

Being there and taking responsibility

Male Child Support Grant beneficiaries' constructions of their masculine and paternal identities in the light of perceived dominant gender norms

Manon van der Meer (4060679)
Master thesis Social Policy and Social Interventions 2015-2016
Supervisor Utrecht University: Prof. Dr. Trudie Knijn
Supervisor CSDA, University of Johannesburg: Zoheb Khan MSc
Second reader: Dr. Mieke Maliepaard
July, 2016



Universiteit Utrecht



Summary

Earlier research has shown that within South Africa, only a small minority of applicants for the Child Support Grant (CSG) are men, a group about which very little is known. This research explores how male CSG beneficiaries living in Soweto, Johannesburg, construct their paternal and masculine identities in relation to dominant gender norms on mother's and father's roles and masculinity. Findings based on sixteen semi-structured interviews with male CSG beneficiaries reveal that being there and taking responsibility for your children is central to fathers' paternal and masculine identities. The majority of fathers' attitudes are in adherence to dominant gender norms, while the majority of these fathers go against them in their behaviour, generating both negative and positive reactions from other people. Fathers' narratives reveal struggles and ambiguities in their identity construction in relation to dominant gender norms. What becomes clear is that they are able to construct an alternative masculinity that includes both providing and taking responsibility on the one hand, and doing primary caregiving and household tasks on the other. Further attention should be given to these involved fathers, both within policy-making and academia.

Introduction

South Africa has a generous welfare state compared to other countries in the Global South (Hassim, 2008). The Child Support Grant (CSG), given to disadvantaged and vulnerable children and relevant within this research, was introduced in 1997 (Lund, 2008; Patel & Hochfeld, 2011; Patel, Knijn & Van Wel, 2015). It is given to the child's primary caregiver on behalf of the child (Hassim, 2008). In this way, CSG breaks from the desirability of the nuclear family and by being gender-neutral, it goes against the normative link between childcare and mothering.

However, only between four and eight per cent of CSG beneficiaries are men (Patel, Hochfeld, Moodley & Mudwali, 2012). Both in South Africa (Datta, 2007; Morrell & Richter, 2006) and other countries (Badgett & Folbre, 1999; Ostner, 2002), the woman's role, despite increasing labour market participation, has remained centred around unpaid caring, located within the private domain. Specific to South Africa, which is identified as a 'highly patriarchal' society (Morrell, Jewkes & Lindegger, 2012), several developments have influenced especially black fathers' involvement in children's lives. These include the migrant labour system, apartheid, unemployment among low-skilled black men, and high levels of HIV/AIDS (e.g. Hunter, 2006; Makusha & Richter, 2014; Mavungu, Thomson-de Boor & Mphaka, 2013; Morrell & Richter, 2006). Together with the inability of many men to meet dominant norms of providing for one's family and paying *ilobolo* (bride price) (e.g. Hunter, 2006), these developments have strengthened many black fathers' absence from their families. In many cases, fathers feel like they have failed and disengage themselves from their children's lives (Mavungu et al., 2013). Combined with unpaid caring seen as the woman's responsibility, scholars speak of a 'double burden' for women (Budlender & Lund, 2011).

Father absence feeds widespread 'deficit' discourses about "bad" fathers (e.g. Datta, 2007; Montgomery, Hosegood, Busza & Timæus, 2006; Ratele, Shefer & Clowes, 2012). They coincide with those on "bad" men, being represented as irresponsible, risk-taking, violent and controlling over women (e.g. Montgomery et al., 2006; Redpath, Morrell, Jewkes & Peacock, 2008). Nevertheless, many men want to or do take care of children, and feel responsible (Chili & Maharaj, 2015; Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2015). CSG beneficiaries, the group of interest within this research, belong to these men who, at least on paper, choose not to be absent, and who arguably undertake more nurturing caring tasks. Black men are focused upon, since the majority of the low-income South Africans targeted by the CSG are black.

Richter points out that one should not underestimate 'the actual and potential contribution, interest, and impact of non-resident and low-income or unemployed fathers and, in doing so, marginalise them further' (Richter, 2006, p. 63). Fathers can play an important role in children's well-

being by providing human, financial and social capital (Richter, 2006), and by positively influencing children's self-esteem and school performance (Makusha & Richter, 2014). Still, whether fathers play a positive role depends not only on physical presence, but also on the quality of the father-child relationship (Lamb & Tamis-LeMonda, 2004; Morrell, 2006). This research will look at how male CSG beneficiaries construct their paternal and masculine identities in relation to dominant gender norms. Thus, the central issue addressed is father presence within the context of widespread father absence in South Africa, thereby challenging the relative non-recognition of these caring men.

Theoretical framework

In this research, the interdisciplinary literature on gender, men and masculinity will be integrated into the theoretical framework with a focus on South Africa (e.g. Morrell, 1998). Influential concepts in this literature, masculinity and hegemonic masculinity (see Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Morrell et al., 2012), are used to understand dominant gender norms and will be central additional to the concepts of fatherhood and care.

Gender and masculinity

Gender, what it means to be “masculine” or “feminine” (Miller, 2011), forms the basis of all theory on masculinity, fatherhood and care. Here, gender is understood as being socially constructed (Connell, 2002; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Morrell, 1998). Gender norms express the appropriate behaviour for men and women (Badgett & Folbre, 1999), and can also point to perceptions of predominant actual behaviour (Cialdini, 2007), such as father absence in South Africa. Masculinity can be defined as a collective gender identity (Morrell, 1998) and according to Lindegger and Maxwell it refers to ‘an everyday system of beliefs and performances that regulate behaviour between men and women, as well as between men and other men’ (Lindegger & Maxwell, 2007, p. 95). Because gender intersects with race, class, region and sexual orientation (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005), many masculinities exist.

Masculinity and hegemonic masculinity

The theory of hegemonic masculinity, developed by Connell (2005), has been authoritative in research on men and masculinity (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Morrell, Jewkes, Lindegger & Hamlall, 2013). It draws attention to some masculinities being more socially valued than others, thereby presenting a particular type of behaviour as the cultural ideal within a specific time and context (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Morrell, 1998; Morrell et al., 2012). Within South Africa, dominant traits of masculinity include being strong, being in paid employment, and being unemotional, independent and in control (e.g. Datta, 2007; Morrell, 1998; Redpath et al., 2008). The use of violence, having multiple sexual partners, bringing children into the world, and behaving irresponsibly also relate to hegemonic masculinity (e.g. Redpath et al., 2008).

Women and alternative masculinities are subordinated or oppressed by hegemonic masculinity, which entails the construction of a hierarchy (Connell, 2005). Hegemonic masculinity is dynamic, has internal contradictions and partly gets its strength from incorporating elements of subordinated masculinities, for example gay culture. Indeed, homosexual men constitute

subordinate masculinities, whereas oppressed marginalized masculinities arise when gender intersects with race and class. Within South Africa, low-income black men arguably belong to this last category, although they should not be regarded as a homogenous group. Although only a minority of men completely adhere to hegemonic masculinity, in general men, so also those belonging to marginalized masculinities, benefit from the 'patriarchal dividend,' which is an advantage enjoyed over femininity (Connell, 2005).

Thus, hegemonic masculinity is a relational construct, and the presence of other masculinities and women are needed to maintain its existence. Nevertheless, Moller (2007) argues that power should be understood as constitutive of everyday social relationships, instead of being solely approached in terms of oppression, domination, and subordination. Possibilities for hegemonic masculinity to change into more gender equal forms always exist, given its socially constructed nature (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Moller, 2007). This will be addressed when discussing undoing gender later in this theoretical framework.

