtedly important in a context in which problematic constructions of masculinity continue to be related to a range of social problems, perhaps most importantly gender-based violence.

The following section will review the research which has been conducted on fathering within the South African context.

2.3 The South African context of fathering

As previously discussed, discourses of fathering are shaped by and through social and cultural processes. In light of this, it is important to examine the context in which fathering occurs. In South Africa there are a number of factors which have not only shaped the way in which fathering has come to be viewed in society, but also constrained some groups of men from being able to fulfil these roles. Ratele and colleagues (2012) argues that “men’s historical and contemporary positions as care-givers have to be understood in the context of South Africa’s history of violent gender and racial oppression and domination” (p. 555). Poverty, unemployment and HIV have all been identified as key factors which undermine men’s abilities to fulfil accepted social roles of fatherhood, as well as manhood.

2.3.1 Traditional fathering roles

Within African culture, traditionally, the father has been regarded as the head of the household. This is reflected in the isiZulu phrase ‘Ubaba walayikhaya’ (the father of the house) (Hunter, 2006). Intertwined with a father’s role as head of the household was the responsibility to lead and protect his family. The father was also a community leader and an important social figure (Lesejane, 2006; Mkhize, 2006). The father was regarded as a particularly important influence for male children and had a key role to play in important cultural rituals (including the initiation into manhood) (Ramphela & Richter, 2006). Therefore, the father acted as a role model (particularly for his sons), was responsible for the moral guidance of the family, and was expected to command respect in the wider community.

Recent research which has been conducted in South Africa suggests that the cultural role of the father as authority figure and moral guide persists. In a study conducted with young ‘black’ and ‘coloured’ fathers in Cape Town and Durban, it was found that they identified the father’s role as being one of advising and guiding children (Swartz & Bhana, 2009). These young men also spoke about a father needing to be respectable and not to engage in behaviours such as excessive drinking, swearing or violence. Similarly, young fathers from low-income communities in Cape Town positioned fathers as protectors, guides and role models in the lives of their children (Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2013). Fathers who worked on the mines in Johannesburg argued that fathers need to set an example and guide children (particularly boys)

towards acceptable behaviour (Rabe, 2006). ‘Black’ adolescent boys in a township in Johannesburg constructed the father’s role as that of disciplinarian and role-model (Langa, 2010a). A study conducted with employees of a government department found that both men and women positioned the father as an authority in the family, who was responsible for the construction of rules and regulations (Maqubela, 2013). Similarly, male youth in rural KwaZulu-Natal reported that the father was the head of the household (Sathiparsad, Taylor, & Dlamini, 2008). ‘Coloured’ and ‘black’ men in Cape Town discussed fathers as needing to fulfil disciplinarian roles and rationalised the use of violence as “necessary and meaningful [and] in the best interests of children whose actions had overstepped the boundaries of acceptable behaviour” (Clowes, Ratele, & Shefer, 2013, p. 262).

Although fathers continue to be positioned as authority figures, moral guides and role models for their children, it is recognised that systems of colonialism and apartheid have severely affected the ability of men to maintain these roles. As a result of land seizure, government taxes, as well as the demand for labour on the gold and diamond mines, many men were forced to work for long periods away from their families (Mkhize, 2006). The participation of many African men in the migrant labour system altered the role they were able to play in their families. “[M]igrant labour meant that whatever intimacy and emotional support fathers had provided became increasingly impossible. “When a man could only return at Christmas, the social role of fatherhood became increasingly attached to a man’s position as ‘provider’ ” (Hunter, 2006, p. 102). The migrant labour system also prevented many fathers from playing an active role in socializing their children and being role models for them (Smit, 2001).

Research suggests that within the South Africa context the discourse of ‘father as provider’ is prevalent. Clowes (2006) argues that from the late 1950s onwards, men were increasingly depicted in relation to the office, rather than the home. This served to create a strong connection between male identity and financial commitments. It has also been found that men from low-income communities constructed providing financially for the family as a central component of successful masculinity (Clowes et al., 2013). In KwaZulu-Natal men were positioned (by both men and women) as needing to be responsible for providing financially for their children and families (Makusha et al., 2013; Montgomery et al., 2006). Within a working-class ‘coloured’ community in Cape Town, it was also found that the father was regarded as the breadwinner, even in contexts in which the wife had paid employment (Field, 1991). Among miners in Johannesburg, fathers who failed to provide for their families were regarded

negatively (Rabe, 2006). Similarly, young 'black' and 'coloured' fathers reported not feeling like real fathers if they were not working to provide for the children (Swartz & Bhana, 2009).

Despite the existence of strong cultural expectations that fathers should provide for their families, poverty and high rates of unemployment can diminish the capacity of many men to provide financially, and thus to be seen as 'good' fathers (Morrell, 2006). Both poverty and unemployment continue to affect population groups previously marginalised by apartheid (Mkhize, 2006). In 1995, 61 per cent of 'black' and 38 per cent of 'coloured' households were classified as poor, compared to one per cent of white household (Wilson, 2004). In 2003, of the 25 per cent of people who were unemployed in South Africa, nearly 50 per cent were 'black', nearly 30 per cent were 'coloured', while only 8 per cent were 'white' (Kingdon & Knight, 2007). It has been argued that in low-income communities in particular, men's financial provision is regarded as essential, as men are likely to be the primary (and often sole) source of income in the family (Morrell, 2006). In light of this, it is not surprising that men in South Africa feel enormous pressure, yet find it increasingly difficult, to provide for their families, particularly in low-income communities (Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2013). Within this context it has been argued that "[d]esertion by fathers is often prompted by their inability to bear the burden of being primary providers. The burden of failure becomes intolerable for those who lack the capacity to generate enough income as uneducated and unskilled labourers" (Ramphela, 2002, p. 158). In light of the fact that many men are unable to provide for their families financially, due to poverty and unemployment, there is a growing perception that men are not fulfilling their fathering responsibilities or are absent from the lives of their children (Ratele et al., 2012). However, there is also evidence to suggest that in situations in which biological fathers are absent, the roles they are expected to play are taken up by other family and community members, a phenomenon known as social fathering.

2.3.2 Social fathering

In comparison to Western definitions of fatherhood, African cultural understandings are far more fluid. For example, in the Zulu culture a child's uncle is referred to as 'ubaba omkhulu' (bigger/elder uncle) or 'ubaba omncane' (smaller/younger father) (Hunter, 2006). Within this context "child-rearing is the collective responsibility of the extended family as a whole" (Mkhize, 2006, p.187). Therefore, fatherhood is not limited to the biological process, but is defined in terms of the social role that a man plays in raising a child (Langa, 2010a). In light of this uncles, brothers, grandfathers, as well as other men in the community may be regarded

as fathers to children. It has also been argued that within the context of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, “designations of ‘parent’ and ‘child’ are increasingly a social process rather than a biological fact... [with parental] rights and responsibilities [resting] with multiple individuals” (Montgomery et al., 2006, p. 2416). However, the contributions of non-biological fathers are often overlooked, due to the persistence of rigid understandings of fathering, as well as methodological shortcomings which do not take into account social fathering relationships (Datta, 2007; Dermott, 2008). Despite these factors, there is increasing research which point to the important role that social fathers play in the lives of children within the context of South Africa. For example, grandfathers, uncles, neighbours and school principals have been identified by men as having acted as father-figures in their lives (Ratele et al., 2012). Similarly, both brothers and mothers have been identified by low-income adolescent boys as key role-models in the absence of their biological fathers (Langa, 2010a). In light of this evidence, there is a need to more fully investigate the importance of social fathering for children. This can be seen to be particularly important within a context where large numbers of fathers may be unable to fulfil fathering roles in the lives of their children due to the legacy of apartheid as well as the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Research which has been conducted on social fathering represents an expanding conceptualisation of fathers and fathering. In a similar vein, there is also an increasing body of research which suggests that traditional understandings of fathering (and mothering) are undergoing shifts within the South African context.

2.3.3 Shifts in traditional constructions of fathering

South African research which has been conducted in the context of the family suggests that both men and women are increasingly drawing on a discourse of ‘involved fathering’ to construct father’s roles and responsibilities. For example, women working in a government department identified a ‘good’ father as someone who spends time with his family, as well as engaging in loving and caring behaviours (Maqubela, 2013). Similarly, ‘black’ and ‘coloured’ men from low-income communities identified ‘being there’, nurturing and talking to children as key aspects of fathering (Ratele et al., 2012). In a quantitative study conducted with English and Afrikaans speaking men in Gauteng, it was found that 87% of the participants agreed that it was fair to expect a father to participate actively in his child’s life (Smit, 2008). Low-income young men were also found to be “invested in being good, caring and loving teenage fathers despite their inability to meet the material needs of their children” (Langa & Smith, 2012, p. 257).

There is also evidence to suggest that shifts are occurring in conceptualisations of mothering. For example, rather than being regarded as predominantly responsible for the day-to-day care of children (as discussed above), mothers are being positioned as providers, as well as role-models and moral guides. In KwaZulu-Natal, when fathers were absent it was found that mothers took on the responsibility for providing children with moral guidance, regardless of the child's gender (Makusha et al., 2013). Similarly, in a working-class 'coloured' community in Cape Town, mothers are regarded as responsible for disciplining and providing children with guidance (Field, 1991). Mothers have also been identified as financial providers by adolescent boys in KwaZulu-Natal (Sathiparsad et al., 2008). In light of this evidence, it appears that more egalitarian discourses of parenting are being taken up by both men and women within the South African context. This can have important implications for broader gender equality. Datta (2007) notes that the reshaping of fatherhood is critical to the achievement of gender equality. "The renegotiation of gender roles, relations and responsibilities in the reproductive sphere relies upon changing masculinities and the meaningful integration of men as husbands/ partners and fathers into the household and family" (Datta, 2007, p. 97).

However, although there is evidence of change occurring in the way parental roles are understood, there is also evidence that traditional understandings of fathers (and mothers) roles continue to shape fathers obligations, roles and responsibilities. This can be seen in the continued power of discourses of providing and protecting. Therefore, it has been argued that "within the changing context of South African society, the discourses around fatherhood contest each other" (Prinsloo, 2006, p. 143). In light of this, it is important to investigate the contexts and ways in which more egalitarian constructions of fathering may be beginning to contest traditional constructions, and therefore, more equal spaces are being opened up for men and women as parents.

As demonstrated in the preceding review, in the past two decades, there has been increasing research (both internationally and in the context of South Africa) investigating the ways in which fathers roles are constructed. This research has been conducted predominantly through engaging with fathers (or men who are soon to become fathers) and in some cases with mothers. However, there is a lack of research which has investigated fathering from the perspectives of children.

2.4 Children's perspectives on fathering

The majority of research on fathering which has been conducted using information gathered from children has been in the form of quantitative studies which have sought to investigate the associations between father involvement and positive child outcomes. Nixon and colleagues (2012) note that in these studies “the measures of quality in the relationship are predetermined by the researcher” (p. 382). In contrast, studies which employ qualitative approaches can be seen to provide children with the opportunity to formulate their own narrative about their fathering relationships and are likely to shed light on the way in which children construct fathering roles and responsibilities. It has been argued that in order to develop understandings of fathering and fatherhood it is important to investigate the perspectives of those who are intimately involved in these relationships (Makusha et al., 2013). As fathering is a co-constructed, socially engaged activity in which children play an active role, it is important to investigate their perspectives (Nixon et al., 2012).

The limited number of qualitative studies which have been conducted with children suggest that children draw on, as well as contest, traditional constructions of fathering. For example, in a study conducted with 11 – 13 year old girls from low-income communities in the United States, it was found that the girls constructed their relationships with their fathers as being constituted primarily through shared activities rather than through intimate emotional engagement (Way & Gillman, 2000). These girls spoke about the fact that they could not share their intimate concerns with their fathers due to the fact that “he’s a man and... I’m a girl” (Way & Gillman, 2000, p. 320). In contrast to this, a study conducted with 15 – 19 year old girls from working class families in the United States found that girls spoke about feeling very close to their fathers and constructed their relationships as open, warm and engaged (Way & Stauber, 1996).

In South Africa, children in rural KwaZulu-Natal, defined their mothers as primary caregivers and their fathers as providers (Makusha et al., 2013). Adolescent boys from a disadvantaged township school in Durban constructed fatherhood as being associated with responsibility and respect (Morrell, 2007). Similarly, low-income adolescent boys in a township in Johannesburg constructed their fathers as important role models for masculinity and as disciplinarians (Langa, 2010a). However, these boys also drew on a discourse of involved fathering and described fathers as loving and caring. In a study conducted with 10 – 12 year olds at four schools in KwaZulu-Natal, children also drew on more egalitarian discourses of fathering. Time spent

together, affection, caring, interest in children, and involvement in housework and childcare duties were identified by children as characteristics of ‘good’ fathers (Richter & Smith, 2006). In light of this research, it appears that young people are actively contesting traditional constructions of fathering, which position men and women as inherently different from one another. There is a need to more fully investigate the ways in which young people construct the roles and responsibilities associated with fathering, as this will not only advance understandings of fathering within the South African context but may also help to identify ways in which work around gender transformation can be facilitated.

The majority of research which has been conducted with young people in South Africa has investigated the perspectives of ‘black’ children living in low-income communities. However, there is a significant lack of research which investigates the perspectives of other groups of South African children who may live in different social, cultural and economic circumstances, for example ‘coloured’ children living in communities characterised by unemployment, poverty and violence. Given that fathering is a socially constructed role which is shaped by cultural and social factors, it is important to investigate the ways in which this group of young people construct fathering roles and responsibilities. The investigation of the perceptions and experiences of these youth will not only allow for a better understanding of how fathering in these types of communities is understood by young people, but also shed light on how fathering may benefit youth in these communities.

2.5 Summary

In summary, both quantitative and qualitative research suggests that fathers contribute in particular ways to their children’s lives. Quantitative research has suggested that fathers contribute in emotional, cognitive, financial and social ways to their children’s development, while qualitative research has suggested that fathers act as providers, protectors and (more recently) nurturers in the lives of their children. Within the South African context certain historical, cultural and social factors have shaped the way fathers roles and responsibilities are conceptualised. Evidence suggests that traditional expectations (including that fathers will protect and provide for their families) continue to exist alongside more modern ones (that fathers will nurture and care for their children). While there has been a significant amount of research conducted on the ways in which fathering is constructed from the perspectives of men, both internationally and in the South African context, there has been limited attention paid to the ways in which children construct the roles and responsibilities of fathers. This represents

an important area of investigation for advancing more comprehensive understandings of fathering within the South African context.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the research aims and the methodology employed in this research project will be outlined. Firstly, the aims and research questions which guided the study will be presented. Secondly, the study will be situated within a feminist poststructuralist framework. Then a brief overview of qualitative methodologies and case study research will be provided. This will be followed by a discussion of Photovoice methodology. Thereafter, an overview of the data collection and analysis methods, research setting, participants and procedure will be presented. Finally, the ethical considerations pertaining to the study will be discussed.

3.1 Aims and Research Questions

This study aimed to explore the discourses that adolescents living in an urban, low-income community of Cape Town draw on when discussing fathering in their community, and to consider the implications of these discourses. The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How are the roles of fathers constructed in adolescents' discussions of fathering in their community?
2. How are the responsibilities of fathers constructed in adolescents' discussions of fathering in their community?
3. What are the implications of these constructions with regard to power relations and subjectivity?

3.2 Research design

In light of the aims of this study, feminist post-structuralism can be seen to be an appropriate theoretical framework. This framework, which was articulated by Weedon (1987), utilises poststructuralist theories of language, social processes, institutions and subjectivity in order to achieve feminist research aims. Feminist research is "concerned with interrogating and understanding the political, economic and social inequalities between women and men" (Hare-Mustin, 2004, p. 16) with an aim to challenge these existing power relations and identify strategies for change (Weedon, 1987). From a feminist standpoint, women' (and as is argued in this study, men's) identities and experiences are intimately intertwined with their relative positionings within a particular society. In light of this, it is of vital importance to examine the conditions which govern these identities and experiences (Sawicki, 1991). Alternatively, post-structuralism can be broadly defined as a range of theories which share common assumptions

regarding language, knowledge and subjectivity (Weedon, 1987). Therefore, “what feminist post-structuralism offers us is a theoretical basis for analysing the subjectivities of women and men, in relation to language, other cultural practices, and the material conditions of our lives” (Gavey, 1997, p. 61).

Language can be seen to be of central importance within a feminist post-structuralist paradigm. It is through language that people are seen to generate ‘truth’ (Davis & Gergen, 1997). It is argued that words do not merely ‘map’ or ‘copy’ the world, but that they create how the world is perceived. In light of this, language can be seen to “constitut[e] social reality for us” (Weedon, 1987, p. 22). Language provides ways of thinking, speaking and giving meaning to the world (Burr, 2003). Therefore, all meaning and knowledge are seen to be “discursively constituted through language and other signifying practices” (Gavey, 1997, p. 53). Knowledge and meaning are thus understood to be socially constructed and therefore, transient and innately unstable. In light of this, particular understandings of the world can be seen to be made available through certain discourses (Gavey, 1997).

Discourse refers to an interconnected “system of statements which cohere around common meanings and values... [that] are a product of social factors, of powers and practices, rather than an individual’s set of ideas” (Hollway, 1983, p.231). According to Foucault (1972) discourses “form the objects of which they speak” (p. 49). They operate to structure society in a certain way and are reproduced in social institutions, modes of thinking and individual subjectivities (Gavey, 1997). Therefore, discourses govern the way in which a certain topic can be talked about and experienced (Hall, 2001). Gavey (1997) argues that discourses are culturally, politically and historically constituted. However, not all discourses carry the same authority and power. Dominant or hegemonic discourse (for example discourses which position men as financial providers and women as nurturers and care-givers) “appear ‘natural’, denying their own partiality and gaining authority by appealing to common senses” (Gavey, 1997, p. 54). Therefore, these discourses can be seen to perpetuate existing power relations. However, while some discourses are more powerful than others, it has also been argued that discourses are ambiguous and plurivocal, and are sites of “conflict and contestation” (Sawicki, 1991, p. 1). Therefore, there is the potential for hegemonic discourses and the social conditions which they construct to be challenged.

Within a feminist post-structuralist framework, discourses are also seen to constitute and construct subjectivity. Subjectivity refers to “the conscious and unconscious thoughts and

emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her way of understanding her relation to the world” (Weedon, 1987, p. 32). Therefore, discourses offer a framework against which people can make sense of their own behaviour and experiences, as well as that of others (Burr, 2003). Subjectivity can be seen to “change with shifts in the wide range of discursive fields which constitute them” (Weedon, 1987, p. 33), and therefore, is regarded as malleable and fluid. In light of this, subjectivity is a site of conflict and disunity, which can be seen to be central to both preserving the status quo, as well as the process of political change (Weedon, 1987).

Discourses of fathering, which prescribe ways of being a father in a particular context, can be seen to shape not only how fathers are viewed in a particular context, but also men’s individual subjectivities. These discourses are also closely associated with hegemonic discourses which construct appropriate masculinity in particular ways. Hegemonic discourses of masculinity can be seen to be intimately intertwined with patriarchal social structures in society, which position men as powerful and women as inferior. There is, therefore, a need to investigate the ways in which discourses of fathering (and masculinity) make certain roles and responsibilities available to fathers, as well as how these constructions may reinforce (or challenge) inequality between men and women. In light of this, feminist post-structuralism is an appropriate framework from which to explore fathering, as it allows for an examination of the relationships between discourse, power, and subjectivity (and in particular gendered subjectivity).

As this research project aimed to examine the discourses which participants draw on in their discussions of fathering in their community, as well as the implications of these discourses with regard to power and subjectivity, a qualitative research design was appropriate.

Willig (2008) notes that “qualitative research is concerned with meaning in context” (p. 149). Qualitative research methods can be seen to have been developed in response to criticisms of traditional psychological research methods (Boonzaier & Shefer, 2006). It has been argued that traditionally psychological research has been dominated by quantitative methods which are situated within a positivist, empiricist paradigm (Boonzaier & Shefer, 2006). This research approach, which is concerned with the use of ‘scientific’, ‘rational’ and ‘objective’ methods, has “purported to lead to knowledge which reflects the ‘truth’ of human behaviour” (Boonzaier & Shefer, 2006, p. 3). Therefore, the findings from research conducted with predominantly middle-class, white, heterosexual males have been generalised to a variety of other population groups. In light of this, the experiences of these groups (particularly those of women and others

on the margins of society) have been marginalised (Boonzaier & Shefer, 2006). It has also been argued that positivist research endorses individualism, as it studies behaviour bereft of the social, cultural, political and historical context in which it occurs (Boonzaier & Shefer, 2006). As a result, this research can be seen to minimise the impact of the social context and, therefore, obscure the existence of oppressive systems (Wilkinson, 1996).

In light of these criticisms, qualitative research has sought to acknowledge that meaning and behaviour can be seen to occur within particular, social, cultural and historical contexts (Boonzaier & Shefer, 2006). Babbie and Mouton (2002) note that it is only through examining events within the contexts in which they occur, as well as the ways in which these contexts confers meaning onto these events, that an understanding of these events can be gained.

This research study has a case study design, as it investigated the ways in which a particular group of young people, within a particular social and cultural context, constructed the roles and responsibilities of fathers. Within this specific setting, the study included multiple cases (each participant's account can be regarded as a single case), in an attempt to explore the differences and similarities both within and between cases (Yin, 2014).

Willig (2008) notes that the aim of a case study is to understand the particularity of a specific case. In order to do this it is necessary to consider the case within its context (Willig, 2008). Through detailed, contextual investigation a case study design can be seen to facilitate “the deconstruction and subsequent reconstruction of various phenomena” (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 556). It has been argued that a case study may be a particularly useful research design in a context where “the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident” (Yin, 2014, p. 16). As can be seen from the research discussed in the literature review, particular constructions of fathering are intimately linked to the social and cultural factors which operate in the society in which these constructions occur. In my analysis I have attempted to pay attention to the ways in which the particular social context in which the study is situated may have shaped participants constructions of fathering.

