

# Men and Masculinities

## **“Do you guys take showers with your children?”: Gendered Embodiment and the Legitimation of Italian Fathering Practices**

Journal:	<i>Men and Masculinities</i>
Manuscript ID	JMMX-19-0169.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	Fatherhood, Masculinity, Parenting, qualitative research, gendered embodiment
Abstract:	This work aims at investigating gendered embodiment in fathering practices in a national context, Italy, where understandings of fatherhood, at the institutional as well as the individual level, are still more centered on the provider ideal than on a model of nurturing and caring fatherhood. This qualitative research on Italian first-time fathers of children under three years old focused on men’s participation in routine, instrumental and material childcare practices, exploring the potential for a transformation in both the meanings attached to fatherhood as well as to aspects related to embodiment and constructions of masculinity that sustain inequalities. The findings show that, while participation in hands-on childcare plays an important role in the construction of intimate father-child relationships, a legitimation of men’s bodies’ involvement in interaction with children is still missing, especially for care practices that overlap with constructions of motherhood.

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4                   **“Do you guys take showers with your children?”: Gendered**  
5  
6                   **Embodiment and the Legitimation of Italian Fathering Practices**  
7  
8  
9

10  
11           **Abstract**  
12

13           This work aims at investigating gendered embodiment in fathering practices in a national  
14           context, Italy, where understandings of fatherhood, at the institutional as well as the  
15           individual level, are still more centered on the provider ideal than on a model of nurturing  
16           and caring fatherhood. This qualitative research on Italian first-time fathers of children  
17           under three years old focused on men’s participation in routine, instrumental and material  
18           childcare practices, exploring the potential for a transformation in both the meanings  
19           attached to fatherhood as well as to aspects related to embodiment and constructions of  
20           masculinity that sustain inequalities. The findings show that, while participation in hands-  
21           on childcare plays an important role in the construction of intimate father-child  
22           relationships, a legitimation of men’s bodies’ involvement in interaction with children is  
23           still missing, especially for care practices that overlap with constructions of motherhood.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41           **Keywords:** fatherhood; masculinity; parenting; gendered embodiment; qualitative research  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 The last decades have seen a burgeoning of research on fatherhood. The emergence of  
5  
6 research on fatherhood as a social phenomenon followed a rise of discourses in the Western  
7  
8 world around so-called “new” fathers, more involved and willing to participate in their  
9  
10 children’s lives (Cannito, 2019; Dermott, 2008; Kim & Pyke, 2015; Miller, 2011b; Randles,  
11  
12 2018). Looking at fathers’ involvement in their children’s life from a gendered perspective,  
13  
14 fatherhood has been interpreted as a specifically masculine experience, stimulating  
15  
16 reflections on the gendered meanings of the transition to parenthood and involvement with  
17  
18 children in shifting constructions of masculinities. Indeed, many scholars have shown that  
19  
20 changes in the ways fatherhood is understood and enacted reflect meso- and macro-level  
21  
22 changes in gender relations within and across societies (Bertone, Ferrero Camoletto, &  
23  
24 Rollé, 2015; Crespi & Ruspini, 2016; Dermott, 2008; Grunow & Evertsson, 2016; Hobson,  
25  
26 2002; Kim & Pyke 2015; Miller, 2011b). Within this construction, several scholars  
27  
28 (Connell, 1995; Doucet, 2013; Ranson, 2015) have looked at the involvement of bodies in  
29  
30 material care as part of a re-signification of masculinities, potentially toward more  
31  
32 egalitarian modes of gender relations.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 In the Italian context, fathers’ gendered embodiment in material childcare has  
39  
40 received little scholarly attention. Despite this, scholarship on fatherhood in Italy has  
41  
42 considered diverse issues and provided a nuanced picture of Italian fatherhood, taking into  
43  
44 account different aspects and perspectives, including men’s participation in care practices.  
45  
46 Research has documented that a majority of Italian fathers agree that the “breadwinner”  
47  
48 model, which sees the man as more involved in the public sphere of paid work than in the  
49  
50 private sphere of domestic and care work, is still prominent (Della Puppa & Miele, 2015;  
51  
52 Musumeci & Santero, 2018), though some also point out that Italian fathers are looking for  
53  
54 intimacy with their children and value involvement in childcare (Bertone, Ferrero  
55  
56 Camoletto, & Rollé, 2016; Magaraggia, 2012; Cannito, 2019). Despite this body of research  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 on fatherhood in Italy, little attention has so far been paid to narratives around the more  
5  
6 mundane, day-to-day material childcare practices and their role in the construction of  
7  
8 fatherhood. In this article, I begin to fill this gap.

9  
10 This work aims at investigating men's participation in material childcare practices, with a  
11  
12 specific focus on physical contact and the involvement of bodies considered as issues related  
13  
14 to gender and masculinity. Drawing on thirty-three discursive interviews with Italian first-  
15  
16 time fathers of young children (0-3 years old), I consider the intersections of involvement  
17  
18 in material care practices and processes of meaning construction around fatherhood, through  
19  
20 an analysis of men's understandings of embodied care and its implications for masculinities  
21  
22 and parenting. In particular, I focus this analysis on the relevance of bodily contact and  
23  
24 physical intimacy in providing care, and especially in practices traditionally identified as  
25  
26 motherly or feminine. Investigating fathering practices and embodiment holds a dual  
27  
28 potential: on the one hand, it provides useful instruments for rethinking men's roles as  
29  
30 fathers and their place in gender relations; on the other, it can expose the lack of social and  
31  
32 cultural legitimation of men's bodies engaging in care work and the persistence of  
33  
34 hegemonic constructions of masculinity for understanding fatherhood, further legitimating  
35  
36 gender inequality (even as it might simultaneously illustrate change).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **MASCULINITIES, CARE PRACTICES, AND EMBODIMENT**