Fatherhood and caring

Fatherhood is seen as central to masculinity: being able to procreate and financially providing show masculine strength (e.g. Datta, 2007; Mkhize, 2006; Morrell, 2006). Scholars emphasise its socially constructed and multi-dimensional nature. Lamb and Tamis-LeMonda point out that fathers can have many roles, such as 'companions, care providers, spouses, protectors, models, moral guides, teachers [and] breadwinners' (Lamb & Tamis-LeMonda, 2004, p. 3).

Marsiglio, Day and Lamb (2008) conceptualize fatherhood by looking at father involvement and influence, thereby drawing upon the influential framework developed by Lamb, Pleck, Charnov, and Levine (1987). For involvement, engagement, accessibility and responsibility are distinguished. The first is about direct interactions with the child (e.g. feeding, playing), the second refers to supervisory activities and the potential for interaction (e.g. cooking with child present), and the third to the extent of responsibility taken for the child's welfare (e.g. organizing care arrangements, buying clothing). Paternal influence, the second dimension, refers to nurturance and provision of care, emotional, practical, and psychosocial support of female partners, and economic provision (Marsiglio et al., 2008).

Caring and nurturance are more strongly associated with mothering (e.g. Badgett & Folbre, 1999). According to Razavi, unpaid caring includes direct personal care for both people with intensive care needs and those physically fit, consisting of activities such as bathing and feeding, and activities being preconditions for personal care, such as 'preparing meals, shopping and cleaning sheets and clothes' (Razavi, 2007, p. 6). This definition comprises the caregiving part of the tripartite framework developed by Fisher and Tronto (1990). Additionally, Fisher and Tronto identify caring about and

taking care of. The first refers to a connection between people and is formed by an orientation rather than love or affection. It involves a process of selection for which knowledge is needed and does not necessarily involve care work. Taking care of is constituted by 'the responsibility for initiating and maintaining care activities' (Fisher & Tronto, 1990, p. 42). More time, knowledge and skills are needed for this, involving the ability to make judgments and assess available resources. That these resources can be unevenly distributed means that power is involved. Hence, an asymmetry may exist between responsibility and power (Fisher & Tronto, 1990). Taking care of can be seen as similar to the element of responsibility of father involvement by Marsiglio et al. (2008).

Fatherhood is highly time- and place-dependent (Lamb & Tamis-Lemonda, 2004; Mkhize, 2006; Ratele et al., 2012). Within South Africa, the dominant norm is that "good" fathers financially provide for their families (e.g. Datta, 2007; Mavungu et al., 2013; Redpath et al., 2008). Nevertheless, recent empirical work (e.g. Chili & Maharaj, 2015; Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2015; Graham, 2014) shows that being emotionally supportive and morally guiding, as well as protecting and being a role model, are regarded as important roles besides providing.

Doing and undoing gender

While dominant gender norms influence identities, they do not fully determine them. The ethno methodological theory of doing gender by West and Zimmerman (1987) is helpful to understand agency and the relationship with structure. Through bodily expressions and behaviours during social interaction, people actively construct their gender identities within the framework of wider structures. People are held accountable for doing gender according to the dominant conceptions about their sex. The post-structuralist view (see Nentwich & Kelan, 2014), exemplified by Butler (2004), emphasises the performativity and inherent fluidity of identity.

Both approaches to doing gender are fruitful for analysing gender identity construction. In this research, gender identity will be understood as contradictory and ambiguous, being both constantly constructed and constrained by (material) structures. This means that no endless opportunities for (re)constructing exist (Connell, 2002). Indeed, within South Africa, socio-economic changes and unemployment rates interact with the dominant gender norm of financially providing to impact gender identity construction (Langa, 2010).

Debates on undoing gender accompany those on doing gender (e.g. Deutsch, 2007; West & Zimmerman, 2009). Although Deutsch speaks of reducing gender difference, West and Zimmerman argue for redoing gender to change the consequences of gender difference and thereby accountability to gender. Despite the different terminology, both works point to the possibility of transforming gender relations into less unequal ones. This relates to alternative gender practices,

such as fathers doing care work, and comes close to the post-structuralist view of undoing gender as subversion: changing the dominant gender order (Nentwich & Kelan, 2014).

Regarding positive influences on transformations in gender practices, Deutsch (2007) lists structural factors, such as policies (cf. Hobson & Morgan, 2002), as well as interactional ones, such as communication and relationship skills, or love for the significant other within the relationship (cf. Marsiglio et al., 2008). Similarly, in relation to fatherhood, Marsiglio et al. note that love for children, wanting the experience of caring, or anticipating loneliness or financial vulnerability play a role in positive involvement in children's lives, as well as perceptions of children's needs for father involvement or financial resources. Morrell and Jewkes (2011) find that necessity, life-changing events, caring at a young age, role models and unemployment are influential. Social support is also crucial (e.g. Graham, 2014). Indeed, possible reactions by community and service organisations may dis- or encourage men to care (e.g. Montgomery et al., 2006). Lastly, experiences with own fathers are important (Lupton & Barclay, 1997; Marsiglio et al., 2008; Mavungu et al., 2013).

Identity construction in the light of dominant gender norms

The literature on masculine and paternal identity construction (see Morrell et al., 2012) shows the importance of having an eye for nuance, contradictions and ambiguities. While many fathers endorse dominant gender norms (e.g. Mavungu et al., 2013), a considerable number are engaged in care work (e.g. Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2015; Graham, 2014; Morrell & Jewkes, 2011) or express non-hegemonic ideas (Blackbeard & Lindegger, 2007; Davies & Eagle, 2007; Langa, 2010). This literature shows different ways of relating one's identity to dominant gender norms. Some studies (e.g. Chili & Maharaj, 2015; Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2015; Graham, 2014) show that men who care in more nurturing ways do not always feel threatened in their masculine identity. Men can unproblematically combine alternative caring practices, such as giving bodily intimate care, with the dominant norms of providing and taking responsibility. Enderstein and Boonzaier note how 'fatherhood becomes a highly valorised masculine identity' and highlight the centrality of taking responsibility and being there in fathers' narratives (Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2015, p. 512). On the other hand, men can feel social pressure to conform and have contradictory feelings resulting from occupying a middle ground between non-hegemonic and hegemonic norms (e.g. Langa, 2010).

In other cases, fathers guard the boundaries of their care work by undertaking 'masculine care' (Brandth & Kvande, 1998; Doucet, 2004), which involves fathers seeing themselves as their children's friends, playing with them or teaching independence. Fathers can also place caring within the framework of providing and protecting, which fits hegemonic masculine ideals (Morrell & Jewkes, 2011). Similarly, men may feel pragmatic about performing care work out of necessity, while still expressing adherence to dominant gender norms (Ostner, 2002). Alternatively, men may express

gender equal ideas, although having difficulty with adhering to them in practice (Plantin, Månsson & Kearney, 2003). Lastly, alternative practices can also be constructed as superior to hegemonic masculinity, thereby emulating the dynamics of hegemonic masculinity (Davies & Eagle, 2007). In conclusion, conforming to and resisting hegemonic masculinity often go together and new kinds of masculinities are being constructed, thereby sometimes incorporating feminine elements (see Doucet, 2004).

Research questions

This research is embedded within Zoheb Khan's (CSDA) PhD project on male CSG beneficiaries, which studies care motivations, care arrangements and child well-being impacts within wider gender dynamics. The goal of this research is to get more insight into how male beneficiaries construct their paternal and masculine identities in relation to perceived dominant gender norms, thereby looking at the interrelations between hegemonic masculinity and caring. As Morgan states: 'One strategy of studying men and masculinities would be to study those situations where masculinity is, as it were, *on the line*' (Morgan, 1992, p. 99). The following research question has been formulated:

In what way do male beneficiaries of the Child Support Grant in Soweto, Johannesburg, by caring for children, construct their masculine and paternal identities in relation to perceived dominant gender norms?