3.3 Participants

The research project was conducted in a low-income, violence-prone community in Cape Town. This community is situated on the Cape Flats, on the outskirts of Cape Town. This area came into existence under the Population Registration Act with people who were classified as ‘coloured’ being forcibly removed from other parts of Cape Town (including District Six). The

community continues to reflect this profile as 98.75% of the current population are ‘coloured’ (Statistics South Africa, 2003). Almost half (44%) of the population live in council flats which are more commonly referred to as ‘courts’. This community is also characterised by high levels of unemployment, school dropout and teenage pregnancy, with 38% of the population being unemployed and only 13% having completed Grade 12 (Statistics South Africa, 2003). This community is also characterised by high levels of crime and violence, including gang violence, as well as drug and alcohol abuse.

Participants for the study were nine females and five males between the ages of 16 and 18, who are part of a community-based youth leadership programme. All of the participants were ‘coloured’, Afrikaans-speaking (although proficient in English), and came from low-income households. They were currently completing their matric or Grade 11 year at one of the three high schools in the community. Participants were recruited for participation in the study by the youth programme coordinator. Participants were chosen based on them expressing an interest in participating in the study. This particular group of participants were selected because they are fast approaching adulthood (and potentially parenthood). During the course of the study a number of participants made reference to the fact that they would one day become parents. One participant in particular remarked: “I am not exempt from becoming a father”. In light of this, it can be argued that it is particularly important to investigate how these adolescents understand fathering, as these understandings are likely to inform the fathering (and mothering) roles they take up. It was felt that by engaging with these young people a greater understanding of the ways in which fathering practices are reproduced, as well as how these practices are shifting may be gained.

Although this group of participants, in many ways are perhaps atypical of adolescents in this community (they are in their final years of schooling and belong to an organisation that is actively involved in uplifting the community) they were selected as it was felt that they would be able to engage in the group aspects of the study (see Procedure), as they are familiar with each other. It was also felt that this group would easily be able to access support (within the same organisation) if they found the research process distressing in any way (see Ethical considerations).

3.4 Data collection

This study made use of Photovoice methodology. Photovoice is “a process by which people can identify, represent and enhance their community through a specific photographic

technique” (Wang & Burris, 1997, p. 369). It places cameras in the hands of marginalised groups, who have little access to those who are responsible for making decisions about their lives, in order to allow them to document their life conditions as they view them (Wang & Burris, 1994). Following the taking of photographs, participants asked to discuss their photographs, in either groups or individual interviews. Therefore, Photovoice is a participant-driven methodology as it enables participants to identify their own concerns and priorities. The Photovoice process seeks to empower participants to define how the project unfolds, therefore seeking to avoid dependency and powerlessness (Wang & Burris, 1997).

Photovoice can be seen to have three main goals:

- 1) To enable people to record and reflect their community concerns
- 2) To promote critical dialogue and knowledge about important community issues through large and small group discussions of photographs
- 3) To reach policy makers (Wang & Burris, 1997, p. 370).

Photovoice can be regarded as a feminist method as it assumes that women (and other marginalised groups) are active agents in the world and authorities on their own lives (Wang & Burris, 1997). It recognises that those who are often excluded from policy and decision-making have insight and expertise into their communities and worlds that researchers, professionals and other outsiders lack (Wang & Burris, 1997). In light of this, Photovoice “expands the representation and diversity of participant voices that assist to define and improve the realities experienced by community members, who many times are not heard” (Hergenrather, Rhodes, Cowan, Bardhoshi & Pula, 2009, p. 694).

Photovoice is a particularly useful method when working with marginalised groups as it enables participants to represent not only their community’s challenges, but its assets as well. Wang and Burris (1997) argue that household surveys and other conventional methods that seek to identify community needs, through focussing only on the identification of problems facing communities, may inadvertently “reinforce a sense of impotence, inferiority and resentment” (p. 373). Through the taking of photographs, participants are also given control over how their lives and represented (Brunsden & Goatcher, 2007). A focus on assets and allowing participants to control how their community is represented can be seen to be particularly important in light of widespread perceptions that fathering (particularly in low-income communities such as the one in which the study was situated) is in ‘crisis’. Through allowing participants to photograph both positive and negative aspects of fathering and

therefore to choose how they wish to represent this issue, potential space is created to explore positive examples of fathering and to disrupt pejorative constructions.

It has been argued that the use of photographs taken by participants allows researchers to gain a more in-depth perspective of participant's worlds and experiences. Bergen (1972) notes that "every image embodies a way of seeing... the photographer's way of seeing is reflected in his choice of subject" (p. 10). Therefore, the photographs allow the researcher to gain "the possibility of perceiving the world from the viewpoint of those that lead lives that are different from those traditionally in control of the means for imagining the world" (Ruby, 1991, p.50). It has also been noted that the use of photography may facilitate more effective documentation of participants experiences and feelings than words alone, offering them an opportunity to think about their lives and communities in ways they may not previously have considered, and making available a creative space in which their experiences can be articulated (Brunsden & Goatcher, 2007). This can be seen to be particularly important when working with children and young people, as their developing linguistic and cognitive capacities may limit their ability to express themselves verbally. Photographs may allow participants to express themselves beyond the limits of traditional forms of data collection (for example closed ended questionnaire items, or interviews that rely solely on verbal articulation skills).

Photovoice has been identified as a particularly useful methodology for working with young people. It has been used internationally and in South Africa to conduct research with a variety of communities, including adolescents who are disadvantaged or at risk (Kessi, 2011; Langa, 2010b; Moletsane et al., 2007; Wilson et al., 2007). Wang (2006) argues that Photovoice methodology allows youth to express their concerns through drawing on their own language and experiences. Traditionally children have not been encouraged to express their perspectives and ideas (Matthews & Tucker, 2000). Through positioning young people as experts, and allowing them to photograph and discuss their communities, their ingenuity and perspectives are affirmed (Wang & Burris, 1997). Through allowing young people to photograph their communities, it is participants, rather than the researcher that decide what is meaningful and important. "Participants' images will be statements, assembled, invested and purposive; framed in their own terms, and in their own lived experiences" (Brunsden & Goatcher, 2007, p.45). Therefore, the researcher is able to gain insight into the ways in which young people construct notions of fathering.

While Photovoice can be regarded as a participatory research method, the participatory aspects of this particular study can be seen to be limited. Although photographs were taken and selected by participants, the specific focus on fathering was predetermined, and participants were not involved in the analysis and writing up of the findings, although participant checking was done prior to the write up of the findings. The implications of this are discussed in the limitations section in the final chapter.

After participants had taken photographs representing ‘fathering’, data were collected in the form of individual interviews, using a photo-elicitation interview (PEI) technique. The PEI “[uses] photographs to invoke comments, memory, and discussions in the course of a semi-structured interview” (Banks, 2001, p. 87). Participants were interviewed about photographs which they had taken and selected (see Procedure). Using photographs in the context of the interview has a number of benefits. Because participants have taken and then selected the photographs themselves, the traditional power dynamic within the context of the interview, where the researcher occupies a position of power and authority, is disrupted. When photographs are taken and then selected by participants, participants are in control of what is discussed within the context of the interview (Noland, 2006). “Through their choice of, and relation to, their own photographs, [participants] can set the agenda for the interaction and can lead, direct and terminate the discussion” (Brunsdon & Goatcher, 2007, p. 45). Participants are, therefore, positioned as expert guides who lead the researcher through the content of their photographs (Collier & Collier, 1986).

It has been argued that traditional interview formats may be particularly problematic for young people (Clark-Ibanez, 2004). Within the context of a verbal interview, the verbally mature adult (the researcher) can be seen to have a communicative advantage, and therefore the adult’s authority is accentuated (Clark, 1999). Clark (1999) argues that this “can limit the research value of interviews, as most children are more willing to open up about their own worlds if adult superiority is set aside rather than accentuated” (p. 40). Therefore, the PEI, in which participants are positioned as experts on their own photographs, and through their selection of certain photographs are able to direct the discussion, can be seen as a particularly useful method when interviewing young people. It has also been noted that adolescents may struggle with self-esteem issues, and therefore the interview process may be particularly awkward and uncomfortable for them (Clark-Ibanez, 2004; Noland, 2006). The use of participants’ own photographs, which they are familiar with, may potentially lessen these feelings and encourage them to share their perceptions and experiences. Therefore, within the context of the PEI young

people are given a greater sense of control and authority, and the interview context is transformed into one of empowerment (Clark, 1999).

3.5 Data analysis

The data were analysed using a Foucauldian discourse analysis (FDA). Consistent with a feminist post-structuralist framework, FDA is concerned with language and the way in which it constitutes social and psychological life (Willig, 2008). In FDA, close attention is also paid to the ways in which discourses “function in relation to structures of power” (Gavey, 1997, p. 58). As discourses are seen to be bound up with institutional practices which organise, regulate and administer social life, attention is also paid to the ways in which discourses reinforce and legitimate existing institutional and social structures (Willig, 2008). FDA also seeks to interrogate the relationship between discourses and subjectivity (i.e. how people feel and think), as well as how this may impact on practice (what people do) (Willig, 2008). Therefore, through providing a detailed, historically, culturally and socially specific analysis, FDA aims to enable an explanation of “the working of power on behalf of specific interests and [an analysis of] the opportunities for resistance to it” (Weedon, 1987, p. 41).

The data analysis was conducted according to the six steps laid out by Willig (2008).

1. Discursive constructions: The first stage of the analysis involves the identification of the different ways in which the discursive object is constructed in the text.
2. Discourses: The second stage of the analysis aims to locate the various discursive constructions of the object within wider discourses
3. Action Orientation: The third stage of the analysis involves a closer examination of the discursive contexts within which the different constructions of the object are being deployed.
4. Positionings: Having identified the various constructions of the discursive object within the text and having located them within wider discourses, we now take a closer look at the *subject positions* that they offer.
5. Practice: This stage is concerned with the relationship between discourse and practice. It requires a systematic exploration of the ways in which discursive constructions and the subject positions contained within them open up or close down opportunities for action.
6. Subjectivity: The final stage in the analysis explores the relationship between discourse and subjectivity. This stage in the analysis traces the consequences of

taking up various subject positions for participant's subjective experience. Having asked questions about what can be said and what can be done from within different discourses (Stage 5), we are now concerned with what can be felt, thought and experienced from within various subject positions (p 115 – 117).

3.6 Procedure

At the beginning of the data collection process, participants were divided into two groups (males and females). Given participants' developmental stage, it was felt that they may feel more comfortable engaging in an initial discussion about fathering and sharing their feelings and opinions in same-sex groups. I met with each group for three 90-minute sessions over a period of five weeks. I then met individually with each participant to conduct an interview. The group meetings and individual interviews took place in the room which is used for youth meetings which is situated on the property of one of the high schools in the community. This venue was chosen not only because it was convenient for participants (they were able to walk there after school) but also because it was familiar to participants. It was hoped that this would help them to feel more comfortable during the group discussions and individual interviews. Participants were interviewed individually about their photographs as it was presumed that some of the material discussed in the interviews may be sensitive and personal (for example participants' discussions of their own fathers and families). The group meetings and interviews were all audio-recorded, with participants' permission, and then transcribed.

Session one: Introduction. In the first meeting I introduced myself to participants. I then gave participants an opportunity to introduce themselves. I then explained to participants that the study aims to explore youth perspectives on fathering in their community. I explained how the data would be collected and the format of the subsequent meetings. Participants were then asked to discuss 'fathering in my community'. The discussion centred on definitions, roles and responsibilities of fathers, and examples of (positive and negative) fathering behaviours.

Session two: Photography training. In the second group meeting participants were provided with some basic photography training. I gave participants some tips about how to take photographs (including advice about layout, distance, and using the flash). Participants were then shown how to use a disposable camera. A discussion was then held about how to use images symbolically to represent ideas. Following this, participants were given safety instructions about taking their photographs (see Ethical considerations). Participants were then each given their own disposable cameras and instructed that they had two weeks in which to

take photographs of ‘fathering in my community’. Following this two week period, participants returned their cameras to the youth coordinator. I then collected the cameras and had the photographs developed.

Session three: Selection of Photographs. In this session participants were given their developed photographs. They were asked to select five photographs to discuss in their interviews. Participants were also asked to give titles to all of their photographs.

Individual interviews. I then interviewed participants individually about their selected photographs. These interviews were conducted using the photo-elicitation technique, as discussed in the data collection section, where participants were asked open-ended questions about the five photographs they had selected. These questions included:

1. Describe what is happening in the photograph.
2. Why did you choose to share this specific photograph?
3. How do you think this photograph relates to your life and the lives of people in your community?
4. What story do you think this photograph is telling?

Most interviews lasted between thirty to fifty minutes.

Debriefing. During the course of the interviews it became clear that some participants found this process quite emotional, particularly in cases when they had chosen to share details of their own relationships with their fathers. In response to this, I held an additional group session in which participants were asked to discuss how they had experienced the interviews. While some participants did mention that they found parts of the interviews upsetting, participants recounted predominantly positive experiences. Overall it seemed that they had found it helpful, enjoyable and interesting to reflect on issues surrounding fathering in their community.

Verification. A meeting was held with participants in which the research findings were presented. Participants were asked to verify these findings. Participants indicated that they agreed with the way in which the data had been analysed.

Community feedback. Following the completion of this project a feedback session will be held in collaboration with the organisation through which participants were recruited. This organisation works with youth, as well as men within this specific community. Participants, members from the men’s programme and the current youth leadership programme will be

invited to attend. During this session the research findings will be presented, alongside an exhibition of participants' photographs. The purpose of this session will be to generate ideas for the ways in which the research findings can inform the men's project, as well as work with youth in the community. This is in line with the Photovoice aim to promote critical dialogue and knowledge.

3.7 Ethical considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethics Review Committee of the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Cape Town in May 2013. Consent to conduct research at this particular organisation was also obtained. A number of basic ethical considerations can be seen to apply to the treatment of participants in both quantitative and qualitative research (Willig, 2008). Researchers are seen to be responsible for protecting participants from harm or loss, as well as preserving their dignity and psychological well-being as far as possible (Willig, 2008). The following section will discuss the ethical considerations relevant to this study.

3.7.1 Consent

Corbin and Morse (2003) argue that in order to obtain informed consent, participants must be made fully aware of what participation will entail, as well as what the risks and benefits of participation are. Because some of the participants were under the age of 18, both informed consent from the participants' parents and informed assent from the participants themselves was obtained (see attached consent and assent forms). Both participants and participants' parents were informed that participation in the study is voluntary and that participants may withdraw at any point without the risk of negative consequences. The community-based organisation through which participants were recruited indicated that the learners and parents are literate in English, therefore assent and consent forms were presented in English.

The consent and assent forms established permission for the researcher to use participants' photographs and narratives about their photographs for academic purposes, such as publication and presentations. Permission from both participants and their parents will have to be obtained if narratives and photographs are to be used for any other purposes.

3.7.2 Confidentiality

Participants' responses in both the group discussions and the individual interviews have been kept confidential as far as possible. However, complete confidentiality could not be guaranteed,

as participants may have shared information discussed in the group discussion with individuals outside the study. In the first meeting a discussion was held regarding the importance of confidentiality in order to make participants aware of this issue. In the writing up of the research project, participants have been given pseudonyms and identifying information has not been included in an attempt to ensure confidentiality.

3.7.3 Risks and benefits for participants

It has been argued that the benefits to participants of participating in research should always outweigh the risks (Corbin & Morse, 2003). Within the context of this study it has been acknowledged that taking photographs of people and activities in the community may potentially place participants at particularly high risk, due to the high prevalence of violence and crime in the area. In light of this, participants were provided with safety guidelines for taking photographs in the session where they are given their cameras. Participants were instructed to obtain verbal consent when photographing people, not to trespass on private property and not to photograph people engaging in illicit activities (for example crime and drug use), but rather to try and represent these activities more symbolically.

High levels of crime in the community may potentially also place participants at risk of being robbed of their cameras while they are taking photographs. In order to reduce this risk, participants were instructed not to go out and take pictures on their own and to ensure that a family member, friend or fellow participant accompanies them at all times. This was made clear to participants and parents in the consent forms, as well as in the second session.

Although the research focuses on fathering in the community, rather than on participants' own experiences of fathering, it was recognised that participants may find some parts of the group discussions and individual interviews distressing. In light of this, participants were provided with information about the counselling services available in their community.

Benefits of participating in this study included receiving basic photographic training, as well as an opportunity to voice their concerns and ideas regarding fathering in their community. Participants were also provided with a set of printed copies of their photographs for them to keep.

3.7.4 Issues regarding secondary participants

It has been argued that when photographic material is introduced into the research process, secondary participants are likely to enter the study (Brunsden & Goatcher, 2007). In light of this, ethical considerations need to be extended in order to include these secondary participants. Brunsden and Goatcher (2007) note that the primary concerns regarding secondary participants are privacy and anonymity. In light of this, attempts were made to protect the rights of the people photographed by participants. As has been mentioned above, participants were instructed to obtain verbal consent from people before they photograph them. If participants wish to take photographs of children, participants were instructed to obtain verbal consent from the child's parent. The faces of all people appearing in the photographs were obscured and the names of people in the photographs were not referred to in the research report.

3.8 Summary

This chapter has outlined the aims which has guided the study, as well as outlined and evaluated the research design used in this study. This research project was guided by a feminist post-structuralist framework and made use of Photovoice methodology. Data were collected using a PEI technique. Consistent with a feminist post-structuralist framework, the data were analysed using a FDA. The fundamental elements of FDA have been discussed. A description of the setting, participants, recruitment process, and data collection procedure were also provided. Finally, the ethical considerations, pertaining both to the research participants, as well as secondary participants, were presented.

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS

In their photo narratives of fathering in their community, participants constructed a number of roles as being key components of ‘good’ fathering. These included being ‘involved’ fathers who expressed love for and were intimately involved in their children’s lives, providers who met the material needs of their families, as well as protectors who provided discipline, as well as guidance for their children. Despite the construction of clear roles which participants expected fathers to fulfil, they also discussed ‘absent’ fathers who failed to fulfil these ‘good’ fathering roles. However, in light of high rates of father absence, participants also discussed the ways in which other family and community members fulfilled fathering roles in the lives of children, these men (and women) were regarded as social fathers.

4.1 ‘Natural’ mothering

All of the participants drew on essentialist gendered discourses to develop clear distinctions between the roles fulfilled by mothers and those fulfilled by fathers in the lives of children. Mothers were positioned as natural nurturers and carers, while fathers were constructed as being innately incapable of fulfilling these roles.



Soraya: A young mother (loving)

Cassidy: From my perspective a mother is very loving. She will always be the loving person but you get some mothers that are not so loving.

Fernando: Coz I think every child needs a mother... needs a mother's love coz a father can't do that...I think the father can't show the child how much they care for him as much as a mother does coz a mother gave birth to the child. So a father can't show that much love and affection to the child.

Soraya: They [mothers] must know they can't leave a father alone because a father is not someone that really knows how because there's a saying that says a mother will know when the child's doing wrong where the child didn't even speak about it yet. She knows there's something wrong with you. So a father doesn't see quick [he] just leave the child. You can't all the time just leave him.

Mothers were represented by seven of the participants (both male and female) as being the parent who provides love and care for children. In the first extract above “she will *always* be the loving person” implies that this capacity for motherly love is eternal and unwavering, thereby constructing this as a fixed and natural characteristic of the mother. In contrast to this, fathers were constructed as being innately unable to provide love and care to children in the same way that mothers can. Fernando notes that “fathers *can't show* the child how much they care for him”, thereby discursively positioning fathers as incapable of expressing love and care for their children. This differentiation between mothers’ and fathers’ capacity for love was achieved primarily through describing mothers as being intrinsically more connected with their children, as they are the ones who “gave birth to the child”. Fernando notes that it is “*because*” the mother gives birth to the child that she can care for and love the child, therefore making a direct connection between birthing and nurturing. Here Fernando can be seen to be drawing on the ‘bonding’ discourse which constructs the bond between mother and child as occurring naturally following birth (Lupton & Barclay, 1997). In light of this, the mother is privileged over the father as the primary care giver and the one who is best suited to meet the child’s emotional needs.

Similarly, Soraya notes that mothers are able to tell when something is wrong with their child without the child having to say anything. Through this, mothers are constructed as possessing an underlying, unspoken and intuitive connection with their children. This can be seen as an example of the discourse of ‘natural’ mothering, whereby mothers are constructed as possessing ‘instincts’ which allow them to recognise and appropriately respond to their children’s needs (Hays, 1996; Macleod, 2001; Miller, 2011). This construction of mothers as naturally intuitive is consistent with Perälä-Littunen’s (2007) findings in a study with men and

women in Finland, where the mother was regarded as being closer to the child than the father and the “bond between mother and her child was described as an emotional umbilical cord” (p. 347) . Similarly, middle-class mothers in South Africa positioned mothers as primary parents in the lives of their children (Jeannes & Shefer, 2004). In contrast to the mother, Soraya notes that a father is “not someone that really *knows* how”, thereby positioning fathers as lacking a natural, intrinsic connection with their children which would allow them to identify the child’s emotional needs, resulting in them “just leav[ing] the child”.

Through the construction of mothers as naturally more caring, loving and connected to their children, they are discursively positioned as being essential in the lives of their children; as Fernando notes “every child *needs* a mother”. This is consistent with findings from Johnston and Swanson’s (2006) study conducted with mothers in the United States, where the mother was constructed as being irreplaceable in terms of the child’s developmental needs. The idea of the mother as essential in the life of the child is further reinforced through the construction of fathers as incapable of fulfilling the loving and caring roles in their children’s lives, therefore “[mothers] must know they can’t leave a father alone”. As a result, mothers are positioned as being solely responsible for their children’s emotional needs (as they are the only ones who possess the capacity to fulfil these), while fathers are excluded from fulfilling these needs and are cast as emotionally negligent and incapable. Through drawing on the ‘bonding’ and ‘natural’ mothering discourses, which positions the mother as the primary care giver, the father is excluded from the realm of care-giving, unless it is under the mother’s supervision. Therefore, in order to make a positive contribution to their children’s lives (and therefore be seen as ‘good’ fathers) the implicit assumption is that fathers need to be contributing to their children’s lives in other non- emotional ways.

Although mothers were predominantly represented as being naturally more nurturing than fathers by participants, in some instances there also seemed to be an element of ambivalence in participants’ discussions. In the above extract from Cassidy, although she constructs being loving as characteristic of mothers, she also notes that “you get some mothers that are *not* so loving”. Therefore, the notion that mothers are naturally more loving, and as a result responsible for providing love to their children, is challenged to some extent.

Aliyah: When you were born your mother was there actually, unless your mother actually passed away when you were born then it would be your father, but in most cases it’s your mother. Your mother taught you how to walk, um she taught you

sometimes how to drive your first car, um she'd give you advice on boys, she'd give you extra tutorial lessons.

Similarly, in the above extract the mother is constructed as fulfilling important developmental (teaching the child how to walk) and emotional (giving the child advice about boys) needs in the life of the child and being the one who was “there actually when the child was born”. Through linking the mother’s capacity to fulfil the child’s needs to the act of giving birth to the child, Aaliyah can be seen to be drawing on the ‘bonding’ discourse. However, the phrase “then it would be your father” can be seen to disrupt the notion of the mother as the only possible care-giver as it positions the father as potentially being able to fulfil role. This implies that a father may be able to take the mother’s place as the primary care giver. However, Aliyah goes on to say that “in most cases it’s your *mother*” and that it is only when the mother is deceased that the father would take over this role. Therefore, the occupation of this role by the father is discursively positioned as an exception to the rule, reinforcing the idea that this role normally or naturally belongs to the mother. In light of this, the construction of the mother as the one who is responsible for fulfilling the child’s emotional needs (and by extension the exclusion of the father from this role) remains predominantly unchallenged.

The ambivalence which is present in these two examples of talk about the roles of mother and fathers in the lives of their children, and more specifically the representation of mothers as primary care givers, may indicate an awareness by these participants of the problematic nature of essentialist discourses (e.g. the ‘bonding’ and ‘natural’ mother discourses). Therefore, these participants may be attempting to disrupt these discourses and create space for alternative understandings of mothering and fathering. However, it may be that challenging these discourses more directly or extensively was difficult for these participants due to the dominance of these gendered discourses in the wider social context.

There were other instances in the text where participants more successfully challenged constructions of fathers as incapable of providing love and care for their children.

Bianca: It's a father showing love to his daughter. It's like they the father and the daughter's just being playful and they're loving each other. It's nice....There is actually fathers that care for their children and care for their families... It's actually saying that fathers are supposed to be people who love you, who care for you, who would do anything for you.

Bianca: Well personally my daddy is a very loving person. He's never been the bad person at all. He's always been there for my mommy, for us and so I think that this is how fathers should be, the way my father is with us.

Valerie: But also not knowing who her dad was, only seeing pictures also makes her unhappy... Because she would have loved to touch get his touch, his hug, to remember how he hug, how he kissed her on the cheek, telling her he loved her.

In contrast to representations of mothers as primary care-givers, six of the participants identified the capacity to provide love and care to a child as an essential component of good fathering. Bianca notes that fathers “are *supposed* to be people who love you, who care for you”, thereby constructing these as appropriate (and necessary) functions for fathers to fulfil. Similarly, Valerie, in describing a girl whose father has passed away, notes that the child is now lacking someone to hug, kiss and love her. Therefore, showing affection to the child, as well as expressing love, is attributed to the father. In her discussion of her own father, Bianca makes the distinction between a “very loving person” and “the bad person”. It is implied that by virtue of the fact that her father is “loving”, he is not “the bad person”, thereby positioning being loving as a mark of a ‘good’ father. Here Bianca and Valerie can be seen to be drawing on the discourse of ‘involved’ fatherhood, which defines the role of the father in terms of love and involvement in the life of his child(ren) (Dermott, 2008). Bianca also talks about the way in which her father has “been there” for her and her siblings, as well as for her mother and that this is how fathers “*should* be”. “Being there” is constructed in terms of being “a very loving person”, and therefore as an emotionally engaged presence. Similarly, Miller (2011) notes that all of the British fathers that she interviewed talked about wanting to establish a relationship with their child and used the term ‘being there’ when they described what kinds of fathers they wanted to be.

Despite constructing ‘being there’ as an important component of good fathering, in Bianca’s discussion of the father showing love to his child she seems to imply that not all fathers fulfil this role in the lives of their children. She notes that “there is *actually* fathers who care for their children”, which discursively positions this type of caring as possible but unusual or uncommon.

Courtney: They don't know what it is to be a father but once you have your own child it's like there's something in you. Everyone has that soft spot even though some people

don't show it. There's something in that shows that you wanna try, you wanna do something to help the child.

Linked to participants' representations the expression of love and care for their children as an important aspect of 'good' fathering, one participant discussed the way in which fathers develop a natural instinct which allows them to care for their children. Courtney notes that having your own child leads to the development of "something in you" that makes the father "wanna do something to help the child". Therefore, developing a natural urge and connection to their child(ren) is deemed possible for fathers. This is described as "a soft spot" which implies a sense of gentleness and tenderness. Here Courtney is invoking a 'natural' mothering discourse which constructs caring as natural and instinctive. Miller (2011) argues that "expressing an immediate attachment or bond draws upon a discourse of essentialism which is much more closely associated with women and expectations of maternal instincts" (p. 91). However, as Courtney is drawing on this discourse in order to construct fathers as possessing natural paternal instinct, she can be seen to be challenging the notion that women alone possess natural caring capacities. Therefore, a nurturing, loving and caring subjectivity is made available to men as fathers. However, Courtney also notes that although "everyone has a soft spot... some people don't show it". Here she may be making reference to the fact that it may be more difficult for fathers to demonstrate (as opposed to feel) care and love towards their children. Similarly, in a study conducted with black youth in America, sensitivity and a soft-hearted nature were identified by participants as weak and unmanly (Berry, 1992). Connell (2000) notes that the suppression of emotion and the denial of vulnerability can be seen as essential components of hegemonic masculinity, therefore more nurturing and caring positions are not available to men, as fathers, in the same way that they are available to women, as mothers.

For a number of participants, in discussing the role of the father as someone who provides love and care for their children, emotional expression and openness seemed to be a key component of this role. Therefore, participants can be seen to be challenging discourses of masculinity which position men as unemotional and distant.



Cassidy: Father-daughter love

Soraya: Because a father's supposed to be there at all times he's supposed to be there... This father is very serious about his family. He's really compassionate, he's very um when one of his family members cry he cries with them or if the whole family's crying he's crying with them because he knows what it is, he feels.

Cassidy: I'm like his apple of his eye [laughs] and he really loves me but he didn't show me that he wants to be there when I need him and stuff... The first control tests in this year, so I did very [well] from last year so he's just like good and good bye. It's like he doesn't want to make me feel like excited and proud. When you're a child you want to feel excitement, you want to feel your parents are proud of you doing so good in in school but for me it doesn't feel that way... If he's proud of me then he just keep it for himself but he doesn't know how to act or show his emotions. So he must work on that and sometimes I want to tell him he must come to school for this counselling stuff.

In a similar way to Bianca, Soraya notes that “a father's supposed to be there”. “Be[ing] there” is constructed in terms of emotional engagement with the family through the description of the father as “compassionate”. Being there is also constructed in terms of experiencing (“he feels”) and expressing emotions (“he cries with them”). Here Soraya is drawing on the discourse of ‘involved’ fatherhood which positions intimate, emotional involvement with children as an important aspect of ‘good’ fathering (LaRossa, 1988). Cassidy can also be seen to be drawing on an ‘involved’ fatherhood discourse in her discussion of her father's lack of emotional expression towards her. Through acknowledging that she's the “apple of his eye... and he really loves [her] but that he didn't show [her] that he wants to be there”, emotional expression is

represented as a key aspect of ‘good’ fathering. Therefore, it is insufficient for Cassidy’s father to just love her, he needs to express these feelings in order for her to feel “excitement and proud”. She notes that “he must come to school for this counselling stuff”, thereby constructing this lack of emotional expression as a problem which her father needs to “work on”. Similarly, in a study conducted in England, fathers represented the capacity to openly demonstrate emotion as the key to a good father-child relationship, whilst a reluctance or failure to express feelings was represented as an aspect of ‘bad’ fathering (Dermott, 2008).

Emotional expressiveness, while being constructed by participants as a key component of ‘good’ fathering, was also discussed outside the context of the father-child relationship.

Bianca: My daddy was greeting another man that came from church and they were hugging each other so I thought that that was a special moment to see that two men were actually embracing each other. Not thinking of it like they’re gay or anything, they were just embracing each other.

In the above extract, Bianca describes her father hugging another man as a ‘special moment’. The act of two men embracing (and expressing emotion towards each other) is, therefore, constructed as positive. Here Bianca can be seen to be drawing on a discourse of caring masculinity (Plantin et al., 2003). However, the use of the word “special” to describe this act also implies that it is a rare occurrence. This is further reinforced by the use of the word “actually”, which suggests that in reality it is uncommon to see two men behaving in this way. Linked to this, Bianca also makes a direct connection between the act of two men hugging and homosexuality (“they’re gay”), thereby implying that this type of (public) expression of emotion between men is characteristically homosexual. However, Bianca can also be seen to be challenging the notion of expression of emotion as characteristically homosexual, and therefore ‘inappropriate’ for heterosexual men (“not thinking of it like they’re gay”). Therefore, by constructing emotional expressiveness by men as positive and disrupting the connection between this behaviour and marginalised forms of masculinity, Bianca may be attempting to reposition emotional expression as a masculine trait and challenge hegemonic masculinities which deny this type of expressiveness. In light of this, caring subject positions can be seen to be created not only for fathers to take up, but also for men more generally.

While participants positioned emotional expressiveness as a key component of ‘good’ fathering, as well as an important aspect of masculinity more generally, participants also

positioned shared activities between father and child as a central way for the father to express love and care towards the child.



Hayden: Happy family

Hayden: Um what I see here is a father that took out his whole family for a night to spend more chillful you know to grow more in love with each other. They'll soon know that you know they have a great father.

Elton: He's taking his family out and like enjoying and just to have fun. I think it's a person like we need in [our community] just to have a... positive like how can I say like a role model in our society.

Winston: I had a father around me but he wasn't really interested... he's there as my father but he's not there as a father. I never went shopping with my dad. I always went shopping with my mother... I wanted with a father because sometimes I see at beaches, shopping malls that son and father having a lot of fun ... and father and son at a rugby match which I never experienced... I have an uncle that knows my problem with my father... when he go to places he will always invite me and... tell me yes hello my son what are doing now at school and so... the uncle being a father figure in my life.

Both Hayden and Elton represent fathers taking their families out as a positive activity through describing the fathers as “a great father” and a “positive role model”. Hayden also notes that through spending relaxing time together, the family is able to “grow more in love with each other”. Therefore, the act of spending time together is constructed as facilitating a close and loving relationship. Similarly, Dermott (2008) in a study conducted with fathers in England,

found that spending time with their children was positioned as an important way for fathers to “[build] up enough knowledge to define the relationship [between father and child] as emotionally close” (p. 74). Linked to this, Winston reflects on the fact that he does not engage in shared activities with his father, thereby implying that the two of them do not have a close relationship (“my problem with my father”). In contrast to this, Winston constructs his uncle as “a father figure” or social father in his life. This is due to the fact that his uncle spends quality time with him (“when he goes to rugby matches... he will always invite me”) and shows an interest in his life (“he will always tell me... what are you doing now at school”). Lupton and Barclay (1997), in a study conducted with fathers in Australia, found that men spoke about the importance of developing a close and loving relationship with their child through ‘shared activities’. The failure to engage in share activities positions Winston’s father as “not [being] there as a father”, whilst his uncle’s fulfilment of this role positions him as a father figure or social father. Therefore, engaging in father-child shared activities is constructed as a central role of ‘good’ fathering.

While to some extent participants’ use of a discourse of ‘involved’ fatherhood opens up the possibility for fathers to be more involved in their children’s lives (through spending more time with them), these discussions of shared father-child activities can also be seen as an example of the ways in which there is a “tendency for men to participate in the ‘fun’ aspects of parenthood, while women are in charge of the rest” (Johansson & Klinth, 2007, p.19). In a study with men and women in Botswana, Datta (2007) found that it was regarded as unnatural for men to participate in household tasks. Although participants can be seen to be challenging essentialist discourses which position mothers as carers and exclude fathers from this realm, what is missing from participants’ narratives are discussions of more equitable child care and domestic arrangements. Taking responsibility for the daily care of children and participating more equally in parenting has been recognised as a key aspect of ‘involved’ fatherhood (LaRossa, 1988; Lupton & Barclay, 1997). However, only one participant made reference to this type of arrangement.

Michael: Now he has a baby and now what I can say about his is he’s a hard worker. He’s trying he’s trying to be um the best he could be and he’s always thinking of being a helper in the house. He helps maybe like see there he help maybe to make food. He help to bring money into the house and he help always to bring food in the house. I want also to be a person like how he is and I also to learn things from what he do and I think I will also be a father that do things like that and I just admire him for the things

that he do. It's telling about a young man being responsible and being a helper in the house, take care of things his wife used to do but he just takes [a] stand.

In the above extract the father is represented as a “helper in the house”. Although his helping duties include tasks that traditionally have been associated with men as fathers, for example providing financially (discussed later), he is also constructed as being responsible for making food, a task which has traditionally been associated with women (Miller, 2011). This distinction between female and male tasks is reinforced through the use of the phrase “take care of things his wife used to do”. However, although this discursively positions some household tasks as traditionally feminine, Michael can also be seen to be attempting to disrupt this polarisation through constructing the father’s participation in these tasks as positive (“I admire him”). Michael is perhaps also attempting to reposition participating in domestic activities as ‘masculine’. This can be seen through the reference to helping in the house as “being responsible” and “tak[ing] a stand” within the realm of domestic tasks in the household, which evokes a sense of strength and commitment associated with more hegemonic forms of masculinity. Therefore, through positioning participating in household tasks as an aspect of ‘good’ fathering (and masculinity), a domestic subject position (in which men can participate equally in domestic tasks such as cooking) is made available to men.

From the above extracts it can be seen that participants drew on essentialist discourses which position mothers as naturally nurturing and caring, and therefore the ones who are responsible for providing love and care for their children. In contrast, these essentialist discourses position men as lacking these capacities, and therefore fathers are excluded from caring for and nurturing their children. These discourses have important implications for the ways in which fathers, mothers and children are able to experience fathering relationships, as well as masculinities and femininities more generally. The positioning of fathers as unable to provide care and love for children can be seen to exclude experiences of intimate, loving fathering relationships. Essentialist discourses of ‘natural’ mothering “continue to construct paternity... in ways that can leave little – or at least ambivalent - spaces for men [as fathers]” (Miller, 2011, p 13). It has been argued that fathers may feel excluded from the domain of nurturing and caring that is far more closely associated with mothers. In light of the fact that fathers are positioned as unable or ill-equipped to fulfil their children’s emotional needs, fathers may avoid engaging in these types of relationships with children. Miller (2011) argues that essentialising discourses of ‘natural’ mothering were drawn on by men to explain their lack of involvement in their children’s lives. Therefore, essentialising discourses which position women as primary

caregivers can be seen to allow (or even force) men to disengage from or abandon their caring responsibilities towards their children. It has also been argued that hegemonic masculinities do not allow men to engage in child-care and household tasks, as this type of work has traditionally been regarded as feminine (Datta, 2007). Wall and Arnold (2007) note that involved “fathering, especially of young children, continues to clash with hegemonic cultural ideas of masculinity” (p.520). Therefore, men may choose to disengage from this type of work in order to be considered ‘men’.

The essentialist discourses of nurturing and caring can also be seen to make available certain gendered subjective positions for women. The ‘bonding’ and ‘natural’ mother discourses position women as inherently nurturing, thereby constructing this as an important component of femininity. Therefore, women are unable to abandon their caring responsibilities in the same way that men can, without risking being regarded as ‘bad’ mothers (and ‘bad’ women) (Miller, 2011). Despite significant shifts in women’s involvement in the work force, Maher and Saugeres (2007) argue that idealised images of mothering persist, with motherhood and femininity remaining intimately entwined. Linked to this, the ‘natural’ discourse of mothering also positions women as being better prepared to take care of their children (i.e. to meet their developmental needs), therefore perpetuating an unequal division of caring labour with mothers taking responsibility for the majority of childcare tasks (Lupton & Barclay, 1997). Through ‘bonding’ and ‘natural’ mothering discourses, mothers are positioned as needing to be constantly available and attentive to their children and to put their child’s needs before their own (Hays, 1996; Macleod, 2001). In light of this, women are made disproportionately responsible for the care and nurturance of children (Ramphela & Richter, 2006). This unequal division of care is captured in a comment made by Amelia: “you usually just see mothers going with their children to school and mothers going to the library”.

In terms of implications of the ‘natural’ mothering discourses for children, constructions of fathers as incapable of providing love and care for children may mean young people are unlikely to participate in or seek emotionally supportive and close relationships with their fathers. This may further serve to reinforce the exclusion of fathers from the realm of caring and nurturing. Winston notes that “it’s not easy [for] a boy to hug another boy because they will have all these... fun making stuff”. Therefore, it may be particularly difficult for male children to engage in or experience their fathering relationships as emotionally intimate, as the provision of love and care has traditionally been associated with women and marginalised masculinities. It is interesting to note that it was predominantly female participants who spoke

about emotional expressiveness as a key aspect of ‘good’ fathering, while male participants discussed shared father-child activities. It is possible that this is due to ‘emotional expressiveness’ being more available to female participants as a result of emotionality traditionally being associated with femininity. Therefore, male participants may be unable to talk about emotional expressiveness in the same way as female participants, even though there may be a desire for this (i.e. to be able to their fathers or have their fathers hug them), as it is in conflict with hegemonic constructions of masculinity.

However, despite the problematic implications of the discourse of ‘natural’ mothering for men, women and children, participants attempts to challenge this discourse can be seen to make alternative subjective positions available. Through drawing on discourses of ‘involved’ fatherhood, nurturing and caring subject positions are made available to men, thereby allowing and encouraging men to engage emotionally with their children. Through this discourse, “the ability to express and engage in fatherly love for one’s child” is positioned as a key component of appropriate masculinity (Lupton & Barclay, 1997, p. 144). Therefore, emotionality is reconfigured as masculine and men are ‘permitted’ to pursue emotional engagement with their children (Dermott, 2008; Morrell, 2006). When fathers are positioned as possessing caring and nurturing capacities, the notion of nurturing and caring as primarily (and inherently) women’s work is, at least temporarily, disrupted (Clowes, 2006), and more equitable childcare arrangements, in which men and women share responsibility for caring for children, are made discursively available. The shifting of (sole) responsibility for childcare away from women as mothers can also be seen to make alterative positions available to women in the context of the family (i.e. breadwinner).

While some participants positioned fathers as carers and nurturers in the lives of their children, these roles were discursively positioned by the majority of participants as belonging to mothers. In contrast to this, almost all the participants discussed financial provision as a key responsibility for fathers to fulfil.

4.2 Father as ‘provider’

Twelve of the fourteen participants discussed fathers providing for their families, representing this as a key component of good fathering.



Valerie: A father will do anything to provide for his family

Amelia: But then you find a good side like the father shows come we go to this shop we buy this and what do you need for school... So then your father will buy it for you. Like that is what I think a father must be like...be supportive.

Courtney: Fathers... actually need to realise that... when a child is born it's a gift from God. So you as a father should provide for that child.

Valerie: You're a father... you did choose to go that way nobody chose for you to go that way... find a job... find a proper place to work.

In the first extract above, Amelia refers to a father buying his child school supplies as the “good side” of fathering. She notes that this is what “a father *must be like*”, while Courtney says that “a father *should* provide for the child”, thereby constructing the act of providing as a necessary function for a father to fulfil. Valerie makes a direct connection between the choice to become a father and the responsibility of providing for a child: “you did *choose* to go that way...find a job”. Therefore, the act of providing is discursively positioned as an intrinsic responsibility of the father (which men are aware of before they choose to become fathers). Similarly, Courtney directly links the act of providing with the child being “a gift from God”, which implies a duty and responsibility on the part of the father. The act of becoming a father is constructed as being automatically connected to the responsibility of taking care of the child’s material needs (Dudová, 2006). Here participants can be seen to be drawing on the ‘father as provider’ discourse, which assumes men’s economic provision for their families and positions them as ‘natural’ breadwinners (Coltrane, 1998; Miller, 2011). These constructions of providing as a central element of good fathering are consistent with findings of studies which have been conducted with migrant workers in Johannesburg (Rabe, 2006), low-income young fathers in

Cape Town and Durban (Swartz & Bhana, 2009), as well as women, children and men in rural KwaZulu-Natal (Makusha et al., 2013), as well as in England (Dermott, 2008), Australia (Lupton & Barclay, 1997), the United States (Allen & Doherty, 1996) and the Czech Republic (Dudová, 2006).

Hayden: She's [the mother] not even financially stable... to raise a child which means that child don't get a proper needs, there's no provider. So they don't get what they need and growing up for them is also not normal.

The notion of the father as being responsible for providing for the family is further reinforced through Hayden's discussion of a household in which the father is absent. Hayden notes that because the father is absent "there's no provider". Therefore, the father is constructed as being solely responsible for providing financially for the family. In light of this, fathers are positioned as essential (and irreplaceable) to families and children (Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2013) and a childhood without a father is constructed as "not normal".

Fernando: This is a man working hard for his family. He's trying everything he can to support his family and... he's there to care for his family...

The act of a father providing for his children and family is also represented as "supportive" and evidence that "he's there to care for his family". Therefore, providing is discursively positioned as a supportive and caring act. However, this 'financial caring' can be seen to contrast with the way in which caring is constructed in relation to mothers (as loving and nurturing, discussed in the previous section). As a result, the father is positioned as "a breadwinner who does not have the ability or the desire to nurture his child day-by-day so he funds his family but keeps his distance" (Thompson & Walker, 1989, p. 860). Through this construction of the father as the 'financial care-giver' rather than emotional care-giver, nurturing and caring subject positions are made unavailable to men as fathers. This can be seen to further reinforce the obligation for fathers to contribute to their families through financial means (as this is only contribution that is regarded as 'appropriate' for fathers).

Despite financial caring being constructed as distinct from emotional caring, participants also discussed fathers providing for their families as a way of facilitating the development of positive family relationships.

Cassidy: When he get paid so he took us out and we go... eat at Spur...so we were very like a happy family.