The sub-questions are the following:

1. How do male beneficiaries construct and give meaning to their masculine and paternal identities?
2. What role does caring for children play in male beneficiaries' constructions of their paternal identities?
3. How do male beneficiaries perceive dominant gender norms on masculinity and fatherhood?
4. How do male beneficiaries relate their own masculine and paternal identities to perceived dominant gender norms?

Strategy and method

Qualitative methods are regarded as being most suited for studying how people construct and give meaning to their social world (Denscombe, 2010). To gain more insight into how male CSG beneficiaries construct their paternal and masculine identities, theory-informed semi-structured interviews were held. The semi-structured nature allowed for flexibility during the interviews, giving respondents the opportunity to come up with issues they found important, while keeping the conversation focused on theoretically based topics (Boeije, 2008; Denscombe, 2010). This meant a rich understanding could be gained.

Sampling

Before the actual data collection started, the topic list was piloted. This was done with a father similar in socio-economic background and skin colour, though not a CSG beneficiary, since the preference was to include in the actual data collection all beneficiaries who could be sampled. In total, fifteen beneficiaries were interviewed (see appendix 1 for an overview). Two employees from the local office of the South African Social Security Agency (SASSA) in Soweto approached respondents by telephone, thereby using a list provided by the SASSA Head Office. Participants were approached from a part of the list of beneficiaries who live relatively close to the office, which was judged by one of the employees. When someone did not respond, the next person was called. No random selection took place. Interviews were held in one of the rooms of the office, and generally took between one and 1,5 hours. An additional participant whose interview was included in the sample was recruited by a fellow researcher. This father uses the CSG of his daughter who left her children in his household. Lastly, extra telephone conversations were held with six of the participants to clarify answers given to interview questions and to ask some important additional questions.

Data collection

The topic list used during the interviews (see appendix 2) was based on the theoretical framework, whereby theoretical concepts were translated into operationalizations and interview questions. Firstly, fatherhood was operationalized by distinguishing the different father roles, and by the more abstract dimensions of responsibility (Marsiglio et al., 2008), and caring about and taking care (Fisher & Tronto, 1990). The more concrete caring tasks were put under a separate topic, thereby drawing upon the activities mentioned by Razavi (2007), Fisher's and Tronto's (1990) caregiving and Marsiglio et al.'s (2008) engagement and accessibility. The operationalization of masculinity focused on traits

seen as masculine within the literature (e.g. Datta, 2007). The CSG was the last topic to be asked about. Questions were also asked about demographics and the respondents' households. Finally, doing gender was not made into a separate topic, since the topics of fatherhood and masculinity deal with gendered behaviour. Moreover, the issue was interwoven in all aspects of the topic list.

The interviews started with easy basic questions about the respondents themselves to build rapport. Thereafter, a start was made with a general introductory question on being a father, as well as with respondents' own understandings of caring, as bases for the interviews. Before moving on to concrete caring activities, another general question about paternal identity was asked. Lastly, additional questions related to paternal and masculine identity constructions were asked, as well as questions on the CSG. This order made the conversations flow naturally during the interviews. To let them flow even more naturally, as well as to avoid influencing the respondents' answers on their paternal identities by making them more conscious of masculine norms, the topic of fatherhood was addressed first. Throughout the period of data collection, the topic list was adjusted based on learning experiences from the interviews. For example, additional to the initial more open questions on perceived masculine norms, more directed questions on these were asked by referring to norms mentioned in the literature (e.g. men do not cry). Lastly, in two cases, respondents did not feel comfortable speaking English. SASSA employees were present to interpret.

Sample

All sixteen interviewed fathers either received a CSG in the past, were the direct recipients or in one case, used the grant from another family member not present in the household anymore. Most fathers were aged between 35 and fifty years old and the children they took care of between six and eighteen years old. All fathers applied for the CSG because they found themselves in a situation in which they needed it, meaning either their children's mothers passed away or they were left with the children. In two cases, the father's partners did not have South African citizenship, which is the reason why the father had to apply. Most fathers either lived with their current partners or as single parents with other family members within the same household or yard; the minority lived alone.

Data analysis

The analysis of the data proceeded in several phases. First, the data was explored by assigning codes to data fragments. The next phase involved looking closely to codes, linking them and creating categories. Focusing on the most important themes arising from the data comprised the last phase, in which the link with the theory was made. Codes that were used most were 'providing (financially)', 'guiding,' 'love,' 'being there,' and 'necessity of caring.' Constant comparison of codes and data took place (Boeije, 2008; Denscombe, 2010). This way of analysing was advantageous, since conclusions

were firmly based upon the data, although the danger of de-contextualising existed (Denscombe, 2010). This means that by moving to higher levels of abstraction, fragments of data are no longer understood within the specific context of the interview. This risk was reduced by continuously looking back to the context when examining a data fragment.

Reliability, validity and ethical considerations

Bernard (2006) points to several potential sources of bias when using qualitative interviewing, including the deference effect, the expectancy effect, asking threatening questions and socially desirable answering. These biases point to the important influence the interview context and the researcher's identity have on the data obtained (cf. Boeije, 2008; Lupton & Barclay, 1997). This is regarded by some as a disadvantage of qualitative research (Denscombe, 2010). Lastly, it should be acknowledged that the interviews could be regarded as a form of doing gender and arguably of reproducing gender binaries (Deutsch, 2007).

The above discussion points to issues of reliability and validity. Based on Boeije (2008), efforts to strengthen these included keeping in contact with fellow researchers on data interpretation, and confirming interpretations with interview participants during interviews. Especially given the context of this research, the researcher's gender and skin colour were kept in mind during the research process, by reflecting on how these could have influenced fathers' answers to the questions asked (see Bernard, 2006). Reflexivity thus played an important role. Finally, in line with ethical guidelines, caution was taken in questioning sensitive topics. Moreover, participants were asked to sign a consent form, could opt out anytime, and all interviews remained confidential. Interviews were recorded with permission.

Paternal identity construction

Several common elements came up during the analysis of fathers' narratives about themselves as fathers. What virtually all fathers emphasise is being there for their children. This is mainly how fathers define what caring for their children means. It involves taking responsibility for your children and their well-being. Qinisela, a father of a daughter of five and a one-year-old son, explains his views:

[..] to care about your children is to know that, is to have that, the time for them. You have to have some time to spend with them, just to check with them, just to play and understand them better. And also to know that you are their father, sometimes you are their mentor, their guide, then also to take care that – to know them that they are wearing, they are eating, they are doing all of the stuff like that and that – you must also know that they are playing, and having those funny things for them.

In this quote, it becomes clear that understanding your children is seen as important, and by being there as a father this understanding can be enhanced. When you get 'that connection' with your children, they will tell you about their problems. Love plays an important role in this. Even though not all fathers speak of this connection, virtually all express love to their children or they tell them that they love them.

Although providing is highly present in all fathers' narratives and important to all of them, what thus becomes clear is that there is more to being a father. Adam, taking care of his 16-year-old 'number 1 princess', says:

[..] sometimes even if you don't have money, just sit with your kids, have a nice conversation, you know.

Similarly, Patrick, a father of two boys of twelve and seven, emphasizes children mostly need attention.