Hayden: Now if you're financially stable you can treat your family and it's not about the money but... you can take them outside of their atmosphere and let them relax a bit, feel safe.

Elton: This one is about and a happy family and now they're like gonna like have supper here at the place and to see how the child... I can see there how freedom there in their faces.

Three participants discussed fathers who took their families out to eat as an example of positive fathering in their community. In the above extract Cassidy makes a direct connection between her family being “happy” and her father taking them out to eat at Spur. This activity is made possible by him getting “paid”. Similarly, Hayden and Elton constructed fathers taking their families out to eat as facilitating a sense of relaxation and freedom. This act of fathering may be seen as particularly important in the context of a community such as this, which experiences high levels of community violence. Fathers taking their families out to eat is constructed as particularly positive due to the fact that they give families time away from the community violence so that they can “relax a bit” and “feel safe”. It has been argued that the ability of fathers to provide economically for their families may contribute to social capital as fathers are able to “develop relationships with their children by taking them places, experiencing events and engaging in activities that require financial capital” (Christiansen & Palkovitz, 2001, p. 91 - 92). Therefore, although Hayden notes that it is “not about the money”, it appears that the ability to provide financially in the form of activities such as eating out, positions men as ‘good’ fathers who contribute to the happiness and safety of their families. In light of this, the ability to provide financially may represent an important (and sanctioned) way for fathers to initiate other types of roles (i.e. emotionally involved ones) with their children and families.

While almost all participants constructed financial provision as a key component of good fathering, implicit in these assumptions was the notion of making sacrifices and ‘taking responsibility’. These notions of responsibility and sacrifice also appeared to be closely linked to constructions of hegemonic masculinity and what it means to be a ‘man’.

Cassidy: 10% of men are supportive to their families, support you throughout... they will go out of their way to let you be happy and live your life you want to live... like a father that [puts] money away for you to go and study, a father like that man!

Valerie: he's selling chips just to provide for this family... many fathers won't do that and like you see he's not smiling because he's not happy because this is his job... there is fathers that are good, that will do anything to provide for his for their family... there is a father who stands by his family.

In the extract above, Cassidy notes that a “supportive’ father [puts] money away for you to go and study”. Therefore, support is constructed in terms of financial provision (providing for the child’s education). In light of this, financial provision is discursively positioned as a key means through which fathers can support their families. However, it is not only the financial support which is important, but also the nature of this support. That is, a ‘good’ father “support[s] you throughout” and “go[es]’ out of his way to let you be happy”. In light of this, commitment and sacrifice are positioned as key aspects of good providing (and good fathering). Similarly, Valerie notes that the father who is selling chips to support his family is “not happy”. Implicit here is that the father sacrifices his own happiness in order to be a “good [father] that will do anything to provide for his family”. Linked to this, through doing “anything to provide for his family” this father is seen to be “stand[ing] by his family”. Therefore he is constructed as showing commitment to his family as well as responsibility for his family, through the sacrifices he makes to fulfil the provider role. It has been argued that the role of being a good provider is intrinsically linked with masculine honour (Brandth & Kvande, 1998). In light of this, fathers are positioned as needing to “do anything to provide” in order to be regarded as ‘good’ fathers. It has been argued that economic provision by a father may hold a particular salience in low-income communities due to the many sacrifices that men must endure in order to fulfil this role in their families (Christiansen & Palkovitz, 2001). Similarly, in a study conducted with working-class coloured men in Cape Town, working hard and making sacrifices were seen as being key aspects of being a good father (Badroodien, 2006). It is interesting to note that although Cassidy and Valerie construct sacrifice and commitment as key elements of good fathering, they also both note that it is the minority, rather than the majority of fathers in their community that conform to this version of fathering. This suggests that although participants are drawing on the discourse of ‘father as provider’, this type of fathering is perceived as non-normative within the context of this community.

Closely linked to the notion of sacrifice and commitment, fathers who provide for their families were also discursively positioned as taking responsibility and being ‘men’.



Aliyah: Walking home in the rain

Jerome: It just tells me also that they are very hard workers, man. They [are] not sitting at home waiting for ... money like to fall out of the sky. They [are] going to go to work... all that they can to probably get as much money as they can.

Aliyah: I saw men coming from work but it was like raining and they were walking home... I think this shows commitment, perseverance and persistence. I'm sure these men are working... trying to provide for their families and this is a very good role that they're actually playing... if the younger ones should see them they'd also [be] ... more positive about life and the future that is waiting for them... there's a lot of drug dealers and drug addicts that don't really work but these men are... bringing [the] positivity back into my community... I have to actually take my [hat] off to these men for actually being men.

In the above extract, Jerome discusses two men who are “very hard workers”, thereby discursively positioning them as diligent. Through “go[ing] to work” they are constructed as taking responsibility for providing for their families, rather than “sitting at home waiting for money to fall out the sky”. This is consistent with findings from a study conducted with teenaged boys from a township in Durban, where providing is closely linked with taking responsibility as a father (Morrell, 2007). Similarly, Aliyah constructs men who are working to support their families as demonstrating “commitment, perseverance, and persistence”, which is a “very good role”. Therefore, commitment and endurance are constructed as necessary in order to fulfil the role of the ‘good provider’ (Bernard, 1981). Not only are these men discursively positioned as fulfilling a good role in their families, but they are positioned as role

models in the wider community. In contrast to men who are drug dealers and drug addicts and “don’t really work”, men who provide for their families are constructed as “bringing positivity” back into the community. Therefore fathers who choose to provide for their families are talked about as being responsible and deserving of respect. In light of this, working (despite difficult circumstances) is what distinguishes a ‘good’ father from a ‘bad’ one. Brandth and Kvande (1998) note that work is assumed to be the major basis of masculine identity. Linked to this, Aliyah makes a direct connection between providers who demonstrate commitment, persistence and perseverance, and the act of “actually being *men*”. These characteristics, as well as the act of providing, are cast as inherently masculine. Intrinsic in this construction of masculinity is the notion that the father must go out and work (Adomako Ampofo & Boateng, 2007). The implication is that fathers need to demonstrate commitment to, and persistence and perseverance in, providing. In light of this, fathers who are unable to fulfil these requirements are denied status as men. This can be seen as an example of how “the provider role continues to be an important feature of hegemonic images of masculinity” (Marsiglio & Pleck, 2005, p. 260).

The construction of providing as an inherently masculine activity which fathers are primarily responsible for was further reinforced by discussions of mothers who provide for their families.

Aliyah: My mother at the moment, as my father’s not working, she’s actually being the father also because she’s the one providing for us, she cooks...cleans, she takes us to school. She does everything.

Winston : It may be that the father is unemployed but he actually helps the mother by looking after the kids during the day, helping the homework, almost like they are compromising the task and just dividing it because maybe for the time being the mother is... maybe supporting the family until the father gets a job.

In the above extract, Aliyah notes that her mother is “actually being the father... because she’s the one providing for us”. The mother’s fulfilment of the role is also constructed as temporary: “at the moment”. Therefore, although this role is currently being fulfilled by Aliyah’s mother the role of the provider is still attributed to the father. Similarly, Winston notes that a father and mother may have exchanged roles (the father takes care of the children, while the mother works) because “for the time being the mother is... supporting the family *until the father gets a job*”. In light of this, the father’s position as the ‘natural’ provider is taken for granted, while the mother’s providing role is constructed as secondary (Coltrane, 1998). Linked to this, the

father is “help[ing]” the mother ‘by looking after the kids’. This implies that in a similar way to how a mother may temporarily fulfil the role as the provider, the father is able to temporarily fulfil the role of child-carer. However, the construction of these reversed roles as temporary serves to reinforce the traditional division of labour (father as breadwinner, mother as child-carer). Implicit in the positioning of the father as ‘the helper’ is the notion that it is not his ‘job’ to take care of the children on a permanent basis. In a study conducted with dual-earner Mexican American couples, Coltrane (1998) found that when the husband was regarded as the main-provider, women tended to take the majority of the responsibility for household and child-care activities, while the husband “remained in a helper role” (p. 521). In light of this, women and men become fixed by the traditional assumptions surrounding the division of household labour, with fathers’ roles being confined to that of breadwinners and mothers to that of child-carers. Participants’ lack of reference to mothers as ‘natural’ providers can be seen as an example of the way in which societal expectations that men should be the ones to provide for their families persist, in spite of the fact that women are increasingly sharing in this role (Taylor et al., 1988).

Despite the fact that almost all the participants drew on the ‘father as provider’ discourse which is rooted in gendered assumptions regarding the division of household labour, there were instances where participants appeared to be attempting to challenge the notion that a good father is one who only assumes the responsibility of financial provision.

Soraya: This girl’s dad, whenever he comes all he gives is money. Now and then he’ll hug her... but he gives just the stuff she wants but still the love between the two of them [isn’t] there... He must... give... stuff and clothes and whatever she wants or needs he gives but not that love that a father’s supposed to give, it’s not there.

Courtney: The father’s just like if I can give my child money, if I can give my child cars and things then that’s fine. There’s I gave you, what do you still want from me? But I think sometimes they just have to go a little bit deeper... show that [child] just love. Just ask the [child] how was your day, are you fine? Simple things like that can affect the child in a big way.

Winston: A father doesn’t actually just... have to pay the bills, be all manly. You can be loving, you can be fun, you can be everything, you can be the best friend... you can just be there in every sense you can.

These three participants discussed the way in which fathers who provide financially are not necessarily meeting their children's needs. Soraya notes that although the father provides for his child by giving her "the stuff she wants... clothes and whatever", the "love that a father's supposed to give is not there". While the act of providing materially for the child is constructed as the responsibility of the father ("he *must* give... clothes"), the father is also represented as having a responsibility to love the child: "that love that a father's *supposed* to give". Here Soraya can be seen to be drawing on the discourse of 'involved' fathering, which constructs intimacy and love between the father and child as a key component of good fathering (Dermott, 2008). Similarly, Courtney notes that a father needs to "go a little bit deeper... show the child love". Therefore, just giving the child "money... and cars" implies insufficient involvement on the part of the father, although fathers may think this is sufficient: "what do you still want from me?". Therefore, Courtney can be seen to be challenging the notion of financial provision as a key component of good fathering by positioning 'involved' fatherhood, in the form of emotional expression and interest in the child's life, as being more important than providing for the material needs of the child (affecting the child more). Linked to this, Winston makes the connection between providing and masculinity: "pay the bills... be all manly". In light of this, income generating work is constructed as being closely associated with hegemonic masculinity (Brandth & Kvande, 1998). However, despite to some extent drawing on the 'father as provider' discourse, Winston attempts to disrupt this notion through noting that fathers don't "*just*" have to do this. Therefore, Winston can be seen to be making space for alternative subject positions for fathers, alongside the provider role. These subject positions can be seen to be more intimate and loving: "you can be the best friend... you can just be there in every sense that you can". Similarly, middle-class divorced fathers in Johannesburg identified providing as only part of their fathering role, with being intimately involved in their children's lives also being identified as a key aspect of fathering (Khunou, 2006).

It seems that participants demonstrated a level of ambivalence in their attempts to challenge the 'father as provider' discourse. They appear to be both evoking this discourse, as well as trying to create space for alternative 'involved' fathering positions alongside it. The fact that all except two of the participants drew on the 'father as provider' discourse suggests that it is central to how these young people understand fathering in their community. Therefore, the notion that "men should work and provide for their families [appears to be] a densely reified aspect [of cultural] consciousness" (Daly, 1996, p. 474). In light of this, it may have been difficult for participants to challenge the 'father as provider' discourse more directly.

The dominance of the ‘father as provider’ discourse in participants talk about fathering in their community can perhaps be understood by examining the relationship between provision and poverty. Dermott (2008) argues that in low-income communities people are constantly aware of the critical importance of money; therefore, within these communities the emphasis on finances is likely to be more pronounced. In light of this, poverty can be seen to “strongly bind fatherhood and manhood in South Africa where material signifiers of masculine status are rare” (Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2013, p.10). Therefore, in low-income communities, a ‘good’ father is one who will try his “utmost to secure life opportunities for his child[ren]”, while a ‘bad’ father denies his responsibility to provide for his family (Morrell, 2006, p. 21). It is within this context that not only the act of provision, but “commitment, persistence and perseverance” to providing become important markers of both masculinity and ‘good’ fathering.

The discourse of ‘father as provider’ can be seen to have a number of important implications in terms of how fathers, mothers and children experience fathering, as well as their gendered identities. It has been argued that there exists a strong societal expectation that fathers will provide for their children and families’ economic needs (Glikman, 2004). The dominance of the ‘father as provider’ discourse in participants’ talk of fathering in their community seems to support this. As a result of the dominance of this discourse, fathers are likely to feel enormous pressure to provide for their families (Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2013). However, in communities where unemployment is high, many men are unable to fulfil this prescribed role and therefore to be considered ‘good’ fathers, and perhaps more importantly ‘good’ men. In light of this, men may experience a “failed self” (Glikman, 2004; Swartz & Bhana, 2009). In order to compensate for this “[fathers] may often dissociate themselves from [the provider role] to minimize their sense of inadequacy” (Marsiglio, 1994, p.330). It has been argued that when men are unable to meet the expectations that exist around providing, they often create alternative pathways in order to assert their masculinities (Salo, 2007). Therefore, men may engage in domestic violence, alcoholism, suicide, as well as criminal activity as they struggle to redefine their masculine identities (Morrell & Swart, 2005; Salo, 2007; Silberschmidt, 1999). In the context of the community in which the study was conducted, it appears that many men are engaging in these types of activities, with participants making frequent mention of men who steal, are addicted to alcohol or drugs, and men who are involved in illicit gang activities (see later section on ‘absent’ fathers).

In terms of the division of household labour, Hood (1986) notes that implicit in the assumption of the father as the provider, is the reciprocal assumption of the mother as the housewife and

child-carer. Therefore, the discourse of ‘father as provider’ does not only fix men as breadwinners but it also fixes women as homemakers. In light of this, it is only once the act of providing for the families’ economic needs ceases to be the sole responsibility of the father that childcare and housekeeping will cease to be the sole responsibility of the mother (Safilios-Rothschild, 1972). The lack of recognition of women as ‘natural’ providers also serves to deny women ‘worker’ subject positions. Dual-provider perspectives are necessary not only to lessen the pressure that men feel to provide for their families, but also to ‘permit’ women to move beyond their roles as wives and mothers and into the economic sphere as employees and income generators (McAdoo & McAdoo, 1998).

It can also be argued that as the father’s role is to provide (solely in an economic sense), he is freed from other types of family obligations (such as cooking, cleaning and taking care of the children) (Bernard, 1981). Research suggests that both men and women use the father’s provider role as justification for limited involvement in housework and childcare (Coltrane, 1998; Miller, 2011). When fathers do venture beyond their provider role, they may be regarded as “men who mother, rather than men who father” (Montgomery et al., 2006, p 2416). This may further serve to discourage men from engaging in activities that have traditionally been associated with women and may also have damaging consequences for their masculine identities. Therefore, the ‘father as provider’ discourse can be seen to legitimate and perpetuate an unequal division of labour within the household and as long as men continue to be regarded as primarily responsible for providing for their families, little space exists for men to engage in other types of familial and parenting roles.

In terms of fathers relationships with their children, the ‘father as provider’ discourse creates structural barriers to men’s emotional involvement with their children due to that fact that “it legitimates inflexible and highly demanding work schedules” at the expense of father-child relationships (LaRossa, 1988, p. 457). The role of the provider is also implicitly defined in terms of the provision of material, rather than emotional support. In light of this, children have also had to learn that is their fathers’ ‘job’ to work to provide for the family and therefore, children have had to learn not to expect much in terms of emotional involvement, from their fathers (Seidler, 1997, p.162). Therefore, intimate and emotional subject positions are denied to both fathers and children within the context of the father-child relationship.

While the ‘father as provider’ discourse was undoubtedly central to participants’ constructions of fathers roles and responsibilities, the ‘father as moral protector’ discourse was also dominant in participants’ constructions of fathering.

4.3 Father as ‘moral protector’

Thirteen participants discussed ‘protecting’ as one of the primary roles of the father. While a few participants made reference to fathers needing to protect their families from physical danger, protecting was mainly constructed in terms of moral protection: teaching children right from wrong and protecting children from negative influences so that they grow up to be responsible members of society (Lupton & Barclay, 1997; Swartz & Bhana, 2009). There were two main ways in which fathers were positioned as fulfilling the role of moral protectors; firstly by instilling discipline and secondly by providing guidance and acting as positive role models.



Aliyah: Fathers instil discipline in us

Aliyah: Coz I believe that fathers do in a way um show us what is right and what is wrong and what we’re supposed to and what we’re not to do and if we have to do something wrong they always the one to hit us or discipline us.

Soraya: He [the father] knows that it’s right for a father to hit the child.

In the extract above Aliyah notes that fathers are “*always* the ones to hit us or discipline us”, while Soraya says that “*it’s right* for the fathers to hit the child”. In light of this, disciplining children in the form of physical punishment is constructed as a natural role for the father to fulfil. Here participants can be seen to be drawing on the ‘father as disciplinarian’ discourse

through which the father is positioned as primarily responsible for disciplining children (Allen & Doherty, 1996; Perälä-Littunen, 2007). This is consistent with findings of a study conducted with fathers in Botswana where none of the participants questioned the right of their father to physically punish them (Datta, 2007). The act of fathers disciplining children is also represented as a way for them to protect children by enforcing the right way to do things: “if we have to do something *wrong* they always the one to *hit* or *discipline* us”. Therefore, fathers are discursively positioned as needing to hit their children in order to keep them from engaging in negative activities. The role of the father as natural disciplinarian was further reinforced through participants’ discussions of children who were disciplined as a result of the influence of their fathers.

Hayden: In this photo is two Muslim children...going to Mosque... what that means is that...they have a father in their life and their father is disciplined, they are disciplined and they listen to what is expected of them and they... contribute to the positivity of this... environment... which tells me... they step out of line but they have a father to tell them you know it's the wrong thing.

Cassidy: You can see in a family when a father supports because you will see this is discipline no this goes right and everything just goes to the way the father like wants it to be like the children go to school, they don't get complaints from the teacher, they are doing good in school, they're doing good at home, they're doing good in church.

In the extract above, Hayden attributes the children going to Mosque and doing “what is expected of them” directly to the father’s provision of discipline: “they have a father to tell them... it’s wrong”. Cassidy also makes a direct connection between the presence of the father and discipline, which results in the children doing well at school, doing well at home and doing well at church. In light of this, the act of providing discipline is directly attributed to the father, thereby positioning him as the natural disciplinarian. Hayden constructs the father as not only providing discipline but also being disciplined himself. Here Hayden can be seen to be drawing on a discourse of hegemonic masculinity, in which discipline is constructed as a key component of masculinity (Field, 2001). Therefore, in order to be considered a ‘good’ father (and a ‘good’ man) a father is required to demonstrate a sense of discipline, as well as instil discipline in his children. This is consistent with findings from a study conducted with coloured men in a working class suburb in Cape Town, where self-discipline was seen as being linked to being a man (Badroodien, 2006).

The act of the father disciplining his children is also discursively positioned as positive through Cassidy noting that the children are “doing *good* in school... at home... in church” and Hayden noting that the disciplined children “contribute to the *positivity* of the environment”. In light of this, instilling discipline is represented as an essential component of good fathering. This notion of discipline as a key responsibility for fathers to fulfil was further supported through discussions of families in which fathers were absent.

Fernando: Children grow up... they become rude. They do not listen to their mothers, even though their mothers raised them... because there's no father to teach them how to respect and to learn them the respect they need to know.

In his discussion of single mother families, Fernando notes that “children... become *rude*... because there's *no father*”. Implicit here is the assumption that children who are raised in the absence of a father are undisciplined (Datta, 2007). Mothers, therefore, are positioned as unable to provide discipline for their children, as it is only fathers who can “teach them how to respect”. In light of this, disciplinarian subject positions are made unavailable for women and women are constructed as lacking authority over children. The unavailability of these types of subject positions to women can be seen to be linked to the discourse of ‘natural mothering’, through which mothers are positioned as being more emotional, nurturing and gentle rather than as authoritative disciplinarians (Perälä-Littunen, 2007).

Implicit within the constructions of the father as the natural disciplinarian seems to be the assumption that the father occupies a position of authority within the family. It is through this authority that he is able to exercise his disciplinary role without question. The authority of the father within the family can be seen to be linked to hegemonic constructions of masculinity in which the capacity to exert control over others is seen as a marker of being a ‘man’ (Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009). Consistent with this, Berry (1992) found that a man who was able to demonstrate dominance over his family and exert harsh discipline was regarded as being strong and masculine. Therefore, in order to be considered not only a ‘good’ father, but also a ‘good’ man, it is necessary for fathers to occupy a position of authority and control within the family. However, it was not only through authority and discipline that fathers were constructed as protectors. Guidance and modelling positive behaviour were also offered by participants as being key aspects of good fathering.

Hayden: Your father is the one that needs to...set footsteps out for you and you need to follow that footsteps. Um like if you take a lion... you know the cub will... learn from the father...

In the above extract, Hayden notes that the father is the one who “set[s] footsteps out for you”, thereby representing the father as a guide. Hayden also compares the act of a father guiding a child to a lion guiding a cub. Therefore, the father’s role as the guide is discursively positioned as occurring naturally, similarly to how it would occur in nature. Through this naturalisation, providing guidance becomes an automatic and fixed role for fathers to fulfil. One of the ways in which the father was represented as guiding his child was through being a positive role model.

Michael: It’s telling about a great father figure that shows his child to be a man of influence, of good behaviour and a man of courage and a man of... hope.

Hayden: A father needs to be a positive role model... if a father isn’t a positive role model you... can’t be positive because if your father swears in the house you will definitely swear. If you are not a positive father your children won’t turn out positively. Yet there is some that has beat the odds but it’s really few that really beat the odds and most of them end up like that...[fathers]need to be your guideline... because if they’re not there... you’ll be like hopeless.

Courtney: Ok it’s of three youngsters... they... gambling so for money and smoking weed ... there’s not a father figure or their father’s busy doing wrong things, like the father’s maybe on drugs or the father’s selling drugs now. So... the children’s thinking but that’s my daddy, I want to be like him and then they start following him.