The first large quote by Qinisela highlights other elements of fathers' paternal identities, such as guiding and monitoring. Whereas monitoring involves for example keeping track of children's school achievements, guiding points more to instilling certain norms and values. Examples are respecting and helping other people, no smoking or drinking, and going to church. Guiding also involves encouraging children to pursue their dreams: about half of the fathers explicitly mention that they want their children to achieve more than they have. Related to this, about half of the

fathers express the importance of them being an example to their children. Sanele, who takes care of his two girl nieces of nine and seven years old, says the following, making a link with protection:

Whatever that you do, she [his girl niece] thinks it's right, you know. If you're smoking in the house, they will grow up thinking that it's a right thing to do, you know. So, you must just adjust it.

Protecting is not mentioned by many fathers. Nevertheless, it is implicit to many elements of paternal identity. Applying for the CSG is itself a form of protection. All fathers spend the grant on a variety of things in accordance with their children's needs, which for example involves school fees or clothing. Another example of protecting is when fathers speak of deciding on when to tell their children about their mother's passing.

All these elements show fathers' engagement with their children. From some of the stories can also be deduced that fathers sometimes worry. Tom, who takes care of his 8-year-old son, says:

[..] it's like I'm gonna get a heart attack. Where is he? Then I start to worry. Because every time when the school is out, he comes back straight home. He's not some child who goes everywhere.

Hereby, he also shows he knows his son. More generally, fathers know their children's hobbies, what food they like, and their personalities. Additionally, that some fathers have developed a washing schedule or save money every month to spend at the end of the year shows their engagement, including their ability in planning and organizing care.

When it comes to concrete activities, almost all fathers did the primary caregiving tasks of feeding, bathing and changing nappies, in the past, with some in a supporting role towards their partners and about half as the primary caregiver. In these latter cases, fathers either did not have a partner within the household or the partner was not able or willing to take the primary responsibility of the children. Those fathers who currently have children of five years old and younger only fulfil a supporting role towards their partners, meaning they are not the primary caregiver. Among these fathers are the two who have applied only because this was impossible for their partner to do so because they are not native South-Africans. All other fathers carry the primary responsibility for their children's well-being, which in some cases still involves bathing, but generally does not involve the above-mentioned tasks anymore given the age of the children. What it does involve is going to school meetings, taking the children to school or the clinic, going to the park, playgrounds, movies, or the mall, playing, and helping with homework. The great majority of fathers also perform household tasks, such as cleaning, cooking, washing and ironing, sometimes sharing in these with their partners or only playing a supportive role. Interestingly, none of the fathers incorporated the primary

caregiving tasks of feeding, bathing or changing nappies in their answers to what a good father is or does, meaning these activities are not salient in their identity construction and do not play a big role. This issue will be discussed more thoroughly when addressing gender norms.

Masculine identity construction

The analysis shows a clear overlap between how fathers construct their paternal and masculine identities. When asked in what ways fathers feel like they are men, the answer always involves taking care of the family, which means fatherhood is constructed as central to their masculine identity. Lethabo, who has a 15-year-old son, says:

[..] you must [..] take care of your sons. Take care of your wives. Take care of your house. [pause] you are the man who are responsible for the house. You know, everything in fact. [pause] you see.

Thus, for him, being a man means being the head of the household who takes responsibility for the family, although he stays abstract in what this actually means. Other fathers explain it more clearly, by saying that providing for the family is important. John, who is with his 7-year-old son during the weekends, elaborates upon his masculine identity:

I feel like a man, because I try all my best to make sure that my kids go to school, everybody's got food in the house. Support them as a man. Make sure everything goes smooth, even if you're not work. You need to think that, how can I get the money to feed the, to feed your family.

However, for many of the fathers, taking care of your family encompasses more than just providing and as could be read previously, it is also about loving your child. John says:

I feel like a man because I love my boys.

Taking responsibility for your family is an important element in the narratives many fathers construct to account for them being present in their children's lives, and when the situation calls for it, performing primary caregiving as well as household tasks. Being strong and resolute as a man has the same function.

Perception of and relation to dominant gender norms

As was already stated in the methodology, in most cases, either the children's mothers have left the children with the fathers or have passed away, leaving the fathers with the children. However, the

perceived dominant norm is that mothers should take the primary care of children, whereas the father is there to play a supportive role to this and to provide for the family. Sizwe, taking care of an 11-year-old-daughter and 9-year-old son, says:

When we are growing up, we know that, woman, she must take care of kids.

George, a father of a 15-year-old-son, connects the woman to the private domain, being always there. Lastly, Amos, who takes care of his grandson of nine or ten years old, explains:

I was teaching my old son to iron the clothes, you see, because we don't have other girl [a daughter] to do that stuff. I know that it's stuff which is supposed to be done by the female [..]

The great majority of fathers' attitudes adhere to the just mentioned gender norms. In a little over a third of the cases, a difference exists between views and behaviours. Though agreeing with perceived norms, in practice these fathers do household tasks and/or carry the primary responsibility for their children, which sometimes still involves bathing children. Doing these tasks is seen more as a necessity because there is no mother to do them. However, five fathers (Tom, Patrick, Sanele, John and Sizwe) explicitly go against dominant norms, thereby sometimes even employing a narrative of fairness or equality:

I think their [fathers'] role, basically, must be the same, to give love to their children. You know. Do things equally. If the other one is working, take care of your child, in whatever way you can. I don't think some tasks are supposed to be for mothers. You supposed to do things equally (Tom).

In this quote, Tom also shows caregiving can be constructed as part of paternal identities. Nevertheless, he himself and the majority of this group of fathers also talk about the father having a supportive role when the mother is around. For example, Patrick says:

[..] even if I'm staying with a woman, I still have to *give a hand and help her*.

Although some fathers go against dominant norms in both views and behaviours, together with other fathers they make sure that primary caregiving and household tasks are incorporated in their masculine identities in a way that can be aligned with taking responsibility as a man, and thereby showing strength. They are part of your duty as a man. Adam explains how he 'was supposed to hold

the bull by the horns' when he was faced with having to do primary caregiving and household tasks. Similarly, Amos says:

I feel like a man, a strong man. [...] Taking every situation that comes up, you see, because I, I don't want to be ashamed because of that, I want to be brave to doing things like that. And maintain everything. Although it's difficult, but I try to do it.

These examples show that especially when faced with a difficult situation in combination with the necessity of doing caring and household tasks, responsibility is drawn upon. The above quote makes clear that it requires braveness to do "women's tasks." That Amos also says that he sees himself as both a mother and a father could be interpreted as him seeing distinct roles, and not embracing caring or household tasks as part of his paternal and masculine identities. Virtually all fathers who resist dominant norms in their attitudes also show signs of this. John exclaims:

I was everything, I was a wife, I was a man. In that house. She was not doing anything. Was so lazy.

Hereby, he distances himself from his ex-partner. Similarly, but less radical, Tom says fathers should do 'all of the things that women do.' On the other hand, it could also be argued that these fathers break down the gender binary by reconciling the two in their identities: "women's tasks" belong to the fathers' as well. This clearly points to ambiguity.

What is evident in the majority of the narratives and linked to the necessity of taking responsibility, is the primacy of the mother, which is interestingly enough also the case for some of the fathers that resist dominant gender norms in their attitudes. Some fathers express that they are happy that others cannot see that there is no mother, which simultaneously shows their preoccupation with their outside image. The mother is still seen as most suited for primary caregiving. Some fathers speak of 'mother love'; others point to the mother having carried the child and being capable of breastfeeding. Patrick says:

[...] [mothers] are the people who understand kids better than a man, you understand.