In the first extract above, Michael notes that a “great father” is one who “shows his child to be a man of influence, of good behaviour”. The father is constructed as demonstrating these characteristics for his son, and therefore he is positioned as a good role model. Similarly, Hayden notes that “a father *needs* to be a positive role model”, thereby constructing being a positive role model as a necessary role for a father to fulfil. Here Michael and Hayden can be seen to be drawing on the ‘father as role model’ discourse, through which positive role modelling is represented as a key component of good fathering (Morrell, 2006). Similarly, being a positive role model has been identified as a central aspect of ‘good’ fathering by

working-class adolescent boys in a township in Johannesburg, as well as miners in Johannesburg (Langa, 2010a; Rabe, 2006).

The construction of positive role modelling as a necessary requirement for fathers to fulfil is further reinforced through discussions of children who lack a father who is a positive role model. Hayden notes that “if your father swears you will *definitely* swear” and “if you are not a positive father your children *won't* turn out positively”. Through the use of the words “definitely” and “won't” the act of the child following in the (negative) footsteps of their father is presented as inevitable. This is further supported by Courtney's discussion of the young children engaging in negative activities. She notes that “there's *not* a father figure or their father's busy doing the *wrong things*”, thereby directly attributing the children's engagement with negative activities to the behaviour of the father. In light of this, the absence of the father as a positive role model or the presence of the father as a negative role model is discursively positioned as harmful and resulting in negative outcomes for children. While Hayden notes that there are some that have “beat[en] the odds”, he argues that most end up like their fathers and without a father to be “your guideline... you'll be... hopeless”. Therefore, very limited space is made available for children who lack fathers as positive role models to escape these harmful and negative outcomes and they are ultimately cast as being trapped in an inevitable state of hopelessness.

Linked to constructions which positioned fathers as needing to be positive role models to their children, participants also discussed fathers who were role models in their communities.

Bianca: A lot of people know my dad... I would say a pastor... plays a big role in our community. Coz a lot of people look up to them seeing that they are the people that don't um necessarily interfere or mix themselves with the bad things. So a lot of people actually... look um up to them to do the right thing.

In her discussion of her father who is a pastor, Bianca notes that he “plays a *big role* in our community”. She makes a direct connection between this role and the fact that he does not “interfere or mix... with the bad things”. In light of this, her father is constructed as a positive role model in the community and someone who people “look up to... to do the right thing”. Similarly, Swartz and Bhana (2009) found that ‘coloured’ and ‘black’ teenage fathers in Cape Town and Durban characterised a ‘good’ father as someone who was highly regarded within the community. Mkhize (2006) also argues that in African communities the father has historically been regarded as “an important social figure [and] an esteemed member of the

community” (p. 192). Within the context of working-class ‘coloured’ communities, it has been argued that religious institutions and practices provide men with an alternative pathway to acquire ‘tough masculinities’ (Salo, 2007). In contrast to the ‘tough’ masculinities associated with organised crime and gang activities, men who engage in religiosity and piety demonstrate toughness through exercising “spiritual, moral and emotional self-discipline, as they fight off the temptation to earn income through illegal means” (Salo, 2007, p 179). Therefore, Bianca’s positioning of her father as a positive community role model (and a ‘good’ father) may serve as an attempt to disrupt the hegemony of ‘tough’ gangster masculinities within her community. Linked to this, participants also discussed being a positive role model as a key aspect of masculinity.

Aliyah: I think to be a man is to um... to firstly be a good role model and to take responsibility and to act properly, don't go out of line... just be a positive role model to others.

In her discussion of what it means to be a man, Aliyah makes a direct connection between being a “man” and being “a good role model”. Being a good role model is constructed in terms of “tak[ing] responsibility... act[ing] properly” and not “go[ing] out of line”. Therefore, a ‘good’ man is discursively positioned as one who demonstrates these characteristics. In light of this, responsible and moral subject positions are made available to men. Morrell (2007) has argued that manhood is a status which requires responsibility, as well as obliges respect. Field (2001), in his study conducted with ‘coloured’ men from a working-class community in Cape Town, found that masculinity was strongly associated with discipline and the ability to avoid engaging in activities such as violence. Similarly to Bianca, through constructing a ‘good’ man as one who is responsible and refrains from engaging in negative activities, Aliyah may be attempting to challenge constructions of masculinity which incorporate violence and crime and reposition masculinity as responsible and associated with refraining from engaging in these types of activities. This can be seen to be particularly important in light of previous research which has shown that violent and criminal discourses of masculinity are prevalent (and perhaps even dominant) in working-class communities such as the one in which the study was conducted (Field, 2001; Luyt & Foster, 2001; Salo, 2007).

Despite attempts by some participants to resist problematic gendered discourses in their discussions of fathers as ‘protectors’, a number of participants drew on these discourses when talking about the ways in which fathers protect daughters and sons. Participants discussed

fathers as needing to police and protect their daughters' sexuality, while boys were constructed as needing moral protection from their father in order to avoid engaging in negative activities.

Soraya: He's always concerned with what we wear, how open it is, how short it is and stuff. So um I think that that helps in my life I think it's a big ...change... because many fathers they just don't care they just like ok right she have that on ok it's fine ok bye. But my daddy... he knows that how guys look at you... so now he tells me that I must always be covered.

Bianca: My dad tells me I can't go out in that short skirt. There's a reason why he's telling me that coz it's not appropriate for a girl to walk like that. So that's the type of guidance you need sometimes... I understand that women have the right to dress the way they want to, right? But if you look at a community like [this] men... they look at everything in a seductive way... So if I'm gonna have on this um vet t-shirt thingy with this short pants then obviously men are... gonna undress you with their eyes. So it's not appropriate walking like that in the street .

Both Soraya and Bianca note that their fathers police what they wear, particularly in terms of how revealing their clothing is. Soraya notes that this “helps in her life”, while Bianca says that “that’s the type of guidance you need sometimes”, thereby affirming this role. Bianca noting that you “need” this type of guidance positions this policing as necessary. Soraya also notes that fathers who don’t fulfil this role “don’t care” about their children. In light of this, fathers policing what their daughters wear is discursively positioned as an essential caring responsibility which the father is required to fulfil. Similarly, Way and Gillman (2000) note that Latina and African-American girls from low-income backgrounds saw themselves as needing their fathers to protect them from boys and appreciated it when their fathers provided such protection in the form of regulating what they wore.

Implicit in both Bianca and Soraya’s discussions is the assumption that if fathers do not police what their daughters wear, this will invite unwanted attention from men which has the potential to result in rape or sexual assault. In light of this, girls are positioned as vulnerable, while fathers are positioned as responsible for ensuring their daughters safety from other men. This is consistent with findings from a study conducted in low-income communities in the United States, where both fathers and mothers saw protecting children from physical danger as a key responsibility of the father, with girls perceived as more fragile (and therefore needing more protection) than boys (Summers et al., 1999). Here Soraya and Bianca can be seen to be

drawing on the ‘male sex drive discourse’ (Hollway, 1998), which positions men as being unable to control their biological urges to have sex, while women who dress in revealing clothing are positioned as placing themselves in danger of being raped through eliciting these urges. In light of this, both girls who dress in revealing clothing and their fathers who allow them to dress in such clothing are positioned as being responsible for girls getting raped. Men who are perpetrators of rape, on the other hand, are exonerated of blame (Anderson & Doherty, 2008)

In contrast to girls who were constructed as needing (and being grateful for) their father’s protection from physical danger, boys were constructed as needing their fathers in order to avoid making bad choices which result in negative consequences. Fathers were constructed as being particularly important for boys in terms of modelling positive behaviour and providing guidance.



Amelia: Advice giving

Jerome: Every boy needs a father to show him what paths he has to go through... has to discipline him and showing him what is the right way... They sometimes look up to gangster fathers... to be in their fathers’ place because they didn’t have fathers and then they turn out to be big gangsters.

Winston: They didn’t have a father so that the father can actually tell them ok my son we have to sit down and talk about sex and how to go about it... so they just go out and do their own thing. So the father needs to be there and correcting.

Soraya: So maybe that time my daddy wasn't a father for them he this this guy came you see and this girl came along and that's when they just because [my brother]... didn't know about you know having sex and things so he just saw oh that's what you do ok right this is what the world is doing and whatever.

In the extracts above Jerome notes that “every boy *needs a father* to show him what paths he has to go through”, while Winston notes that “the father *needs to be there* and correcting”. Therefore, guidance from a father is constructed as a necessity for boys. Here Jerome and Winston can be seen to be drawing on the ‘a boy needs a father’ discourse, which constructs the appropriate guidance for male children as emanating from the father (Morrell, 2006; Ngobeni, 2006). Similarly, in a previous study with miners in Johannesburg, fathers were positioned as needing to guide their sons (Rabe, 2006). The notion of the father providing guidance for his son is reinforced through Jerome’s discussion of what happens if boys do not have a father to discipline them and teach them right from wrong: “they sometimes look up to gangster fathers...they turn out to be big gangsters”. The implication here is that if an appropriate role model (i.e. a father) is not available, boys will find an inappropriate role model (i.e. a gangster). Gangsters are discursively positioned as being ‘fathers’ due to the fact that they are role models to boys, thereby constructing role modelling as a key function of being a father.

In a similar way, both Winston and Soraya in their discussion of boys becoming fathers at a young age attribute this to the lack of guidance from their fathers: “they didn’t have a father... so they just go out and do their own thing”. Soraya also notes that her brother (in the absence of advice from his father) “just saw oh that’s what you do... this is what the world is doing”. Boys are therefore characterised as being vulnerable to external influences in contexts where their fathers are absent or not fulfilling their roles. Through noting that her father “wasn’t a father for them”, Soraya discursively positions the act of providing guidance to sons as an essential component of fathering, with a failure to do so resulting in men being stripped of their status of fathers. Fathers (who do not fulfil their role as guides and role models) are thus made responsible for their son’s early fatherhood and gangsterism; while boys who do not have fathers to fulfil these roles are positioned as destined to make bad decisions.

Implicit in the constructions of fathers providing different kinds of guidance for boys and girls is the notion that boys and girls are inherently different. Participants also made reference to

these inherent differences between men and women in their discussion of mothers and fathers and their relationships with children.

Soraya: I can speak to [my mom] about girl stuff... periods and things like pimples on your face... or um in terms of buying clothes... she can tell you because your dad is bad at that. But with daddies, I think it's very important what you speak to him because a dad is a guy and you as a girl don't know how other guys are out there. So now he can tell you right this is what guys think... Because he always say... I used to be a young man so I know what it is. .

Amelia: The whole family must have a bond. But I think the main thing is for a father and a son because a father must lead his son and a mother must lead her daughter.

Both Soraya and Amelia discussed children's relationships with mother and fathers as being innately different. Soraya notes that she can speak to her mother "about girl stuff... because your dad is bad at that", thereby representing men as ignorant of these issues. Through this, it is constructed as inappropriate for girls to discuss these kinds of topics with their fathers (Way & Gillman, 2000). In light of this 'feminine' subject positions are made unavailable to men. In contrast to her discussions with her mother, Soraya notes that she talks to her father about 'guys'. She says that "you as a girl don't know how guys are out there", thereby portraying men and women as being essentially different. Linked to this, she notes that her father "used to be a young man so [he] knows what it is", thereby characterising all men as essentially the same. Similarly, Amelia notes that "a father must lead his son and a mother must lead her daughter". While she notes that "the whole family must have a bond", she argues that the "main thing" is for the father and son (and mother and daughter) to have a good relationship, therefore reinforcing the importance of a connection between parents and children of the same gender. This can be seen to prohibit close relationships between mother and sons and father and daughters.

While most participants constructed 'protecting' as an essential role for fathers to fulfil, there were also instances where participants attempted to disrupt the notion that these roles belong solely (and unquestionably) to fathers.

Soraya: His father was in jail... so he came back now... so he used to take his father as a joke coz when he used to tell him um come here or put on your shoes he'd like ha ha

ha but now that [the father's] doing it like really, he's like really showing I'm your daddy you need to listen to me so now and then he's listening.

Courtney: And ja they say a man's supposed to have the authority but he doesn't have all the authority.

In her discussion of a father who was incarcerated and has recently returned home, Soraya notes that the son “used to take his father as a joke”. The implication here is that because he has not been present in his child’s life the father has lost his position as the natural disciplinarian. Therefore, the father’s position of natural authority within the family is undermined. Rather than constructing the father’s authority as occurring naturally, Soraya positions this authority as needing to be earned: “now that [the father’s]... showing I’m your daddy... so now and then he’s listening”. Similarly, Courtney notes that “they say a man’s supposed to have authority”, here she can be seen to be drawing on a discourse of hegemonic masculinity, through which control over others is positioned as a key component of masculinity. However, this discourse is disrupted through “but he doesn’t have all the authority”. In light of this, authoritative subject positions are made available to women and they come to be seen as capable of laying down rules (and therefore ‘protecting’ their children) (Summers et al., 1999).

Despite the fact that a few participants challenged the father’s role as the protector of his family, overall these constructions appear to be central to the way in which participants understand fathering in their community. This can perhaps be understood by examining the link between ‘protecting’ and poverty. Morrell (2006) argues that in impoverished contexts, fatherhood is likely to be more closely associated with protector roles. It could be argued that in the context of this study, where community violence, as well as drug and alcohol abuse are high, children may be more vulnerable, and therefore the role of protecting them from these types of negative influences can be seen to become more important. Consistent with this, research has found that in areas where crime and violence are high fathers are more likely to emphasise the need to ‘protect’ their children through discipline, guidance and role modelling (Summers et al., 1999; Way & Gillman, 2000).

The centrality of ‘protector’ roles to constructions of fathering can be seen to have a number of important implications for fathers, as well as other family members, including mothers and children. Firstly, a strong emphasis on the need for fathers to be positive role models (and esteemed members of the community) may encourage men to take more responsibility and

engage in few negative activities (Jones, 2010). Similarly, an emphasis on guidance may also encourage fathers to engage more with their children in the form of discussing important and sensitive issues (including sex) with them. However, these types of discussions may be limited to fathers and sons due to the fact that intimate discussions with fathers about ‘girl stuff’ are constructed as inappropriate. Linked to this, father-daughter relationships may be further restricted by assumptions about men and women being essentially different. While boys may be encouraged to follow the example set by their father, girls may be encouraged to follow the example set by their mother. Therefore, in a context where gendered discourses are prevalent (e.g. discourses which position women as nurturing mothers and men as economic providers) unequal divisions of labour with the family may be reproduced (Field, 1991).

Discourses which construct fathers as ‘protectors’ can also be seen to have important implications for families in which fathers are absent. When fathers are constructed as natural disciplinarians, guides and role models, the father is essentialised (Ngobeni, 2006). Therefore, the stability of the family is seen to result from the father’s presence and families in which fathers are absent are seen to be unstable and destructive to children’s development (Ngobeni, 2006). This is particularly important to consider within the context where this study was conducted, where the prevalence of single-mother households is high. By virtue of the fact that it is fathers rather than mothers who are predominantly constructed as disciplinarians, guides and role models, the capacity of mothers to fulfil these roles (and therefore raise healthy, well-adjusted children) is denied. Linked to this, children who are raised in single mother households are seen as being unstable and destined to end up engaging in negative activities (Ngobeni, 2006). Therefore, challenges to discourses which position fathers as sole protectors of their families, although limited, can be seen to be important ways of creating space for and legitimising alternative family structures (e.g. female-headed households in which fathers are absent).

4.4 ‘Absent’ fathers

Through their discussions of fathering in their community, participants constructed clear roles for fathers. These included being an ‘involved’ father, a provider and a protector. However, through their photo narratives participants also positioned fathers in their community as failing to fulfil these roles in the lives of their children and families. All fourteen of the participants discussed ‘absent’ fathers. Participants constructed these ‘absent’ fathers in one of two ways;

either as choosing to abandon their responsibilities or as being hindered from fulfilling these responsibilities by structural forces.



Cassidy: Abandoned child

Elton: 30% of [fathers]... here like in our community... they're taking the children away from the bad and like just to go and to have somewhere... to eat and just to have like a nice feeling.

Elton: if I walk around here in [name of residential area] and then they like permanently drink or ... the like the child is sad and I can see like it's not how can I say like a positive role model in their lives.

Winston: I would say 80% of mothers in [name of residential area] doesn't have fathers to... help them um in order to you know to provide for each and everyone in the house.

In the first extract above Elton notes that only “30% of [fathers]” take their children out to eat “just to have... a nice feeling”. In light of this the majority of fathers are constructed as not fulfilling their roles as ‘involved’ fathers because they do not engage in activities with their children. Similarly, Elton also discusses fathers who are “permanently drink[ing]”, arguing that these men are not “positive role model[s]” in the lives of their children. These fathers can be seen as failing to fulfil their role as moral protectors of their children. Winston notes that “80% of mothers [don’t] have fathers to help them... provide”, thereby constructing the majority of men in their community as failing to fulfil their responsibility as providers.

Most participants, in their discussions of men who failed to fulfil their responsibilities as fathers, constructed these men as deliberately choosing to do so.

Fernando: People are lazy. They don't want to work for their money. They want someone to just give them money and they just want to sit around and do nothing

Courtney: Or there's like a part where the mother is doing all the hard work and the father's just sitting there, lazy, doesn't want to go work, doesn't want to do nothing and the mother has to take care of the child.

Michael: Fathers that doesn't that... doesn't want to be successful and don't have a a future to plan ... they are fathers that how can I say that is way... below the bottom.

In the first extract above, Fernando, in his discussion of men who do not provide for their families, notes that this is because “people are lazy” and “they *don't want to work for their money*”. Similarly, Courtney notes that “the father's just sitting there lazy, *doesn't want to go to work*”. In light of this men are constructed as choosing not to provide for their families because they are lazy. Michael, in his discussion of men who abuse alcohol and drugs, notes that these “fathers *doesn't want to be successful*”. Again, fathers' failure to fulfil their responsibilities to their families is constructed as a conscious choice that men make. Here participants can be seen to be drawing on a discourse of ‘deadbeat dads’, which positions men as shirking their responsibilities towards their families in the absence of a valid reason (Sorensen & Zibman, 2001). Both Fernando and Courtney discursively position these men as preferring to “do nothing” rather than fulfil their responsibilities as providers. In light of this, women are constructed as bearing the full burden of “tak[ing]’ care of the child”. This is important to consider given that in participants' discussions of fathering, in many instances women have been positioned as incapable of raising children on their own. Therefore, children who are raised by mothers only can be seen to be cast as lacking proper guidance and discipline, which can only emanate from the father. Linked to this, mothers who do not have fathers to support them were constructed as being ‘single mothers’.

Winston: In my road... most of them is single mothers... not single mothers in the sense of um living alone with their children, the father will be there at the house but they will not be interested and they doesn't work.

Winston notes that within the context of his neighbourhood “most of them is single mothers”. But these women are not “living alone with their children”, rather fathers are present in the

household by “they will not be interested and they [don’t] work”. Therefore, through their lack of interest, and failure to provide, fathers are constructed as being irrelevant within the context of the family. In light of this, showing interest in the family and working to provide are discursively positioned as key fathering responsibilities, with a failure to do so resulting in men being stripped of their status of fathers and cast as ‘deadbeat dads’. This is consistent with findings from a study conducted in households in rural KwaZulu-Natal, in which ‘the dominant discourse of men remained negative and emphasised examples of men as absent, irresponsible and untrustworthy’ (Montgomery et al., 2006, p 2417).

Implicit in ‘deadbeat dad’ discourse is the assumption that men are not emotionally invested in their children and families, and therefore it is easy for them to spurn their responsibilities.

Jerome: Coz there’s other people I also know that’s that husband has left them and doesn’t even care about their children. They walk right past their children and don’t even greet them.

Winston: Well they just... run away. They just... don’t care

Cassidy: He’s riding scrap ... he take the scrap to the scrap yard and he gets now money then he go buy drugs. He doesn’t provide his family because he’s now so stuck into this drug... but he doesn’t actually like care about reality, what is happening. So that really triggers me because I did actually ask him can’t I take a photo because this is happening, most of the fathers here in [this community] is druggies and they don’t actually care about their families.

In the extract above, Jerome notes that fathers who have left their families “[don’t] even care about their children”, while Winston argues that fathers run away because “they just don’t care”. Similarly, in her discussion of fathers who are drug addicts, Cassidy notes that “they don’t actually *care* about their families”. Fathers are thus constructed as not being interested in or concerned about their children (Morrell & Richter, 2006). This is consistent with Jones’s (2010) argument that African-American men in low-income communities the United States, are represented in public discourse as being uninvolved with, uninterested in and uncommitted to their families and children. Given that men are constructed as choosing not to engage with their fathering responsibilities (or to engage in negative activities such as drug and alcohol use instead of these), they are positioned as irresponsible and emotionally disengaged. The disapproval of and resentment for these men is clear through Cassidy noting that this “really

triggers her”. Here participants can be seen to be drawing on a ‘fatherhood deficit discourse’ through which fathers are constructed as either ‘absent’ or ‘bad’ (Ratele et al., 2012). In light of this, disengaged subject positions are made available to men as fathers.

Young men in particular were represented by participants as failing to fulfil their responsibilities as fathers.



Valerie: Missing young father

Soraya: So he in terms of he himself doesn't even have money to provide. He himself is just a youngster running out there, doing his own stuff. He just don't care.

Jerome: I think this he just um made that child because he wanted to, not that he was gonna take care of it or anything.

Hayden: Because the mother have to sit with the problem, not that the child is a problem but ja. It's not it's not a planned child so they didn't like ok we're gonna plan this and... it just happened. So the mother will sit with that child while the father still feel like you know he's a free bird in life, running around. He'll be like ok and he will even get another girlfriend but she will stuck with that forever.

Soraya, Jerome and Hayden all represented teenage boys as abandoning their expected roles as fathers. In the first extract above, Soraya notes that the father “doesn’t even have money to provide”, thereby constructing him as failing to fulfil his role as a material provider for his family. She also notes that “he... is just a youngster running out there... he just doesn’t care”, whereby the young father is characterised as emotionally disengaged from his child. Through

“doing his own stuff” he is also discursively positioned as being irresponsible (as he is failing to do what the family needs him to do). Here Soraya can be drawing on an ‘irresponsible young father discourse’, through which young men are portrayed as being disinterested in and deliberately absent from the lives of their children (Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2013; Glikman, 2004). Consistent with this, it was found that engaging in youth activities such as “hanging out with the fellas” inhibited the ability of young African-American and Latino fathers in low-income communities in New York to be involved in their children’s lives (Wilkinson et al., 2009, p. 962).

Linked to this, Jerome notes that the young father “just made that child because he wanted to, not that he was going to take care of it”. Implicit here is the assumption that young men want to have sex but do not necessarily want to become fathers. When they do become fathers they are constructed as “still feel[ing] like... he’s a free bird in life, running around”. Therefore, young men are represented as not being prepared to give up their lifestyles as young ‘free’ men to assume the responsibilities of being fathers. Through such discourse, responsible and mature subject positions may be denied to young fathers. Similarly, in a study conducted in Finland it was found that some fathers were not willing to take on fathering responsibilities and wanted to carry on with their lives as they had been before the child was born (Kaila-Behm & Vehviläinen-Julkunen, 2000).

In contexts where men failed to fulfil their expected roles as fathers, their masculinity was called into question. This can be seen as an example of the way in which fatherhood and manhood are intrinsically linked (Morrell, 2007).

Aliyah: Firstly, the boys are cowards and that’s why I say boys not men because if you can’t take responsibility... you are a boy in my eyes and I think these women have realised that there they are boys and not men and they can’t deal with living with living with a boy coz... a boy would just be a burden but a man is actually someone that you can rely on.

In her discussion of fathers who do not fulfil their responsibilities, Aliyah makes a direct connection between being a “boy” and being unable to take responsibility. The ability to take responsibility as a father is discursively positioned as a masculine characteristic, while a failure to fulfil the expected roles is constructed as sub-masculine. “Boys” are also positioned as being “cowards” and being a “burden”. Here Aliyah can be seen to be drawing on a hegemonic masculine discourse, through which strength, bravery and commitment are cast as inherently

masculine traits (Bernard, 1981). Failure to conform to these characteristics results in fathers being cast as “boys” rather than “men”.

While a number of participants drew on a ‘deadbeat dad’ discourse and positioned fathers (and young fathers in particular) as choosing to not fulfil their responsibilities, there were also instances in which ambivalence was present in participants discussions of fathers who are failing to fulfil their expected roles.

Fernando: Coz if you ride in the in the along the main road you see a lot of this. I think this men is too lazy to go look for jobs. Now they just stand and wait for a job to come to them...But yet they also supportive. They will just like maybe come early in the morning and come stand along the road to look for jobs...the people sitting at the pub, they don't do this. They they'll rather sit there and wait for someone to give money to them, to go buy them beer or something like that. And it's only like a few people who do this.

Michael : People maybe ask money for some of them use it to buy drugs, some of them use it to buy alcohol... fathers that... already end up in drugs or gangsterism... that's what they choose to... They don't know what way to find out maybe to become maybe a responsible father maybe.

In his discussion of men standing on the side of the road waiting for jobs, Fernando notes that they are “too lazy to go look for jobs”, thereby constructing these men as agentially choosing not to go and look for jobs. However, he also notes that “they[re] also supportive”, positioning them as attempting to fulfil their responsibilities towards their families. There therefore exists ambivalence around whether men are *choosing* to shun their expected roles as fathers or whether larger structural forces (e.g. unemployment) are preventing men from fulfilling these roles despite their best efforts. This ambivalence can perhaps be understood in relation to the dominance of the ‘father as provider’ discourse, which strongly positions men as needing to provide for their families in order to be considered ‘good’ fathers and ‘good’ men. While men are clearly expected to be providers in their families, there also appears to be an implicit awareness that procuring paid employment is precarious in this community. Linked to this, Michael notes that fathers who end up with substance abuse problems or who are involved in gangsterism “choose” this. However, he also argues that “they don’t know [how] to find out” about being a responsible father. While on the one hand men are positioned as choosing to not fulfil their roles as responsible fathers, on the other hand they are constructed as not knowing

how to go about this. Perhaps this can be understood within a context where there are high levels of substance abuse, violence and crime, and therefore, possibly a lack of men (and women) modelling positive behaviours. In light of this, it becomes difficult for people (and particularly youth) to avoid engaging in these types of behaviours.

While the ambivalence in Fernando and Michael's accounts of fathers who do not fulfil their expected roles suggests that there is an awareness of structural factors that prevent men from fulfilling these roles, discourses of 'deadbeat dads' and 'irresponsible young fathers' can still be seen to be prevalent in these (and other participants) understandings of fathering in their community. In light of the dominance of these discourses it may have been difficult for participants to challenge them more directly and extensively. However, there were some instances in which participants seemed to be challenging discourses which position fathers as deadbeat and irresponsible. Instead participants positioned structural forces as being responsible for men's failure to fulfil their roles and responsibilities.

Aliyah: My step-father's also still looking for work... he's like looked all over. So he's still busy looking so that just shows commitment to try to provide for your family. Sometimes it just takes him over and he gets so frustrated that he can't actually get work.

Jerome: He has two children and he like um works... ok he didn't finish matric can't get other work. This is his job. He collects like cans and stuff like that, takes it to the scrap yard and gets it exchanged for money.

Winston: They are first um probably because they are very scared of and they don't know how to handle a child at their very young age and they just don't know. So they will probably just a huge amount... they will actually be scared. Not that they don't care, they will probably love the child but don't know how to express it at a young age like that.

In her discussion of her step-father's search for employment, Aliyah notes that her step-father has "looked all over". Unlike a deadbeat dad who is irresponsible, uncaring and selfish, Aliyah describes her step-father as persistent and committed to the family: "shows commitment to provide for your family". The fact that he has "looked all over" positions unemployment as being responsible for his failure to find a job, rather than his own laziness. Similarly, Jerome notes that the father who collects cans 'didn't finish' matric'. The fact that this father did not

finish matrix is constructed as being closely related to for his inability to get other work. Winston, in his discussion of young fathers notes that the experience of becoming a father may be frightening for them because “they don’t know how to handle a child”. Therefore, young fathers are represented as inexperienced, rather than as selfish and irresponsible, thereby disrupting the ‘young fathers as irresponsible discourse’. Winston goes on to argue that it’s “not that they don’t *care*” but rather that they don’t know how to express love for their child “at a young age like that”. Therefore, rather than positioning young fathers as uncaring and emotionally detached from their children, they are constructed as emotionally immature.

Despite attempts by participants to challenge discourses of absent fathers, including the ‘deadbeat dad’ and ‘young fathers as irresponsible’ discourse, these discourses appeared to be central to the way in which participants understand fathering in their community. These discourses can be seen to have important implications for men as fathers.

These discourses, which position men as agentically choosing to disengage from their fathering roles, can be seen to position men as solely responsible for their failure to fulfil their expected roles (McAdoo & McAdoo, 1998). The fact that only a few participants discussed structural factors which impede men’s ability to fulfil their responsibilities suggests that participants do not acknowledge these factors as playing a role and, therefore, hold men fully accountable for their failures. This can be seen to be particularly important within the context of the community where this study was conducted, where rates of unemployment and school drop-out are particularly high. In light of this, it is undeniable that these factors shape men’s ability to be providers, protectors and even ‘involved’ fathers. The tendency to view fathers who fail to provide, protect and be involved with their families as selfish and irresponsible can be seen to further contribute to “the numerous disincentives men face in confronting familial responsibilities” (Montgomery et al., 2006, p. 2417). Therefore, little social space is created for more engaged, involved and responsible masculinities to emerge (Montgomery et al., 2006). Challenges to discourses of ‘deadbeat’ and ‘irresponsible’ dads can be seen as one way to make more space for and encourage men to take up their expected fathering roles.

While most participants discussed the fact that fathers in their community were not fulfilling their roles and responsibilities, there were also a number of instances where they discussed examples of men (and women) who were not children’s biological fathers fulfilling fathering roles in their lives. These can be seen as examples of ‘social fathering’.

4.5 Social fathers

Eleven of the participants discussed the fulfilment of fathering roles in children's lives by men (and women) other than their biological fathers. These social fathers included uncles, neighbours, teachers, aunts, grandparents, pastors, community members, siblings, friends and gangsters. Participants also discussed instances in which mothers, as a result of the absence of fathers, were fulfilling the roles of both the mother and the father.



Bianca: Pastors in our community being strong role models influencing us to do the right thing

Bianca : Not only your real father your blood father could be a role model you look up to but also someone from outside, maybe like a pastor and that type of other people.

Jerome: When my father wasn't... there... my grandfather was always around like... tell me what the... right way was. I think in in our community there most most probably when the fathers aren't there the grandparents are there to like... um... to like also show them what is right and wrong.

Bianca: It's not necessarily that... you only teach your children the right way... it's a man that's a teacher... he guides not only one child but also a lot of children... in the right direction because the children is going in the wrong direction.

Winston: It's... a teacher on our school which is actually a very good father... [he is] there to talk to you, to give you advice.

In the first extract above, Bianca notes that “not only your real father... could be a role model”. Through this she can be seen to be challenging the implicit assumption that it is only the biological father (“blood father”) who serves as a role model for the child. Therefore, she can be seen to be creating space for other family and community members to take up these positions in children’s lives. Similarly, Jerome notes that in the absence of the father “grandparents are there... [to] show them what is right and wrong”, thereby disrupting the notion that it is only fathers who provide guidance for their children. Linked to this, both Bianca and Winston position teachers at their schools as social fathers because “he guides... children in the right direction” and is there “to give you advice”. Here participants can be seen to be drawing on a discourse of social fatherhood, which positions fathering as an achieved social relationship (Dermott, 2008). In light of this, it is the social rather than the biological nature of the relationship which is foregrounded. It is not merely the biological connection between father and child which is constructed as being important, but rather the nature of the fathering relationships (i.e. being a positive role model and providing guidance and advice). Therefore, guiding and role model positions are made available to other family members, as well as members of the wider community. Linked to this, the notion that children (and boys in particular) whose fathers are absent (or not playing their roles as disciplinarians and role models) are destined to end up making bad decisions can also be seen to be disrupted, as alternative role models are made available to them. This is consistent with findings of studies which have been conducted both in South African and internationally, where family members as well as members of the wider community (including older brothers, grandparents, uncles, neighbours, teachers and school principals) have been identified as father figures in children’s lives (Allen & Doherty, 1996; Langa; 2010a, Ramphele & Richter, 2006). While participants discussed family and community members who were role models and guides, they also made reference to people who played more intimate, emotional roles in their own and other children’s lives.

Saarah: This man is my neighbour... he’s also a father to me because... my father in particular doesn’t live with me... he [the neighbour] comes there, he asks me how are you doing, how was your day and all the things that a father should do. He comes and just look up on me and stuff.

Cassidy: My grandma is very supportive, my grandma and my aunt... like the love they give to me. They support me like emotionally.

Aliyah: Even if we do not have a father of our own...there's always going to be that uncle or that grandpa or that grandmother or that auntie that's going to be there for you.

In the first extract above, Saarah notes that her neighbour: “comes there, he asks me how are you doing, how was your day and all the things that a *father should do*”. Through this, he is positioned as playing a fatherly role in her life. Similarly, in her discussion of the lack of emotional support she receives from her father, Cassidy positions her aunt and grandmother as fulfilling this role in her life: ‘they support me like *emotionally*’. Linked to this, Aliyah notes that in the absence of the biological father “there’s always going to be that uncle or that grandpa or that grandmother or that auntie that that’s going to *be there* for you”. Through the use of the word “always”, the availability of family members to fulfil this role is constructed as a permanent fact. All three of the participants can be seen to be drawing on a discourse of social fatherhood, with emphasis being placed on the nature and quality of the relationship between the father figure and the child, rather than the biological connection. This can be seen in the way Saarah refers to her neighbour as being “a *father*” to her as a result of the nature of the interaction between them. In light of this, emotionally engaged subject positions are made available to other family and community members. Therefore, alternative forms of emotional support are made available to children. This is consistent with findings from a study conducted in rural KwaZulu-Natal, where social fathers were found to engage in domestic care of and emotional involvement with children (Montgomery et al., 2006). While participants positioned family members, as well as members of the community as fulfilling positive emotional roles in the lives of children, two participants also discussed the ways in which gangsters acted as social fathers for children.

Courtney: There isn't even someone special. So now the gangsters come and... they're gonna give you that. They're the first people to show you love. They will give the children food... they will take the people to the beach... then tomorrow the gangster comes to you, here keep this gun or shoot this person for me, I did that for you.

Hayden: Because he didn't have a father and because he have no direction he is... naïve he can be dyed in any colour which means if a gangster come and a gangster tell him you know take the gun, shoot, he will definitely shoot.

Courtney notes that in the absence of “someone special”, gangsters will be “the first people to show you love... give the children food... take the people to the beach”. Therefore, through

these activities gangsters are constructed as forming relationships with children. Once these relationships have been formed “the gangster comes to you, here keep this gun or shoot this person for me”. Therefore, children who do not have a positive relationship with their fathers (or who do not have a positive social father), are represented as vulnerable to attention from gangsters. This is further reinforced by Hayden’s comment that “because he didn’t have a father and because he have no direction he is... naïve”. He goes on to say that if” a gangster tell him you know take the gun, shoot, he will definitely shoot”. The use of the word “definitely” constructs this as inevitable. In light of this, positive social fathers are positioned as important not only for providing children with guidance, positive role models and love, but also because they prevent children from developing potentially dangerous relationships with negative father figures.

Through their discussions of fathering in their community, participants positioned a range of different people as social fathers in the lives of children. Linked to this, there were also a few participants that discussed how, in the absence of fathers, mother have taken on both parenting roles.



Cassidy: Mother playing both mother and father roles

Aliyah: I think that fatherhood is not just fathers. It’s actually mothers as well coz in our daily lives we find that some people don’t actually have fathers... and the mother actually does the father’s role as well as the mother’s role.

Soraya: In the area that I’m in... there are a lot of mothers that play the father role and the mother role in terms of supporting and caring and safety and stuff. So that’s why I

chose it... coz it's a single mother with a daughter trying to give her everything she needs.

Valerie: To show um people that even though you do need a dad, you don't need a dad that much because there are good moms... she would go to work for her kids and she's trying to provide for her house, putting her house right.

In the first extract above Aliyah notes that “fatherhood is not just fathers. It’s actually mothers as well”. Through this, mothers are positioned as being able to take up fathering roles. This is further reinforced by: “the mother actually does the father’s role as well as the mother’s role”. Similarly, Soraya notes that “there are a lot of mothers that play the father role and the mother role in terms of supporting and caring and safety and stuff”. Linked to this Valerie says that “even though you do need a dad, you don’t need a dad that much because there are good moms”. Here she can be seen to be challenging the construction of fathers as essential to their children’s well-being. Therefore, the assumption that the biological father’s absence results in maladjustment in children is refuted. The essentialness of the father is further challenged by Valerie’s construction of the mother as the provider (“she would go to work for her kids and she’s trying to provide for her kids”). Therefore, the notion that the provider role belongs solely to the father (as previously discussed), is disrupted. Similarly, in a study conducted with men in Botswana it was found that participants referred to mothers who took on both the male and female roles in the household (Datta, 2007). It has been argued that this is “illustrative of the extent to which motherhood may be being reconstructed... due to the absence of fathers” (Datta, 2007, p. 106).

The fact that the majority of the participants drew on a discourse of social fatherhood, and that some participants positioned mothers as (successfully) fulfilling both the mother and father’s roles in the lives of their children, can be seen to have a number of important implications. Firstly, it can be seen as evidence of shifting notions of the family (Ratele et al., 2012). It can be argued that through challenging “the biological determinism of ‘real’ fatherhood”, the multiple and fluid nature of family structures can be recognised (Clowes et al., 2013, p.263). Through the discourse of social fatherhood, alternative (extended) family structures (as well as community networks) are positioned as contributing positively to children’s development. These alternative structures are also made available to children as legitimate forms of emotional support. This is important as it extends the ‘safety net’ that is available to children in communities in which various risk factors co-exist (Allen & Doherty, 1996).

Secondly, participants' discussions of mothers fulfilling both parenting roles can be seen to position the female-headed household as a legitimate family structure, which contributes positively to child's well-being. This can be seen to challenge notions of these households as potentially harmful to children's 'normal', 'healthy' development (Langa, 2010a; Ratele et al., 2012). This may be particularly important within the context of the community in which the study took place, with participants' narratives suggesting a high prevalence of female-headed households.

Finally, the fact that participants constructed social fathering roles as being held by both men and women also suggests that traditional notions that fatherhood is inextricably linked to maleness are shifting. It can perhaps be argued that instead of constructing 'motherhood' and 'fatherhood', participants are instead constructing 'parenthood', a role which can be taken up by either men or women. In light of this, traditional gendered (and inherently unequal) parenting roles can be seen to be transforming, with space being made for more egalitarian versions.

4.6 Summary

This chapter has explored the discourses drawn on by participants in their discussions of fathering in their community. Participants can be seen to have drawn on gendered discourses which position men (and women) in particular ways. While mothers were positioned as 'natural' care-givers and nurturers, fathers were positioned as financial providers and moral protectors. In light of these rigid constructions, men (and women) were denied alternative subject positions. However, within participants' photo narratives there were also instances in which they challenged these gendered discourses and attempted to make more nurturing and emotional subject positions available to men as fathers. For example, participants drew on a discourse of 'involved' fathering to represent the provision of love and care as an important aspect of 'good' fathering. While participants constructed particular roles for fathers they also represented men in their community as 'absent' fathers, who chose not to fulfil these roles in the lives of their children and families. Therefore, these men are regarded as 'deadbeat dads' and are seen to be solely responsible for their failure to fulfil their fathering roles. However, there were some participants who challenged the discourse of 'deadbeat dads' through positioning structural factors as being responsible for men's failure to fulfil their fathering roles and responsibilities. While some men were constructed as choosing to disengage from their

fathering responsibilities, other men (and women) were portrayed as stepping in to fulfil fathering roles in the lives of children, as social fathers.

In the following chapter, the findings will be considered in relation to previous literature on fathering. The limitations of the study will also be discussed and suggestions will be made in terms of future research and practice.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This study sought to identify and explore the discourses that adolescents in an urban, low-income community in Cape Town drew on in their photo narratives about fathering in their community. In particular, the study aimed to examine how fathers' roles and responsibilities were constructed by participants, as well as the implications of these constructions. This was done in light of quantitative research which has suggested that fathering is associated with positive child outcomes and, therefore, that fathers have important roles to play in their children's lives. The analysis was also informed by qualitative research which has demonstrated that understandings of fathering are shaped by a range of social and cultural factors. The results of the study contribute to the limited research which has been conducted on children's perspectives on fathering in South Africa. The results of the study suggest that the ways in which these adolescents construct fathering are influenced by dominant discourses of fathering (including discourses of providing, protecting, and 'involved' fathering), as well as gendered discourses which position men and women in particular ways.

This chapter will provide a summary of the findings, as well as concluding remarks. Firstly, a summary of the findings will be presented and the implications of these findings will be discussed. This will be followed by a discussion of the limitations of the study and issues of reflexivity. Thereafter, some suggestions will be made with regard to future research. Finally, some practical implications of this research will be discussed.

5.1 Summary of findings

This section will provide a summary of the discourses which participants drew upon in constructing fathers' roles and responsibilities. There were six main discourses which participants drew on in their discussions of fathering in their community: 'natural' mothering, 'involved' fathering, father as 'provider', father as 'moral protector', 'absent' fathers and social fathers.

Mothers were constructed by participants as having a 'natural' capacity to care for and nurture children. Participants drew on 'bonding' and 'natural' mothering discourses which constructed mothers as possessing an intrinsic connection to their children. Fathers, on the other hand were constructed as lacking the same intrinsic emotional connection with children, and, therefore, lacking the ability to meet their emotional needs. In light of this, mothers were positioned as being solely responsible for providing for their children's emotional needs. Therefore,

participants' can be seen to have drawn strongly on an essentialist discourse which positions mothers (and women more generally) as natural care-givers, while simultaneously denying men this role. This is consistent with research which has been conducted both internationally and in South Africa, which has found that essentialist constructions of mothering persist "despite clear changes in women's decisions about mothering and employment" (Maher & Saugeres, 2007, p. 6). There were very few instances in which participants attempted to challenge the notion of mothers as natural care-givers. In light of this, while fathers are denied caring subject positions, and therefore, are discouraged from taking up caring roles in their children's lives, women are fixed in caring subject positions, with little space being made available for them to take up alternative roles.

Although discourses of 'natural' mothering were dominant in participants' photo narratives, there were also instances in which a degree of contradiction and ambiguity were present and participants appeared to be attempting to disrupt the notion that men are inherently incapable of meeting children's emotional needs. Participants also challenged this assumption more directly through drawing on a discourse of 'involved' fathering, whereby fathers were positioned as emotionally and physically engaged with their children. Through this discourse participants also appeared to be attempting to challenge hegemonic constructions of masculinity, and to reposition emotional expressiveness (which has traditionally been regarded as 'feminine' and therefore 'un-masculine') as a key component of masculinity. Research both in South Africa and internationally has documented the way in which 'good' fathering is increasingly constructed in relation to emotional engagement and involvement in children's lives.

While participants constructed emotional and physical engagement as key components of 'good' fathering, only one participant also represented participation in household tasks (which have traditionally been regarded as women's work) as an important aspect of 'good' fathering (and 'good' masculinity). The fact that only one participant constructed fathering in this particular way suggests that the notion that women should be responsible for the majority of domestic tasks (including child-care) remains dominant amongst this particular group of young people. Therefore, little space is made available for a renegotiation of (more equal) domestic responsibilities to occur.

Financial provision was constructed as a key element of fathering by all but two of the participants. Implicit within this discourse were notions of making sacrifices and taking responsibility. Linked to this, financial provision was also constructed as a central component of masculinity. While the discourse of ‘father as provider’ is undoubtedly central to the ways in which this particular group of young people understand fathering, it is interesting to note that almost all of them also discussed the fact that the majority of fathers in their community do not fulfil this responsibility. Therefore, it appears that the discourse of ‘father as provider’ remains hegemonic, despite the perceived absence of fathers that actually enact this particular role. In light of this, there appears to exist a very rigid expectation that men will provide for their families, with their failure to do this resulting in them being considered ‘bad’ fathers and ‘bad’ men.