Being the primary caregiver as a father does not come naturally, and both he and Amos explain the many skills they have learned. Over half of the fathers link their skills to being raised by a woman. Some fathers had to take primary care of their siblings. Interestingly, Amos, while seeing caring for children as a woman's task, wants to open a counseling service for, among others, men who are left with their children.

In constructing their identities, fathers distance themselves from absent fathers, who, according to Bheki, taking care of his 14-year-old daughter, 'run away' because everything is expensive. Many other fathers spend their money on liquor, get drunk and are abusive. In this light, Adam says:

I see myself as somebody who is making a difference.

Patrick speaks of 'stubborn men' who refuse to put their pride aside. He turns around the argument of strength:

[..] you gonna be always run away from those things, because you're afraid of them. That means [..] you're not strong enough to face those type of things.

Similarly, Sanele points out how, because of their ego, other men would not be able to cope with being alone, thus expressing a feeling of superiority. Fathers whose partners left also distance themselves from mothers who "eat" the grant money.

An issue still unaddressed is how some fathers struggle in relation to dominant gender norms. Regarding providing, multiple point out they sometimes have difficulties in giving their children the same as other children. Qinisela speaks of 'peer pressure.' Interestingly, when asked about how they express their love to their children, many fathers talk about buying things. George emphasises that he does not have enough power to push his son up into a better position than his own. Connected to this, multiple fathers think the grant is not sufficient in supporting their children.

George also struggles with doing things differently than the norm, when it comes to primary caregiving:

They gonna judge me, maybe if I'm changing the nappies, [coughs] [..] to say, why this man is doing the woman thing. [..] hey I was scared before, hey, [..] [b]ecause I was doing something the other men, they don't do. Hey!

Significantly, he is afraid that other men think that a woman tells him what to do, thus clearly showing gendered power relations. Correspondingly, Amos gets negative reactions on being the main one responsible for the household and his grandson, with other men accusing him of being gay. During the interview, after having told this, he feels the need to prove himself, in the sense that he is a man who is able to take care of the household and a child: he says he makes sure that he and his children always look neat when they are going outside. This also shows his preoccupation with his

outside, public image within the community, especially with how other men perceive and react to him. This preoccupation arguably strengthened by his position as the church pastor.

Other fathers also talk about negative reactions, which mainly focus on their masculine identities. Sanele tells what happens when he hangs up his nieces' underwear:

[..] they start saying names: hey, this one is gay, man, [...] But because you know what, what you are doing, it won't bother you.

Tom talks about his childhood, when he did household chores for his single mom and was a 'laughing stock':

They used a certain word for gays. But [...] we, ended up not, [...] not, you know, having some concern with what other people are saying.

As these last two examples show, many fathers find ways to deal with the comments. George repeatedly says that what he does comes 'from the heart,' and he simultaneously feels 'little' and strong. For the majority of fathers, religion is a way of coping. They find solace in believing and say they pray to receive strength and courage to continue caring for their children. Some fathers frame their roles as a task given by god to test them. Moreover, some approach their pastors for advice.

Multiple fathers also speak of getting positive comments, which interestingly focus more on the fathers' paternal identities. Fathers are seen and see themselves as role models. Adam says his friends say he is 'one of a kind,' Bheki would get a crown from mothers and elderly ladies if they had one, and Sizwe talks about the school principal who called him and invited him to 'show other men what they can do for their kids.' Tellingly, the principal first asked about the children's mother.

The primacy of the mother also comes back in other comments. Jeff, who has taken on the care for his grandchildren, says:

And when you get to the clinic you find yourself as the only man with small kids and people will be asking: where is the mother?

More generally, some fathers express a wish for more recognition:

'[...] they say, mother, mother, mother. Me, I not feel alright. Because I said, me, I love my child. Now, but what about me?' (Bheki)

Masculinity and the CSG

The lack of recognition, which ambiguously goes together with beliefs in the primacy of the mother, connects to the CSG being overwhelmingly identified as something for mothers. Virtually all fathers did not know they could apply. Some even only applied after they had taken care of their children for a while. About the image, Tom says:

[..] people were generally speaking about it, that, you know what, pregnant- single women, unemployed, they gonna get grant.

Some fathers' perception of SASSA officials' treatment also reflects the primacy of the mother. For example, Qinisela explains:

[..] and even if you come here at SASSA, and say that, and say that, no, now I'm coming here to apply for my child grant, [..] they can't believe you [..] because of the reputation, the bad reputation that they know about the men, that most of the time we don't care of our children. [..] the really thing that they were looking for is to know that really the child is staying with me and why the child is not staying with the mother.

The SASSA offices are identified as a feminine space, with Sanele saying the queue is dominated by women. He speaks of a 'stigma,' which he experiences himself when he goes there:

They [women] say, hey, a man who get a grant, I'll never date him, I'll never date him.

Sometimes he feels ashamed, thus showing ambiguity since he also expresses that he does not care about others' reactions (see previous paragraph). Sanele's feelings of shame may have to do with him feeling pressure from the dominant masculine norms he mentions: having a girlfriend, money and a car. Speaking of the SASSA offices as well, George says that 'everywhere is women, no men, it's only me, just feeling so small,' thereby also linking it to negative feelings about himself.

Besides dating and girlfriends, the perceived dominant masculine norm of not seeking help for problems is connected to the CSG. Related perceived norms stipulate that men are not supposed to cry or share their feelings. Tom says:

[..] this is how we grow up. Because we thought men are not supposed to show emotions, are not supposed to reveal their pain.

In relation to the first norm, although fathers feel bad about applying, they do it because of their

children, something that fits within their responsibility narrative. Multiple fathers go against the other two norms. Two fathers talk about support groups: the 'men's fellowship' and 'brotherhood.' These fathers are both part of the group of fathers that goes against the dominant norm on caregiving in both attitudes and behaviour. In the following quote, the contrast with women, who are perceived to be communicative about their problems, is made:

[..] in a group of brotherhood [M: yeah] we help each other. [...] they're [men] afraid to talk about their life to somebody, said, no, I'm not working, this and that and that. Women, they talk. [...] they call it silence is golden, but I wouldn't think it's golden. [...] because you keep something on yourself, then it eats you. But if you share, somebody's gonna help you. (John)

This quote shows that it is possible to construct an alternative masculinity that allows men to share their feelings, express their emotions and seek help for their problems.

Conclusion and discussion

Conclusion

This research aimed to gain insight into how male CSG beneficiaries construct their paternal and masculine identities in relation to dominant gender norms. The first sub-question focused on fathers' paternal and masculine identities. The results show that fathers find it important that they are there for their children. Being a father is both about providing and giving love to children, to guide them and protect them. Fathers feel like men because they take responsibility for their family, thereby showing overlap between being a father and a man. Sub-question two inquired about the role of care work in paternal identity construction, and the findings show that care work is constructed as less central to it. Perceived dominant gender norms, put central in sub-question three, are that a man and father should provide. The mother has the role of taking the primary care of children and of doing household tasks, whereas the father should provide for the family. Regarding norms on masculinity, a man should be strong and not cry or seek help from others.

Taking responsibility for the family is important for how fathers construct their paternal and masculine identities in relation to dominant gender norms (sub-question four). Fathers distance themselves from absent fathers or mothers. The masculine traits of taking responsibility and being strong function in fathers' narratives to explain them doing primary caregiving or household tasks. Necessity of doing caring and household tasks is also an important element of the narratives. In line with this, most fathers endorse dominant gender norms. Multiple fathers struggle with providing, a norm they strongly adhere to. Although the grant helps in providing, multiple fathers struggle with the feminine image of it, which reflects wider dominant gender norms. Fathers get both positive and negative comments on their alternative behaviour. They react to the negative ones with indifference or sometimes feel conflicted. Lastly, several fathers explicitly reconstruct help-seeking, crying and expressing feeling, traits identified as feminine, as part of being a man.

The findings show that identity construction is fraught with ambiguities. Those fathers whose attitudes go against dominant gender norms, also still prioritise the mother when it comes to primary caregiving and the household. Other fathers feel they are making a difference as a father, while their attitudes are still in line with dominant gender norms. Gender differences are simultaneously redone and reproduced. Moreover, in the face of negative reactions, fathers can both feel indifferent and ashamed, both strong and small. Fathers give primacy to the mother but nevertheless express a wish for more recognition as parents.

In conclusion, fathers are able to construct their masculine identities in a way that reconciles being a man who takes responsibility and provides for his family, and taking care of children that includes primary caregiving and household tasks, as well as expressing feelings. Although this does

not mean fathers do not struggle, it does point to the construction of alternative masculinities that accompany involved fatherhood.

Theoretical discussion

The findings can be linked to the theory. Firstly, elements of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005), such as having work, being strong, unemotional and in control (e.g. Redpath et al., 2008) were identified by fathers, with some being endorsed while others distanced from, thus pointing to new combinations of hegemonic and alternative elements in masculine identity construction (Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2015). Thus, alternative masculinities also incorporate elements from hegemonic masculinity and not just the other way around (Connell, 2005). Clearly, masculinity is a fluid concept: fathers combine seemingly contradictory elements into a coherent and acceptable identity for themselves. Lastly, Connell's (2005) concept of subordinate masculinities comes back when some fathers are accused of being gay by other men, whereby these fathers are put into a lower position in the masculinity hierarchy. This shows the construction of power relations among men.

When looking at Fisher and Tronto's (1990) distinction between caring about, taking care of and caregiving, especially the first two are strongly represented in fathers' narratives. Although the majority of fathers perform primary caregiving tasks or used to, this is not emphasised in their narratives. Several of the influences on positive involvement in children's lives or transformative gender practices, such as perceptions of children's needs, necessity and own upbringing (e.g. Lupton & Barclay, 1997; Marsiglio et al., 2008; Morrell & Jewkes, 2011) can also be seen.

The findings of this research correspond to earlier findings and theories on fatherhood and care. First of all, fatherhood was constructed as central to being a man (e.g. Datta, 2007; Morrell, 2006). When looking at elements of fatherhood, fathers spoke of taking responsibility for their children's well-being and of engagement with their children in the form of direct interactions and supervisory activities (Marsiglio et al., 2008). Resisting and conforming to dominant gender norms go together in ambiguous ways (Doucet, 2004; Ostner, 2002; Morell & Jewkes, 2011; Plantin et al., 2003). Fathers express love for and to their children and provide for them (e.g. Datta, 2007; Mavungu et al., 2013). Thus, they combine hegemonic masculine traits, and caring and emotional engagement (Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2015), and sometimes struggle with this (Langa, 2010). In line with recent studies (e.g. Enderstein & Boonzaier, 2015), fathers' paternal identities incorporate a range of father roles. Traits more associated with the feminine, such as talking about problems, are incorporated in an alternative masculinity (see Doucet, 2004), which is sometimes seen as superior to the hegemonic one (Davies & Eagle, 2007).

Lastly, this research shows that gender cannot simply be undone, or gender differences reduced (Deutsch, 2007). Fathers are held accountable for doing gender according to dominant

gender norms (West & Zimmerman, 1987) and despite resisting them mostly through behaviour, gender remains an important identity in their narratives. Furthermore, it is hard to avoid speaking in terms of men and women. Although most fathers' attitudes are in line with dominant gender norms, which shows how ingrained these norms are, this research shows signs of redoing gender with fathers doing care work and redefining their masculine identities. This points to at least the potential for changing the gender order (Nentwich & Kelan, 2014; West & Zimmerman, 1987), slowly but surely and not without ambiguity and complexity.

Limitations and recommendations

This research has given rich insights into male CSG beneficiaries' paternal and masculine identity constructions in relation to dominant gender norms. It has provided additional empirical evidence for the theories outlined in the theoretical framework, by highlighting positive cases of father involvement and shedding light on a group of fathers not researched thus far. As the fathers shared their struggles during the interviews, being a female interviewer not having the same cultural background may have had a positive influence on creating a safe space for these fathers to openly talk about their experiences. However, with two black women, having a similar cultural background and being SASSA employees, as interpreters, may have restrained those specific fathers, although these fathers did not seem to feel restricted in talking.

Two limitations are important to mention. Firstly, the sampling was not done in a systematic way, which means that not every beneficiary on the list had an equal chance in participation in the research, thus entailing bias. On the other hand, the goal of this research was not to generalize the findings, and the sample turned out diverse enough when it comes to household composition, age, and children's ages. A pitfall that was not entirely avoided was to ask leading questions that reproduce assumptions about masculinity and femininity, thereby also excluding sensitivity to gender identities beyond this dichotomy. Lastly, with the benefit of hindsight, for some interviews an interpreter would have been useful, as some fathers arguably could have expressed themselves better in their vernacular. Some fathers had more difficulty in expressing their perception of norms, which also shows that interviewing can be a challenge to people's reflective capacities.

As this research can be seen as more exploratory, further explanatory research is recommended to more systematically study male CSG beneficiaries and their diverse situations and life trajectories, thereby potentially finding patterns among different sub-groups. Moreover, more in-depth attention could be given to beneficiaries' social (support) networks. Zoheb Khan's PhD-research is arguably able to address some of these gaps.

As for policy recommendations, the most important issue is to change the feminine image of the CSG and to give more recognition to positively involved fathers. This could be done by developing

nation-wide promotional campaigns to change people's knowledge about who can apply for the CSG, thereby also working together with NGOs operating within communities. In this way, change could also occur in people's attitudes on gender and care. Platforms for fathers to share their stories and find support may also be worthwhile. Lastly, SASSA could cast a critical eye on its service delivery to fathers to see if and where it needs improvement, to help fathers feel more comfortable and taken seriously when visiting the offices. Although social policy cannot do it alone, it is important to make sure that all fathers can fulfil the potential of playing a meaningful role in their children's lives, and to make the move towards a more gender equal society.

References

- Badgett, M. V., & Folbre, N. (1999). Assigning care: Gender norms and economic outcomes. *International Labour Review*, 138(3), 311-326.
- Bernard, H.R. (2006). *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (4th edition). Lanham/New York/Toronto/Oxford: AltaMira Press.
- Blackbeard, D., & Lindegger, G. (2007). 'Building a wall around themselves': Exploring adolescent masculinity and abjection with photo-biographical research. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 37(1), 25-46.
- Boeije, H. (2008). *Analyseren in Kwalitatief Onderzoek. Denken en Doen* (3rd edition). Amsterdam: Boom Onderwijs.
- Brandth, B., & Kvande, E. (1998). Masculinity and child care: The reconstruction of fathering. *The Sociological Review*, 46(2), 293-313.
- Budlender, D., & Lund, F. (2011). South Africa: A legacy of family disruption. *Development and Change*, 42(4), 925-946.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.
- Chili, S., & Maharaj, P. (2015). 'Becoming a father': Perspectives and experiences of young men in Durban, South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 46(3), 28-44.
- Cialdini, R. 2007. Descriptive social norms as underappreciated sources of social control. *Psychometrika*, 72(2), 263-268.
- Connell, R. W. (2002). Understanding men: Gender sociology and the new international research on masculinities. *Social Thought & Research*, 24(1&2), 13-31.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity. Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829-859.
- 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(2), 97-113.
- Davies, N., & Eagle, G. (2007). Nowadays they say...': Adolescent peer counsellors' appreciation of changes in the construction of masculinity. *Psychology in Society*, 35, 53-72.
- Denscombe, M. (2010). *The Good Research Guide. For Small-scale Social Research Projects* (4th edition). Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Deutsch, F. M. (2007). Undoing gender. *Gender & Society*, 21(1), 106-127.
- 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*, 2(3), 277.