While there were instances in which participants challenged the ‘father as provider’ discourse, by drawing on an ‘involved’ fathering discourse and constructing mere financial provision as insufficient for meeting children’s emotional needs, overall this discourse was not disrupted. Instead financial provision was represented as the bare minimum that a father should do. Consistent with this, international and South African research has documented that economic contribution continues to be recognised as a key form of male involvement within the family (Montgomery et al., 2006).

Fathers were also positioned as needing to morally protect their families through instilling discipline, as well as acting as positive role models. The absence of a father to fulfil these roles in the lives of children was represented as inevitably leading to children making bad decisions. A number of studies which have been conducted in South Africa, as well as elsewhere in the world, have suggested that the provision of discipline, as well as role modelling, are important roles for fathers to fulfil, particularly in the lives of male children (Morrell, 2006). Fathers, therefore, continue to occupy a position bestowed with power, respect and authority within the family (Maqubela, 2013).

Within the context of this study, fathers were discursively positioned as particularly important in the lives of their sons, in terms of providing them with a positive role model. In contrast, girls were positioned as needing to be protected from negative male influences by their fathers. Although limited research has explored the father-daughter relationship in the South African context, the findings from this study are consistent with research which has been conducted in

the United States. Similarly, in these studies, daughters were represented as needing their father's protection, particularly from the influence of boys.

Although limited, there were also instances in which participants attempted to disrupt the unquestioned power and authority of the father. This can be seen to have important implications within the context of a society such as South Africa, where gender power inequalities, through which men are positioned as powerful, have been linked to high rates of violence against women and children (Jewkes & Abrahams, 2002). Therefore, despite being limited, these attempts to disrupt problematic hegemonic constructions of masculinity can be seen to be particularly significant.

In much of their narratives about their photographs the participants represented the majority of men in their community as failing to fulfil their roles and responsibilities as fathers. Men were predominantly represented as choosing to disengage from these roles and responsibilities. This is consistent with local and international research which has demonstrated that 'black' fathers in particular have tended to be positioned as untrustworthy and irresponsible (Richter, 2006). This representation has important implications as it holds men solely, personally and morally responsible for their failure to fulfil their fathering roles and responsibilities. This understanding can be seen to have important implications for men as fathers within the context of South Africa. . Research which has been conducted with fathers both in South Africa and internationally has documented how structural barriers (including lack of education, unemployment as well as gendered assumptions which position women as care-givers) have limited men's abilities to fulfil certain roles and responsibilities in the lives of their children and families. In light of participants' failure to acknowledge that a range of factors (including poverty and unemployment) continue to limit men's ability to fulfil certain roles within their families, individual men are blamed for their failure as providers. However, there were some instances in which participants attempted to challenge the discourse of 'deadbeat dads', through representing structural factors as being responsible for men's ability to fulfil their obligations as fathers.

Participants represented men (and women) who were not children's biological fathers as fulfilling fathering roles in their lives. These social fathers included family members, as well as members of the wider community. This is consistent with research which has been conducted in South Africa which has documented that fathering is not carried out by the biological father

alone (Ratele et al., 2012). In light of this, the family structure is extended beyond that of the nuclear family, and wider support networks are made available to children. This can be seen to be particularly important within the context on which the study took place, as participants' narrative suggested that biological fathers are often not available (or at least are perceived to be unavailable) to their children. Mothers were also constructed as having a particularly important role to play in the lives of children whose biological fathers were absent. They were constructed as playing the roles of fathers, as well as mothers, in their children's lives. This is consistent with a study which has been conducted in Botswana as well as a study with low-income adolescents in Johannesburg, where mothers were constructed as playing dual-parenting roles in children's lives (Datta, 2007; Langa, 2010a). These findings can be seen to challenge notions that in the absence of fathers, family life is in 'crisis', while positioning female-headed households as legitimate family structures. This is particularly important in the context of South Africa (as well as the specific community in which the study took place) as research has demonstrated that a large portion of children live in female-headed households.

Overall, the findings from this study can be seen to be largely consistent with research which has been conducted in South Africa, as well as internationally, with both fathers and children. Despite the fact that the context in which this study took place can be seen to differ in a number of ways from those of previous research, it appears that similar constructions of fathering have emerged. This suggests that certain conceptualisations of fathering occupy a hegemonic position not only within the South African context but also more universally. In light of this, it may be difficult to challenge these.

5.2 Limitations

The current study has a number of limitations, related to the qualitative research design, the choice of research focus, as well as the use of a discourse analysis. This research was carried out with a very specific group of young people, within a particular community environment. As has been suggested in the analysis section, there are a number of ways in which the particular conditions present in this community appear to have shaped the constructions of fathering which emerged in the study (for example, poverty, unemployment and the presence of high levels of crime and violence seemed to be interconnected with participants' constructions of fathers roles and responsibilities). Similarly, the participants represent a particular sub-set of youth in this community. As they are part of a community-based youth leadership programme, through which they have received particular training, mentorship and

support which is not available to other young people in this environment. They are also all in their final years of schooling, making them among the minority in their community. Therefore, it can be argued that the participants represent an especially resilient and resourceful sub-group of young people within this particular context. It may be this resilience and resourcefulness which allowed participants to start to challenge hegemonic discourses which construct particular (rigid and problematic) roles and responsibilities for fathers. In light of this, it is likely that the constructions of fathering produced by this group of young people is likely to be different from those produced by other young people in this community and young people in other communities.

It can also be argued that the particular research focus on fathering has limited what could be found in this study. Given that the study aimed to explore the ways in which fathers roles and responsibilities were constructed, and participants were specifically instructed to photograph ‘fathering in your community’, participants were to some extent constrained in what they could photograph and then discuss in their interviews. During the course of the research process it became clear that participants’ constructions of fathering are embedded within very particular understandings of families and were in many ways interlinked with (and often in contrast to) constructions of mothering. While this was to some extent explored in this study, there is a need to more fully examine how constructions of families (and the nuclear family in particular) and mothering interact with constructions of fathering.

Finally, because this study was primarily concerned with the ways in which fathers’ roles and responsibilities are constructed, it identified the discourses which participants drew on when constructing fathering in particular ways. However, it can be argued that a focus on discourses of fathering may only shed light on a limited aspect of fathering. LaRossa (1988) notes that fathering is made up of two distinct, but related elements: “the *culture of fatherhood* (the shared norms, values, and beliefs surrounding men’s parenting) and... the *conduct of fatherhood* (what fathers do, their paternal behaviours)” (p. 451). Therefore, while it is often assumed that these two elements are in sync in a particular society, evidence suggests that this is often not the case. This study can be seen to be limited to a focus on the culture of fatherhood (how fathering is constructed), and further research is needed in order to better understand the relationship between these constructions and actual fathering behaviours.

The findings of the study can also be seen to be shaped and, therefore, limited in certain ways by the nature of the relationships between myself as the researcher and my participants. It is to this issue of reflexivity that I now turn.

5.3 Reflexivity

Reflexivity has been identified as an important component of qualitative research. Through the qualitative research process, knowledge is produced in the interaction between the researcher and the participants (Ashworth, 2008). Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention to the ways in which the researcher has contributed to the construction of meanings (Willig, 2008). This involves “reflecting upon the ways in which our values, experiences, interests, beliefs, political commitments, wider aims in life and social identities have shaped the research” (Willig, 2008, p. 10). Reflexivity also invites us to consider how certain insights and understandings may have been made possible by our reactions to the data and research context (Willig, 2008). Within the context of this research study, I was paradoxically positioned as both an ‘insider’ and an ‘outsider’. In this section I wish to explore the ways in which I feel that this contradictory positioning has shaped the data.

5.3.1 On the ‘inside’

In 2013 (the year prior to the start of the study) I spent the year working as a counsellor for the same organisation from which my participants were recruited. During the course of the year I attended and helped to organise a number of the community events held by the organisation. My participants, as members of the organisation’s youth-leadership programme were also involved in these events. Therefore, on a number of occasions I interacted with and participated alongside them. These interactions occurred with a relaxed and often playful and jovial environment where we were able to chat and joke and laugh. In light of this, a sense of familiarity was established. At the beginning of the research process I was, therefore, not simply a strange researcher who had come from the ‘outside’ world, but rather a familiar member of the same organisation.

I also feel that my identity as a counsellor profoundly shaped the meanings which were constructed during the interview process. Not only were participants aware that I was a counsellor, but during the course of the interviews I found it hard to disengage from this part of myself. In light of this, many of the questions were framed in terms of feelings.

Rebecca: Ja so you think your father is like that a kind of example? And how do you *feel* then when you guys go out on a Saturday and do things together?

Elton: I feel like I feel like joy like I can say because from like from the weekend then he like work and then I ha- then I hardly see him like during the week. So I feel joyness and happiness.

Rebecca: Mhmm. Mhmm. And do you think a lot of kids maybe *feel* like they can't talk to people at home?

Winston: Ja a lot of people because sometimes I feel like I can't talk to my mother of about certain things which I would rather wanted to talk to my father about.

I would argue that my position as the familiar counsellor, as well as the way in which I framed questions in terms of personal feelings, created a context in which participants could reflect on their own fathering experiences, particularly in instances where these experiences were painful. As can be seen from Chapter 4, these feelings and experiences were often central to constructions of fathering roles and responsibilities.

5.3.2 On the 'outside'

Although I was in some ways positioned as an 'insider', during the reading of the transcripts it became very clear to me that I was also positioned as an 'outsider'. As a middle-class, 'white', university student I was different in many ways from my participants and a representative of the world that lies beyond their community. My position as an 'outsider' was made explicit through participants active attempts to resist certain identities.

Winston: As I talked about the other photo about a mother that's actually doing all these stuff for their family except the father just the father being completely out of the picture I want to to I choose this photo to see to like *to let you know* that there is actually fathers that always that always make time for their kids.

Valerie: Because um *to show people* there is a father who stands by his family, there is a father who stands by his wife, there is a father that provides for this family, helping his wife, helping the kids with their books, pro- doing all do like there is a good father that sorry won't go the bad way but do the good way.

Elton: *To show like the people* that there can be good fathers like here like here in our place.

As is evident from the above extracts, participants sought to actively challenge negative constructions of fathers in their community. These attempts to disrupt negative perceptions of fathers (and by extension of their community and themselves) were very clearly directed towards me. Within the context of the research process I was a representative of the outside world (a world which often stereotypes low-income, high-violence communities, and the people who live in these communities, as deviant, hopeless, and ‘deadbeat’). Therefore, I represented an audience for which participants could demonstrate that these stereotypes are not true and, alternatively present fathers in their communities in positive ways.

Although my position as an ‘insider’ and an ‘outsider’ may have made certain constructions possible, it can also be seen to have prevented other constructions from emerging. For example, through framing many of my questions in relation to feelings, I may have prevented participants from drawing on other (less emotionally-orientated) constructions. Similarly, my status as an ‘outsider’ was made very clear on a number of instances in the text. Therefore, it is likely that participants may have avoided constructing fathers in particular ways because they did not feel completely comfortable sharing these constructions with an ‘outsider’ or wished to portray a particular version of fathering to the outside world.

5.4 Directions for future research and practice

In light of the limitations of this study there is a need to investigate the ways in which other groups of young people in this particular community, as well as other communities, construct fathering roles and responsibilities. Through this research understandings of how particular social and cultural factors shape constructions of fathering in particular ways will likely be advanced. There is also a need to more fully investigate the ways in which understandings of families and mothering are related to understandings of fathers and fathering. Within the current study it appeared that families were implicitly understood to exist as nuclear units (father, mother and child(ren) living in the same house). Undoubtedly, this construction of the family shaped the constructions of fathering that emerged in particular ways. An examination of the ways in which the family is constructed is, therefore, likely to provide a more comprehensive understanding of constructions of fathering. Similarly, an examination of constructions of mothering (which pays particular attention to the similarities and differences between these constructions and those of fathering) is also likely to advance understandings of the ways in which fathers roles and responsibilities are constructed. There is also a need to investigate the conduct of fatherhood (what fathers are actually doing), and how this relates to

constructions of fathering roles and responsibilities, in order to develop a fuller picture of fathering within this particular context.

The findings of this study can be seen to have a number of practical implications for working with young people, as well as fathers in this particular community. The fact that participants at times resisted dominant discourses and challenged essentialist discourses which position men and women in particular ways suggests that through engaging youth in discussions about fathering, space for alternative types of fathering can be developed. However, the fact that essentialist discourses were so dominant in participants' discussions about fathering in their community, suggests that there is a need to further engage youth in this particular community in thinking about and developing alternative ideas about fathers and fathering. This is particularly important given the fact that the socio-economic realities of this community restrain many men from fulfilling the role of providers that have been constructed by participants, therefore these men are unable to be seen as 'good' fathers. Developing alternative understandings of fathering can also be seen to be important in light of the fact that these understandings will enable new (and more equal) ways of being fathers (and mothers), as well as men (and women) more generally. This is necessary in order to challenge essentialist notions, which limit what is possible for men and women.

In order to facilitate the development of these alternative understandings, ongoing workshops and group discussions could be held with participants which engage them in thinking more critically about the role of fathers in their own lives, as well as what types of fathers they would like to be. Dialogue between fathers and youth could also be facilitated in order to strengthen existing relationships and open up new ones. This could be done through holding workshops with participants and members from the men's group which is run by the same organisation. These workshops could also be used to make fathers aware of the ways in which young people construct fathering roles and responsibilities, as well as the ways in which men can begin transforming fathering (and masculinity) within their community, by, for example taking up 'involved' and nurturing subject positions in the lives of their children and families.

5.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, although participants drew heavily on hegemonic gendered discourses which fixed fathers (and mothers) in quite rigid ways, there were and also instances in which participants challenged these discourses. These alternative constructions can be seen to be particularly significant in light of the hegemonic nature of fathering and gendered discourses

within the context of South African society. It has been argued that it is necessary to meaningfully integrate men into the household, in order to facilitate the renegotiation of gender relations, roles and responsibilities, not only within this context, but within society more generally (Datta, 2007). Therefore, within the context of this study, it appears that fathering represents a potential site for the development of progressive constructions of masculinity which “privilege care, respect and active involvement” (Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2013, p. 1). This suggests that fathering can be seen as an important site for social change and, therefore, it should be regarded as an important area of investigation within the context of future work on masculinities.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M., & Coltrane, S. (2005). Boys and men in families: The domestic production of gender, power and privilege. In M. Kimmel, J. Hearn & R. W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities* (pp. 230-248). California, CA: Sage.
- Adhikari, M. (2005). *Not white enough, not black enough: Racial identity in the South African coloured community*. Cape Town, South Africa: Double Story Books.
- Adomako Ampofo, A., & Boateng, J. (2007). Multiple meanings of manhood among boys in Ghana. In T. Shefer, K. Ratele, A. Strebel, N. Shabalala, & R. Buikema (Eds.), *From boys to men: Social constructions of masculinity in contemporary society* (pp. 50-74). Cape Town, South Africa: UCT Press.
- Allen, W. D., & Doherty, W. J. (1996). The responsibilities of fatherhood as perceived by African American teenage fathers. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 77, 142-155.
- Amato, P. R., & Gilbreth, J. G. (1999). Nonresident fathers and children's well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 557-573.
- Anderson, I., & Doherty, K. (2008). *Accounting for rape: Psychology, feminism and discourse analysis in the study of sexual violence*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ashworth, P. (2008). Conceptual foundations of qualitative psychology. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods* (2nd ed.) (pp. 4-25). London, England: Sage.
- Babbie, E., & Mouton, J. (2002). *Social research*. California, CA: Wadsworth Group.
- Bachrach, C., & Sonenstein, F. (1998). Male fertility and family formation: Research and data needs on pathways to fatherhood. In Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics (Ed.), *Nurturing fatherhood: Improving data and research on male fertility, family formation, and fatherhood* (pp. 45 - 98). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

- Badroodien, A. (2006). The state as non-biological 'father': Exploring the experience of fathering in a South African state institution in the period 1950 to 1970. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.), *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 82 -98). Cape Town, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Banks, M. (2001). *Visual methods in social research*. London, England: Sage.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13, 544-559.
- Bergen, J. (1972). *Ways of seeing*. London, England: Penguin.
- Bernard, J. (1981). The good-provider role: Its rise and fall. *American Psychologist*, 36, 1 - 12.
- Berry, V. (1992). From Good Times to the Cosby Show: Perceptions of changing televised images among black fathers and sons. In S. Craig (Ed). *Men, masculinity, and the media*, (pp. 111-123). London, England: Sage.
- Best, D. L., House, A. S., Barnard, A. E., & Spicker, B. S. (1994). Parent-child interactions in France, Germany, and Italy: The effects of gender and culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25, 181-193.
- Boonzaier, F., & Shefer, T. (2006). Gendered research. In T. Shefer, F. Boonzaier & P. Kiguwa (Eds.), *The gender of psychology* (pp. 3-11). Cape Town, South Africa: UCT Press.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss*. London, England: Hogarth Press.
- Brandth, B., & Kvande, E. (1998). Masculinity and child care: The reconstruction of fathering. *The Sociological Review*, 46, 293-313.
- Bretherton, I. (1985). Attachment theory: Retrospect and prospect. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50, 3-35.
- Brunsdon, V., & Goatcher, J. (2007). Reconfiguring photovoice for psychological research. *The Irish Journal of Psychology*, 28, 43-52.

- Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism*. East Sussex, England: Psychology Press.
- Cabrera, N., Tamis -LeMonda, C. S., Bradley, R. H., Hofferth, S., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Fatherhood in the twenty-first century. *Child Development, 71*, 127-136.
- Chopra, R. (2001). Retrieving the father: Gender studies, “father love” and the discourse of mothering. *Women's Studies International Forum, 24*, 445-455.
- Christiansen, S. L., & Palkovitz, R. (2001). Why the “good provider” role still matters: Providing as a form of paternal involvement. *Journal of Family Issues, 22*, 84-106.
- Clark, C. D. (1999). The autodrivn interview: A photographic viewfinder into children's experience. *Visual Studies, 14*, 39-50.
- Clark-Ibanez, M. (2004). Framing the social world with photo-elicitation interviews. *American Behavioral Scientist, 47*, 1507-1527.
- Clowes, L. (2006). Men and children: Changing constructions of fatherhood in Drum magazine, 1951-1965. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.), *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 108 -120). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.
- Clowes, L., Ratele, K., & Shefer, T. (2013). Who needs a father? South African men reflect on being fathered. *Journal of Gender Studies, 22*, 255-267.
- Coley, R. L. (2001). (In) visible men: Emerging research on low-income, unmarried, and minority fathers. *American Psychologist, 56*, 743 - 753.
- Collier, J., & Collier, M. (1986). *Visual anthropology: Photography as a research method*. New Mexico, NM: UNM Press.
- Coltrane, S. (1998). Stability and change in Chicano men's family lives. In M. S. Kimmel, & M. A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives* (4th ed.) (pp. 520-536). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person, and sexual politics*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

- Connell, R. W. (2000). *The men and the boys*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Corbin, J., & Morse, J. M. (2003). The unstructured interactive interview: Issues of reciprocity and risks when dealing with sensitive topics. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9, 335-354.
- Daly, K. J. (1996). Spending time with the kids: Meanings of family time for fathers. *Family Relations*, 45, 466-476.
- Datta, K. (2007). "In the eyes of a child, a father is everything": Changing constructions of fatherhood in urban Botswana? *Women's Studies International Forum*, 30, 97-113.
- Davis, S. N., & Gergen, M. M. (1997). Toward a new psychology of gender: Opening conversations. In M. M. Gergen, & S. N. Davis (Eds.) *Toward a new psychology of gender: A reader* (pp. 1-30). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dermott, E. (2008). *Intimate fatherhood: A sociological analysis*. London, England: Routledge.
- Desmond, C., & Desmond, C. (2006). HIV/AIDS and the crisis of care for children. In L. Richter, & R. Morrell (Eds.), *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 226-236). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press
- Dickson, K. L., Walker, H., & Fogel, A. (1997). The relationship between smile type and play type during parent-infant play. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 925 - 933.
- Doherty, W. J., Kouneski, E. F., & Erickson, M. F. (1998). Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual framework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 277-292.
- Doucet, A. (2004). "It's almost like I have a job, but I don't get paid": Fathers at home reconfiguring work, care, and masculinity. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers*, 2, 277-303.
- Dudová, R. (2006). Old obligations in the modern world: The father as provider before and after divorce. *Czech Sociological Review*, 3, 573-590.

- Enderstein, A., & Boonzaier, F. (2013). Narratives of young South African fathers: Redefining masculinity through fatherhood. *Journal of Gender Studies*, (ahead-of-print), 1-16.
- Field, S. (1991). "Sy is die baas van die huis": Women's position in the coloured working class family. *Agenda*, 7, 60-70.
- Field, S. (2001). Disappointed men: Masculine myths and hybrid identities in Windermere. In R. Morrell (Ed.), *Changing men in Southern Africa* (pp. 211-224). Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: University of Natal Press.
- Finn, M., & Henwood, K. (2009). Exploring masculinities within men's identificatory imaginings of first-time fatherhood. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48, 547-562.
- Flouri, E. (2005). *Fathering and child outcomes*. West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Flouri, E., & Buchanan, A. (2002). Life satisfaction in teenage boys: The moderating role of father involvement and bullying. *Aggressive Behavior*, 28, 126-133.
- Flouri, E., & Buchanan, A. (2004). Early father's and mother's involvement and child's later educational outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 141-153.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Gallinetti, J. (2006). Legal aspects of fatherhood in South Africa. In L. Richter, & R. Morrell (Eds.), *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 201-215). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.
- Gavey, N. (1997). Feminist poststructuralism and discourse analysis. In M. M. Gergen, & S. N. Davis (Eds.), *Toward a new psychology of gender: A reader* (pp. 49-64). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gillespie, R. (2000). When no means no: Disbelief, disregard and deviance as discourses of voluntary childlessness. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 23, 223-234.