- Enderstein, A. M., & Boonzaier, F. (2015). Narratives of young South African fathers: Redefining masculinity through fatherhood. *Journal of Gender Studies, 24*(5), 512-527.
- Fisher, B., & Tronto, J. (1990). Toward a feminist theory of caring. In Abel, E.K., & Nelson, M.K. (eds.), *Circles of Care: Work and Identity in Women's Lives* (pp. 35-62). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Graham, L. (2014). 'But I've got something that makes me different': Young men's negotiation of masculinities. *South African Review of Sociology, 45*(3), 3-19.
- Hassim, S. (2008). Social justice, care and developmental welfare in South Africa: A capabilities perspective. *Social Dynamics, 34*(2), 104-118.
- Hobson, B., & Morgan, D. (2002). Introduction. In Hobson, B. (ed.), *Making Men into Fathers. Men, Masculinities and the Social Politics of Fatherhood* (pp. 1-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, M. (2006). Fathers without *amandla*: Zulu-speaking men and fatherhood. In Morrell, R., & Richter, L. (eds.), *Baba. Men and Fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 99-107). Cape Town: HRSC Press.
- Lamb, M.E., & Tamis-LeMonda, C.S. (2004). The role of the father. An introduction. In Lamb, M.E. (ed.), *The Role of the Father in Child Development* (pp. 1-31). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J. H., Charnov, E. L., & Levine, J. A. (1987). A biosocial perspective on paternal behavior and involvement. In J. B. Lancaster, J.B., Altmann, J., Rossi, A.S., & Sherrod, L.R. (eds.), *Parenting Across the Lifespan: Biosocial Dimensions* (pp. 111-142). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Langa, M. (2010). Contested multiple voices of young masculinities amongst adolescent boys in Alexandra township, South Africa. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 22*(1), 1-13.
- Lindegger, G., & Maxwell, J. (2007). Teenage masculinity: The double bind of conformity to hegemonic standards. In Shefer, T., Ratele, K., Strebela, A., Shabalala, N., & Buikema, R. (eds.), *From Boys to Men. Social Constructions of Masculinity in Contemporary Society* (pp. 94-111). Lansdowne: UCT Press.
- Lund, F. (2008). *Changing Social Policy: The Child Support Grant in South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Lupton, D., & Barclay, L. (1997). *Constructing Fatherhood. Discourses and experiences*. Thousand Oaks/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Makusha, T., & Richter, L. (2014). The Role of Black Fathers in the Lives of Children in South Africa. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 38*(6), 982-992.

- Marsiglio, W., Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Exploring Fatherhood Diversity: Implications for Conceptualizing Father Involvement. *Marriage & Family Review, 29*(4), 269-293.
- Mavungu, M., Thomson-de Boor, H., & Mphaka, K. (2013). *So We Are ATM Fathers: A Study of Absent Fathers in Johannesburg*. Johannesburg: Centre for Social Development in Africa, University of Johannesburg / Cape Town: Sonke Gender Justice Network.
- Miller, T. (2010). *Making Sense of Fatherhood: Gender, Caring and Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mkhize, N. (2006). African traditions and the social, economic and moral dimensions of fatherhood. In Morrell, R., & Richter, L. (eds.), *Baba. Men and Fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 183-200). Cape Town: HRSC Press.
- Moller, M. (2007). Exploiting patterns: A critique of hegemonic masculinity. *Journal of Gender Studies, 16*(3), 263-276.
- 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*(10), 2411-2419.
- Morgan, D. H. J. (1992). *Discovering Men*. London: Routledge.
- Morrell, R. (1998). Of boys and men: Masculinity and gender in Southern African studies. *Journal of Southern African Studies, 24*(4), 605-630.
- Morrell, R. (2006). Fathers, fatherhood and masculinity in South Africa. In Morrell, R., & Richter, L. (eds.), *Baba. Men and Fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 26-37). Cape Town: HRSC Press.
- Morrell, R., & Jewkes, R. (2011). Carework and caring: A path to gender equitable practices among men in South Africa. *International Journal for Equity in Health, 10*(1), 17.
- Morrell, R., Jewkes, R., & Lindegger, G. (2012). Hegemonic masculinity/masculinities in South Africa: Culture, power, and gender politics. *Men and Masculinities, 15*(1), 11-30.
- Morrell, R., Jewkes, R., Lindegger, G., & Hamlall, V. (2013). Hegemonic masculinity: Reviewing the gendered analysis of men's power in South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology, 44*(1), 3-21.
- Morrell, R., & Richter, L. (2006). Introduction. In Morrell, R., & Richter, L. (eds.), *Baba. Men and Fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 1-12). Cape Town: HRSC Press.
- Nentwich, J. C., & Kelan, E. K. (2014). Towards a topology of 'doing gender': An analysis of empirical research and its challenges. *Gender, Work & Organization, 21*(2), 121-134.
- Ostner, I. (2002). A new role for fathers? The German case. In Hobson, B. (ed.), *Making Men into Fathers. Men, Masculinities and the Social Politics of Fatherhood* (pp. 150-167). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Patel, L., & Hochfeld, T. (2011). It buys food but does it change gender relations? Child support grants in Soweto, South Africa. *Gender & Development, 19*(2), 229-240.
- Patel, L., Hochfeld, T., Moodley, J., & Mutwali, R. (2012). *The Gender Dynamics and Impact of the Child Support Grant in Doornkop, Soweto CSDA Research Report*. Johannesburg: Centre for Social Development in Africa, University of Johannesburg
- Patel, L., Knijn, T., & Wel, F. van (2015). Child Support Grants in South Africa: A Pathway to Women's Empowerment and Child Well-being?. *Journal of Social Policy, 44*(02), 377-397.
- Plantin, L., Mansson, S. A., & Kearney, J. (2003). Talking and doing fatherhood: On fatherhood and masculinity in Sweden and England. *Fathering, 1*(1), 3.
- 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*(4), 553-563.
- Razavi, S. (2007). *The Political and Social Economy of Care in a Development Context: Conceptual Issues, Research Questions and Policy Options*. Gender and Development, Programme Paper Number 3, June 2007.
- Redpath, J., Morrell, R., Jewkes, R., & Peacock, D. (2008). *Masculinities and Public Policy in South Africa: Changing Masculinities and Working Towards Gender Equality*. Cape Town: Sonke Gender Justice Network.
- Richter, L. (2006). The importance of fathering for children. In Morrell, R., & Richter, L. (eds.), *Baba. Men and Fatherhood in South Africa* (pp. 53-72). Cape Town: HRSC Press.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society, 1*(2), 125-151.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (2009). Accounting for doing gender. *Gender and Society, 23*(1), 112-122.

Appendix 1

Table 1: an overview of the research participants

	Name	Age range	Children (CSG)	Household composition
1	Qinisela	< 35	Daughter (5) and son (1) – CSG beneficiary for period of time in past	With partner
2	Lethabo	35-50	Son (15)	With family member(s)
3	Bongani	< 35	Son (7) and daughter (6 months)	With partner
4	Sanele	< 35	Two girl cousins (9 and 7)	Single parent
5	Thabang	50+	Two girls (17 or 18 and 12)	With family member(s)
6	Sizwe	35-50	Daughter (11) and son (9)	Single parent, with family member(s)
7	Adam	35-50	Daughter (16)	With partner
8	Tom	35-50	Son (8)	Single parent, with family member(s)
9	Bheki	35-50	Daughter (14)	Single parent, with family member(s)
10	Amos	50+	Grandson (9 or 10)	With partner
11	Ludo	50+	Grandson (15) – until 2015	Single parent
12	Patrick	< 35	Two sons (12 and 7)	Single parent
13	John	35-50	Son (7) – during weekends	With partner
14	Emmanuel	< 35	Son (4)	With partner
15	George	35-50(?)	Son (15)	With partner
16	Jeff	50+	Grandchild (8)	With partner

Note. To guarantee anonymity, all research participants' names have been changed.

Table 2: the topic list used

Theoretical concept/topic	Operationalization	Interview questions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age • Household composition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Children: gender and age • Caring situation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How old are you? • Who else is part of the household you live in? • How many children live in your household that depend on you (gender, age)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Do you also have children living in other households? • How did you end up caring for your child(ren)?
<p>Paternal identity Own definition of caring (Fisher & Tronto, 1990’</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-conception as a father • Identification with role model • Constructing paternal identity in relation to gender norms 	<p>Paternal identity & own definition of caring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you describe yourself as a father? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does this differ per child? • If someone asks you what caring for your children involves, how would you describe it? Why? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What things does it include? Why? ○ How important do you find caring in this way for your children? Why? ○ Would men/people in your community agree with you? In what ways? Why? How does this make you feel? ○ Can you explain how you feel about being a man and caring for your children? • Do you have a male role model – it can be anyone – when it comes to being a father? A role model is someone who you admire or who you look up to. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Why this person? What characteristics does he have that makes him a good father? Why these characteristics? What about responsibilities?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would other men in your community agree on these characteristics? Can you explain this? How does this make you feel? ○ As a father, are you similar to your role model? In what ways? In what ways are you different?
<p>Caring arrangements (Fisher & Tronto, 1990; Marsiglio et al., 2008; Razavi, 2007)</p> <p>- social/emotional support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Care work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Caregiving/engagement & nurturance: i.a. bathing, feeding, changing nappies, reading to children, helping with homework, playing with children ○ Caregiving/accessibility: housework, grocery shopping • Sharing of activities with other household members • Constructing paternal identity in relation to gender norms 	<p>Caregiving/engagement/accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a father, what are your tasks in the household? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How often do you do these? How come? ○ What do you find the hardest tasks? Why? ○ What do you find the easiest tasks? Why? • What are your tasks in relation to caring for your children? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How do the caring tasks differ per child? ○ Do you feel that there are expectations of you to fulfil these tasks? From whom? Why? ○ Can you explain which ones you prefer or which you enjoy doing? ○ Can you explain which tasks you do not enjoy doing? ○ Can you explain which ones you find hard to do? And which ones are easier? ○ Can you explain for what tasks do you find that you don't have the time for? ○ Do you feel you can take care of your child(ren) in the same way as a mother can? ○ For all the above: does this differ per child? In what way? Why? <p>Autonomy, independence and interdependence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think you are similar or different to other men in your community? In what ways?

Why do you think you are similar or different?

- (if applicable) What makes you involved in your child(ren)'s life/lives, when compared to other fathers?
- What do you think your community (esp. men) thinks about you doing the (household and caring) tasks you do? Why? How does this make you feel?
- Do other household members comment on how you take care of your child(ren)? If so, how, and how does that make you feel?
 - Do their opinions differ from family members? From people (esp. men) in your community? In what ways?
- Do other household members also take care of your child(ren)?
 - Who do these tasks?
 - Who does what tasks and in what situations, and why? Do these tasks differ per child? Why?
 - Can you explain how you decide who does what tasks?
 - Do you feel like you are able to delegate tasks to other members? What tasks? How often? In what situations?
- Do you have friends, family or other people nearby who you can rely on for help with looking after the child(ren)?
 - Can you explain in what situations you need help? Can you give me an example? For which children?
 - What kinds of help do they give to you?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Practical, emotional (e.g. encouragement, providing listening ear, being understanding, reassurance, able to express thoughts and feelings) ○ How do you feel about them helping you? Why? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do you need additional support? What kind of, and why?
<p>Fatherhood roles - Fatherhood: ‘the social role men undertake to care for their children’ (Morrell, 2006, p. 18; cf. Marsiglio et al., 2008)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fatherhood roles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Protecting ○ Providing ○ Role model & moral guide ○ Caring (nurturing) • Constructing paternal identity in relation to gender norms 	<p>Father roles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you regard as the mother’s tasks and roles with respect to caring for children and what as the father’s tasks and roles? Why? Do these differ for children of different ages, and how, and why? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Which of the father’s roles you mentioned do you play in each of your children’s lives? ○ Do you think there are any situations or times when you would do [task he has defined as female] ○ Could you explain which of your roles as a father you find most important when thinking about the relationship with your child(ren), and which less? How do these differ per child? ○ Do your views differ from those of people in your community? How do they differ? What about men specifically? How does this make you feel? ○ Can you explain how you think your community regards you as a father? Do you feel that you are being accepted? Why?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you explain to me what you like about being a father? • Can you explain to me what you dislike about being a father? • What challenges have you had as a father? • In what ways has being a father changed you personally? Can you explain how you have changed since your first child? Have you changed with the birth of new children? How and Why?
<p>Masculinity and masculine identity - collective gender identity (Morrell, 1998) - ‘an everyday system of beliefs and performances that regulate behaviour between men and women, as well as between men and other men’ (Blackbeard & Lindegger, 2007, p. 95) - traits associated with masculinity: e.g. Redpath et al. (2008)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporates hegemonic masculinity and gender norms • Masculine beliefs, performances, behaviour/tasks within family <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As opposed to femininity – power differences • (hegemonic) masculine traits (i.a.): importance of work, independence, dominance, sexuality, strength, not emotional, aggressiveness & violence • Power: influences of community and wider society <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Constructing masculine identity in relation to gender norms 	<p>Masculinity and masculine identity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what way do you feel men and women are similar? • In what ways do you feel that men and women are different? Can you explain this? • Can you describe what characteristics men should have? Why? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Can you explain which of the characteristics you mentioned you find most important and which less important? ○ How have you come to this opinion of what a man should be? • Do you think people in your community would agree with your description of a man? Who would disagree? What would they say a man should be? Why? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Probe about norms on expressing feelings/crying/help-seeking/having a job and own attitudes about this: some people say... • Can you describe in what ways you feel you are a man? Can you explain this? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Can you also describe in what ways you don’t feel you are a man? Can you explain this as well?

<p>Child Support Grant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aspects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Motivation ○ Link with masculinity/gender norms ○ When applied ○ Process of applying ○ Use ○ Importance ○ Other beneficiaries in social network 	<p>Child Support Grant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you tell me how you found out about the CSG? • How do you feel about that you had to apply for the CSG? • How did you find out that men could apply for the CSG? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When did you apply? ○ For whom of your children did you apply? ○ How did you experience the application process? How do you get your money? • Why did you apply for the CSG? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How have you ended up taking care of your child(ren)? • How did family react when you started caring for your child(ren) and applied for the CSG? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ And friends and people from your community? • Only between 2 and 8 per cent of men apply for the CSG. How do you feel about this? Why do you think this number is so low? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How many men do you know that receive the CSG? Or men who take care of children and don't? • Can you explain how you spend the grant? • How important is the grant for you as a father? In what ways? Why?
-----------------------------------	--	---