- Glikman, H. (2004). Low-income young fathers: Contexts, connections, and self. *Social Work, 49*, 195-206.
- Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: Power, knowledge and discourse. In M. Wetherell, S. S. Taylor & S. J. Yate (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 72-81). London, England: Sage.
- Hare-Mustin, R. T. (2004). Can we demystify theory? Examining masculinity discourses and feminist postmodern theory. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, 24*, 14 - 29.
- Hays, S. (1996). *The cultural contradictions of motherhood*. Connecticut, CT: Yale University Press.
- Henwood, K., & Procter, J. (2003). The 'good father': Reading men's accounts of paternal involvement during the transition to first-time fatherhood. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 337-355.
- Hergenrather, K. C., Rhodes, S. D., Cowan, C. A., Bardhoshi, G., & Pula, S. (2009). Photovoice as community-based participatory research: A qualitative review. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 33*, 686 - 698.
- Hochschild, A. (1998). The second shift: Employed women are putting in another day of work at home. In M. S. Kimmel, & M. A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives* (4th ed.) (pp. 515-519). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hollway, W. (1983). Heterosexual sex: Power and desire for the other. In S. Cartedge, & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Sex and love: New thoughts on old contradictions* (pp. 124-140). London, England: The Women's Press London.
- Hollway, W. (1998). Gender difference and the production of subjectivity. In W. Hollway, C. Venn, V. Walkerdine, J. Henriques & C. Urwin (Eds.), *Changing the subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity* (pp. 227-261). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Hood, J. C. (1986). The provider role: Its meaning and measurement. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 349-359.
- Hochschild, A. (1998). The second shift: Employed women are putting in another day of work at home. In M. S. Kimmel, & M. A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives* (4th ed.) (pp. 515 - 519). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hosking, A. (2006). Men, work and parenting. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.). *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 216 - 225). Cape Town, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Hunter, M. (2006). Fathers without amandla: Zulu-speaking men and fatherhood. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.). *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 99 -107). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.
- Jackman, R. (2014, July 14). SA man fights for paternity leave. *IOL News*. Retrieved from http://www.iol.co.za/news/crime-courts/sa-man-fights-for-paternity-leave-1.1719180#.VM9Px_7LfYg
- Jaffee, S. R., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Taylor, A., & Dickson, N. (2001). Predicting early fatherhood and whether young fathers live with their children: Prospective findings and policy reconsiderations. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 42, 803-815.
- Jeannes, L., & Shefer, T. (2004). Discourses of motherhood among a group of South African mothers. *JENdA: A Journal of Culture and African Women Studies*, 5, 1 -16.
- Jewkes, R., & Abrahams, N. (2002). The epidemiology of rape and sexual coercion in South Africa: An overview. *Social Science & Medicine*, 55, 1231-1244.
- Johansson, T., & Klinth, R. (2007). Caring fathers: The ideology of gender equality and masculine positions. *Men and Masculinities*, 11, 42 - 62.
- Johnston, D. D., & Swanson, D. H. (2006). Constructing the “good mother”: The experience of mothering ideologies by work status. *Sex Roles*, 54, 509-519.
- Jones, A. (2010). Low-income African-American fathers and their feelings toward fatherhood: In their own voices. *The University of Maryland McNair Scholars*

Undergraduate Research Journal: Celebrating 19 Years of Student Research and Scholarship, 2, 104 - 124.

Kaila-Behm, A., & Vehviläinen-Julkunen, K. (2000). Ways of being a father: How first-time fathers and public health nurses perceive men as fathers. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 37, 199-205.

Kessi, S. (2011). Photovoice as a practice of re-presentation and social solidarity: Experiences from a youth empowerment project in Dar es Salaam and Soweto. *Papers on Social Representations*, 20, 1-27.

Khunou, G. (2006). Fathers don't stand a chance: Experiences of custody, access, and maintenance. In L. Richter, & R. Morrell (Eds.), *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 265-277). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.

Kingdon, G., & Knight, J. (2007). Unemployment in South Africa, 1995–2003: Causes, problems and policies. *Journal of African Economies*, 16, 813-848.

Lamb, M. E. (1976). Interactions between eight-month-old children and their fathers and mothers. In M. E. Lamb (Ed), *The role of the father in child development* (pp. 307 - 327). New York, NY: Wiley.

Lamb, M. E. (1977). Father-infant and mother-infant interaction in the first year of life. *Child Development*, 48, 167-181.

Lamb, M. E. (1986). The changing roles of fathers. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father's role: Applied perspectives* (pp. 3-28). New York, NY: Wiley-Interscience.

Lamb, M. E. (2010). How do fathers influence children's development? Let me count the ways. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (pp. 1-27). New Jersey, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Lamb, M. E., Frodi, A. M., Frodj, M., & Hwang, C. (1982). Characteristics of maternal and paternal behavior in traditional and nontraditional Swedish families. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 5, 131-141.

- Langa, M. (2010a). Adolescent boys' talk about absent fathers. *Journal of Psychology in Africa, 20*, 519-526.
- Langa, M. (2010b). Contested multiple voices of young masculinities amongst adolescent boys in Alexandra township, South Africa. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 22*, 1-13.
- Langa, M., & Smith, N. (2012). Responsible teenage fatherhood in a South African historically disadvantaged community. *Journal of Psychology in Africa, 22*, 255-258.
- LaRossa, R. (1988). Fatherhood and social change. *Family Relations, 37*, 451-457.
- Lesejane, D. (2006). Fatherhood from an African cultural perspective. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds). *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 173 -182). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.
- Lewis, C., & Lamb, M. (2004). Fathers: The research perspective. In *Supporting Fathers: Contributions from the International Fatherhood Summit 2003* (pp. 44 - 77). The Hague: Bernard van Leer Foundation.
- Lupton, D. (2000). 'A love/hate relationship': The ideals and experiences of first-time mothers. *Journal of Sociology, 36*, 50-63.
- Lupton, D., & Barclay, L. (1997). *Constructing fatherhood: Discourses and experiences*. London, England: Sage.
- Luyt, R., & Foster, D. (2001). Hegemonic masculine conceptualisation in gang culture. *South African Journal of Psychology, 31*, 1-11.
- Macleod, C. (2001). Teenage motherhood and the regulation of mothering in the scientific literature: The South African example. *Feminism & Psychology, 11*, 493-510.
- Maher, J., & Saugeres, L. (2007). To be or not to be a mother? Women negotiating cultural representations of mothering. *Journal of Sociology, 43*, 5-21.
- Makusha, T., Richter, L., & Bhana, D. (2013). Children's experiences of support received from men in rural KwaZulu-Natal. *Africa Development, 37*, 127-152.

- Maqubela, L. N. (2013). *An exploration of parenting: Normative expectations, practices and work-life balance in post-apartheid South Africa, 1994-2008* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/56018/>
- Marsiglio, W. (1994). Young nonresident biological fathers. *Marriage & Family Review, 20*, 325-348.
- Marsiglio, W., Amato, P., Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Scholarship on fatherhood in the 1990s and beyond. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 62*, 1173-1191.
- Marsiglio, W., & Day, R. (1997). Social fatherhood and paternal involvement: Conceptual, data, and policymaking issues. *Report of the Working Group on Conceptualising Male Parenting. Report Prepared and Presented for the NICHD Conference on Fathering and Male Fertility: Improving Data and Research*. Bethesda, Maryland.
- Marsiglio, W., & Pleck, J. H. (2005). Fatherhood and masculinities. In M. Kimmel, J. Hearn & R. W. Connell (Eds.), *The handbook of studies on men and masculinities* (pp. 249-269). California, CA: Sage.
- McAdoo, J. L., & McAdoo, J. B. (1998). The African-American father's role within the family. In M. S. Kimmel, & M. A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives* (4th ed.) (pp. 537-547). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Matthews, H., & Tucker, F. (2000). Consulting children. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 24*, 299-310.
- Mboya, M. M., & Nesengani, R. I. (1999). Migrant labor in South Africa: A comparative analysis of the academic achievement of father-present and father-absent adolescents. *Adolescence, 34*, 763-767.
- Miller, T. (2011). *Making sense of fatherhood: Gender, caring and work*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Mkhize, N. (2006). African traditions and the social, economic and moral dimensions of fatherhood. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.). *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 183 -198). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.

- Moletsane, R., de Lange, N., Mitchell, C., Stuart, J., Buthelezi, T., & Taylor, M. (2007). Photo-voice as a tool for analysis and activism in response to HIV and AIDS stigmatisation in a rural KwaZulu-Natal school. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 19*, 19-28.
- Montgomery, C. M., Hosegood, V., Busza, J., & Timæus, I. M. (2006). Men's involvement in the South African family: Engendering change in the AIDS era. *Social Science & Medicine, 62*, 2411-2419.
- Morrell, R. (2001). The times of change: Men and masculinity in South Africa. In R. Morrell (Ed.), *Changing men in Southern Africa* (pp. 1-35). Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: University of Natal Press.
- Morrell, R. (2006). Fathers, fatherhood and masculinity in South Africa. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.), *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 13-125). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.
- Morrell, R. (2007). Do you want to be a father? School-going youth in Durban schools at the turn of the 21st century. In T. Shefer, K. Ratele, A. Strelbel, N. Tshabalala & R. Buikema (Eds.), *From boys to men: Social constructions of masculinity in contemporary society* (pp. 75-93). Cape Town, South Africa: UCT Press.
- Morrell, R., & Richter, L. (2006). Introduction. In L. Richter, & R. Morrell (Eds.), *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 1 - 12). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.
- Morrell, R., & Swart, S. (2005). Men in the third world: Postcolonial perspectives on masculinity. In M. Kimmel, J. Hearn & R. W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities* (pp. 90-113). London, England: Sage.
- Ngobeni, S. (2006). Representations of fatherhood in black US film and how this relates to parenting in South Africa. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.), *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 147-154). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.

- Nixon, E., Greene, S., & Hogan, D. (2012). "Like an uncle but more, but less than a father"- Irish children's relationships with nonresident fathers. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26, 381 - 390.
- Noland, C. M. (2006). Auto-photography as research practice: Identity and self-esteem research. *Journal of Research Practice*, 2, 1 -19.
- Perälä-Littunen, S. (2007). Gender equality or primacy of the mother? Ambivalent descriptions of good parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 341-351.
- Plantin, L., Månsson, S., & Kearney, J. (2003). Talking and doing fatherhood: On fatherhood and masculinity in Sweden and England. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers*, 1, 3-26.
- Pleck, J. H. (2007). Why could father involvement benefit children? Theoretical perspectives. *Applied Development Science*, 11, 196-202.
- Pleck, J. H. (2010). Fatherhood and masculinity. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (pp. 27-57). New Jersey, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Posel, D., & Devey, R. (2006). The demographics of fathers in South Africa: An analysis of survey data, 1993–2002. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.). *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 38-52). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.
- Presbury, J. H., Benson, A. J., McKee, J. E., Fitch, J., & Fitch, S. (1997). How to think about the "deadbeat dad" problem. *The Journal of Humanistic Education and Development*, 35, 135-145.
- Prinsloo, J. (2006). Where have all the fathers gone? Media (ted) representations of fatherhood. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.). *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 132-146). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.
- Rabe, M. (2006). Being a father in a man's world: The experiences of goldmine workers. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.). *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 250-264). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.

- Ramphele, M. (2002). *Steering by the stars: Being young in South Africa*. Cape Town, South Africa: Tafelberg.
- Ramphele, M., & Richter, L. (2006). Migrancy, family dissolution and fatherhood. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.). *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 73-81). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.
- Ratele, K., Shefer, T., & Clowes, L. (2012). Talking South African fathers: A critical examination of men's constructions and experiences of fatherhood and fatherlessness. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 42, 553-563.
- Richter, L., Chikovore, J., Makusha, T., Bhana, A., Mokomane, Z., Swartz, S., & Makiwane, M. (2011). Fatherhood and families. In Department of Economic and Social Affairs (Ed.). *Men in families and family policy in a changing world* (pp. 49 - 84). New York, NY: United Nations.
- Richter, L., Desmond, C., Hosegood, V., Madhavan, S., Makiwane, M., Makusha, T., . . . Swartz, S. (2012). Fathers and other men in the lives of children and families. Paper presented at *Strategies to overcome poverty and inequality: Towards Carnegie III* at the University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa..
- Richter, L. (2006). The importance of fathering for children. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.). *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 53 - 72). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.
- Richter, L., Manegold, J., Pather, R., & Mason, A. (2004). The fatherhood project. *Children First*, 54, 16-20.
- Richter, L., & Smith, W. (2006). Children's views of fathers. In L. Richter & R. Morrell (Eds.). *Baba: Men and fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 155-172). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.
- Ruby, J. (1991). Speaking for, speaking about, speaking with, or speaking alongside: An anthropological and documentary dilemma. *Visual Anthropology Review*, 7, 50-67.

- Safilios-Rothschild, C. (1972). Instead of a discussion: Companionate marriages and sexual inequality: Are they compatible. In C. Safilios-Rothschild (Ed.), *Toward a sociology of women* (pp. 63 - 70). Lexington, MA: Xerox College Publishing.
- Salo, E. (2007). Social constructions of masculinity on the racial and gendered margins of Cape Town. In T. Shefer, K. Ratele, A. Strebel, N. Shabalala & R. Buikema (Eds.), *From boys to men: Social constructions of masculinity in contemporary society* (pp. 160-180). Cape Town, South Africa: UCT Press.
- Sathiparsad, R., Taylor, M., & Dlamini, S. (2008). Patriarchy and family life: Alternative views of male youth in rural South Africa. *Agenda*, 22, 4-16.
- Sawicki, J. (1991). *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, power, and the body*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schrock, D., & Schwalbe, M. (2009). Men, masculinity, and manhood acts. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 277-295.
- Seidler, V. J. J. (1997). *Man enough: Embodying masculinities*. London, England: Sage.
- Sigle-Rushton, W., & McLanahan, S. (2004). Father absence and child wellbeing: A critical review. In D. Moynihan, T. Smeedling & L. Rainwater (Eds.), *The future of the family* (pp. 116-155). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Silberschmidt, M. (1999). *"Women forget that men are the masters": Gender antagonism and socio-economic change in Kisii district, Kenya*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Nordic Africa Institute.
- Silverstein, L. B., & Auerbach, C. F. (1999). Deconstructing the essential father. *American Psychologist*, 54, 397 -407.
- Smit, R. (2001). The impact of labor migration on African families in South Africa: Yesterday and today. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 32, 533 - 548.
- Smit, R. (2004). Involved fathering: Expanding conceptualisations of men's paternal caring. *Koers: Bulletin for Christian Scholarship*, 69, 101-120.

- Smit, R. (2008). 'New fatherhood'- fact or fiction? The perceptions and experiences of fathers in South Africa. *Acta Academica*, 40, 52-77.
- Sorensen, E., & Zibman, C. (2001). Poor dads who don't pay child support: Deadbeats or disadvantaged? (Report No. B-30). Retrieved from The Urban Institute http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/anf_b30.pdf
- Statistics South Africa. (2003). *A socio-economic profile of ward 17*. www.capetown.gov.za/en/ehd/Documents/Ward17.doc (accessed 6 February 2013).
- Statistics South Africa. (2010). Social profile of South Africa, 2002 - 2009. <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/report-03-19-00/report-03-19-002009.pdf> (accessed 15 November 2014).
- Summers, J. A., Raikes, H., Butler, J., Spicer, P., Pan, B., Shaw, S., . . . Johnson, M. K. (1999). Low-income fathers' and mothers' perceptions of the father role: A qualitative study in four early head start communities. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 20, 291 - 304.
- Swartz, S., & Bhana, A. (2009). *Teenage tata: Voices of young fathers in South Africa*. Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.
- Taylor, R. J., Leashore, B. R., & Toliver, S. (1988). An assessment of the provider role as perceived by black males. *Family Relations*, 37, 426-431.
- Thompson, L., & Walker, A. J. (1989). Gender in families: Women and men in marriage, work, and parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 845-871.
- Townsend, N. (2002). Cultural contexts of father involvement. In C. Tamis-LeMonda & N. Cabrera (Eds.), *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 249-277). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Verschueren, K., & Marcoen, A. (1999). Representation of self and socioemotional competence in kindergartners: Differential and combined effects of attachment to mother and to father. *Child Development*, 70, 183-201.
- Wall, G., & Arnold, S. (2007). How involved is involved fathering? An exploration of the contemporary culture of fatherhood. *Gender & Society*, 21, 508-527.

- Wang, C., & Burris, M. A. (1997). Photovoice: Concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment. *Health Education & Behavior, 24*, 369-387.
- Wang, C. (2006). Youth participation in photovoice as a strategy for community change. *Journal of Community Practice, 14*, 147-161.
- Wang, C., & Burris, M. A. (1994). Empowerment through photo novella: Portraits of participation. *Health Education & Behavior, 21*, 171-186.
- Way, N., & Gillman, D. A. (2000). Early adolescent girls' perceptions of their relationships with their fathers: A qualitative investigation. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 20*, 309-331.
- Way, N., & Stauber, H. (1996). Are "absent fathers" really absent? Urban adolescent girls speak out about their fathers. In B. J. Ross Leadbeater & N. Way (Eds.), *Urban girls: Resisting stereotypes, creating identities*, (pp. 132-148). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Welsh, E., Buchanan, A., Flouri, E., & Lewis, J. (2004). *Involved fathering and child well-being: Fathers' involvement with secondary school age children*. London, England: National Children's Bureau.
- Wilkinson, D. L., Magora, A., Garcia, M., & Khurana, A. (2009). Fathering at the margins of society reflections from young, minority, crime-involved fathers. *Journal of Family Issues, 30*, 945-967.
- Wilkinson, S. (1996). Feminist social psychologies: A decade of development. In S. Wilkinson (Ed.), *Feminist social psychologies: International perspectives*, (pp. 1-21). Milton Keynes, England: Open.
- Willig, C. (2008). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology*. Berkshire, England: McGraw-Hill.
- Wilson, F. (2004). Ideal of manhood beyond many men. *Children First, 58*, 39-44.

- Wilson, N., Dasho, S., Martin, A. C., Wallerstein, N., Wang, C., & Minkler, M. (2007). Engaging young adolescents in social action through photovoice: The youth empowerment strategies (YES!) project. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 27*, 241-261.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* California, CA: Sage.
- Yogman, M. W. (1981). Games fathers and mothers play with their infants. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 2*, 241 - 248.

APPENDIX A

Assent Form



UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

Community Action towards a Safer Environment (CASE) and the University of Cape Town are doing a research project about what being a father means in your community.

What is this study about?

Teenagers don't often get a chance to tell adults what they really think about things! This project is interested in hearing about how you see the role of fathers in the lives of young people in your community.

Do I have to take part?

You do not have to take part in it if you do not want to. And if you decide to join, you can stop taking part at any time. You will not get into trouble if you do not want to be part of this project.

What do I have to do?

If you take part in the project, this is what you will have to do:

- 1) Meet 5 times with a researcher from CASE and the University of Cape Town, together with a small group of other teenagers. The meetings will be after school at a time that we all agree on. The meetings will be held at the CASE offices at Mountview School, and will not be attended by any of the school staff. The meetings will be about 90 minutes long. There will be snacks and cool drinks at all the meetings.
- 2) Listen to some ideas about how to take good photographs. There will be one meeting in which you will be taught basic photography skills.
- 3) Take some photographs to show the researchers how you see the role of fathers in the lives of young people in your community. You will do this after school hours and on weekends or public holidays. You will be given a free disposable camera (this is a camera that you throw away after you have finished using it). The researchers will pay for printing the photographs after you have taken them.
- 4) Tell the researchers and the other members of the group about the photographs you took. What you tell us about the photographs will be used by the researchers to help them

understand how young people see the role of fathers in your community and to create programmes that can help to strengthen the relationships between teenagers and fathers.

- 5) If you want to, you can choose to show your photographs at a community event to be held later this year, so that everyone can see them. But you can choose NOT to show your photographs if you do not want to.

Will what I say be kept private?

Everything you say in the group meetings will be heard by the other group members. Group meetings will also be recorded on a digital audio recorder and then saved on a computer where it will be stored securely with a password. The stories you tell us about your photographs may be used in the reports that the researchers write or present for other researchers, but your real name will not be used. And if you decide to show your photos at a community event, you do not need to put your name on them if you do not want to.

Who will the photographs belong to?

You will be able to keep a copy of all your photographs. If you agree to take part in this study, this means that you agree to also let the researchers use a copy of your photographs in the reports that they write or present for other researchers. But your real name will not be used with your photographs. If we want to use a copy of your photographs for anything else, we have to get your permission.

Why should I take part in this study?

This is a chance for you to express your opinions about things that are important to you in your community. Your opinions will help us to think of ways that we can help to develop better relationships between teenagers and fathers. It is also a chance for you to learn more about taking photographs and how to use photographs to tell a story.

If you would like to be part of the research project, please sign this form below:

Name:.....

Signature:.....

Thank you!

APPENDIX B

Consent Form



UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Dear Parent,

Community Action Towards a Safer Environment (CASE) and the University of Cape Town are conducting a research study with teenagers in your community. The aim of the study is to hear what teenagers think about the role of fathers in their lives. This information will help us to develop community projects that can strengthen the relationships between teenagers and their fathers.

Taking part in the study is voluntary. This means that your child can choose not to take part at all or can stop taking part at any point during the study. Your child will be asked to fill in a form in which they will tell us if they do or do not want to be part of the study.

If your child takes part in this study, they will have to do the following:

- 1) Receive some training from the researchers about how to take photographs
- 2) Take some photographs with a free disposable camera (after school and on weekends). The photographs will be printed by the researchers.
- 1) Attend 5 meetings with the researchers. The meetings will take place at Mount View High School from 3.30pm and will last for about one and a half hours each. The meetings will be tape recorded. Snacks and cooldrinks will be provided.
- 2)

If you give permission for your child to take part in this project, this mean that you agree that their photographs (but not their names) can be used by the researchers for research reports and for research publications or presentations. If the researchers want to use the photographs for any other purposes, you and your child both need to give permission.

If you **agree** that your child can take part in this project, please fill in below:

Your child's name and surname: _____

Your name and surname: _____

Your signature: _____

Today's date: _____

If you have any questions please contact Rebecca Helman (082 443 4650) or John (Youth Co-ordinator at CASE) on 021 691 7066

Thank you!