46  
47 This work draws on several theoretical perspectives. The broader framework lies in the  
48  
49 literature on men and masculinities, according to which masculinities are configurations of  
50  
51 practices structured by gender relations, and have an historical and contextual character  
52  
53 (Connell, 1995). To make sense of fatherhood and gendered embodiment in fathering  
54  
55 practices, I borrow from scholars who have looked at the issue with the help of both feminist  
56  
57 care theory and phenomenology, which helps to highlight bodies' subjectivity (Hamington,  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 2002), as care, in its intersubjective and material character, implies an involvement of the  
5  
6 body.

7  
8 The interconnection between masculinities and fathers' experiences was explored in  
9  
10 Raewyn Connell's (1995) theorization of masculinities and gender relations, in which she  
11  
12 suggests that for a change in the gender order to occur it is necessary to adopt "degendering  
13  
14 strategies" and that a re-embodiment of men is needed. Indeed, as Connell (1995) writes,  
15  
16 "When pictures of men with guns are rare, and pictures of men with [strollers] are common,  
17  
18 we will really be getting somewhere." This **change** involves a transformation in symbols  
19  
20 and actions associated with masculinity, to be sure; but bodies are intimately involved as  
21  
22 well.  
23  
24

25  
26 In subsequent revisions to and critiques of Connell's theoretical concept, especially  
27  
28 the notion of hegemonic masculinity, and proposals of new configurations of masculinities  
29  
30 and shifts in gender relations and/or the gender order (e.g., Anderson & McCormack, 2018;  
31  
32 Arxer, 2011; Bridges & Pascoe, 2014; Demetriou, 2001; Duncanson, 2015), this suggestion  
33  
34 has been primarily taken up by Elliott (2016) in her theorization of "caring" masculinities.  
35  
36 The idea of "caring masculinities" is theoretically based on feminist care theory, which  
37  
38 draws from the concept of the ethics of care (Held, 2006; Tronto, 1993) as an alternative to  
39  
40 classic moral theories, according to which social actors are independent and rational. The  
41  
42 ethics of care, instead, proceeds from the premise that individuals are interdependent, and  
43  
44 that relations of care—in which a person is classed either as caregiver or as care receiver  
45  
46 (Tronto, 1993)—are unavoidable across the course of one's life.  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Drawing upon this theorization, feminist scholars (Fine & Glendinning, 2005;  
52  
53 Kittay, 1999; Ungerson, 2006) have looked into the concept of dependence, arguing that  
54  
55 care implies reciprocal dependence in the relationship between the caregiver and those being  
56  
57 cared for, highlighting the inherently *relational* character of care. As Held (2006) points  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 out, care (both a practice and a value) relies on factors like sensitivity, knowledge and  
5  
6 trust—all factors that can be learned. In Elliott’s (2016) theorization, caring masculinities  
7  
8 are

9  
10 “masculine identities that reject domination and its associated traits and embrace  
11  
12 values of care such as positive emotion, interdependence, and relationality. [T]hese  
13  
14 caring masculinities constitute a critical form of men’s engagement and involvement  
15  
16 in gender equality and offer the potential of sustained social change for men and  
17  
18 gender relations” (2016, p. 240).  
19

20  
21  
22 As a framework, Elliott’s caring masculinities provides an analytical lens for examining  
23  
24 men’s experiences that require engaging with care and bonding, such as fatherhood.  
25

26  
27 Indeed, other scholars have drawn attention to fathers who do perform material care  
28  
29 on their children in an exceptional way, such as stay-at-home dads or fathers taking long  
30  
31 parental leaves, to investigate different conceptualizations of the father’s role as related to  
32  
33 changing masculine identities. For instance, the embodiment of care has been the central  
34  
35 focus of Ranson’s (2015) work on Canadian stay-at-home fathers, documenting that  
36  
37 material childcare work consists of a set of bodily practices that can be learned. In Ranson’s  
38  
39 perspective, fathers’ embodied caregiving and their progress in acquiring competence in  
40  
41 caring practices has feminist potential and could lead to the de-gendering of social structures  
42  
43 through men’s participation in hands-on childcare. Ranson observes how, due to the  
44  
45 imperatives of “true masculinity,” fathers have been socialized to “suppress their bodies”  
46  
47 (2015, p. 3) so that the physical experience of contact with the child’s body and the  
48  
49 reciprocal feeling of being available for touching is a new element introduced into these  
50  
51 fathers’ experience of the world itself. Here, Ranson draws on Lupton’s (2012) notion of  
52  
53 “interembodiment,” which refers to the relational dimensions of embodiment, and the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 concept of “skinship” developing through this intertwining and intimate relationship  
5  
6 between infants and their caregivers.  
7

8  
9 Consistent with other work, Ranson also found that fathers develop strong  
10 attachments to the children they nurture and come to appreciate care work as work in itself,  
11 recognizing its dignity and its difference from any other kind of work. An appreciation of  
12 care work emerges clearly from Hamington’s (2002) account of fathering his child as well.  
13 From a philosophical perspective, Hamington expresses faith in the possibility of a “moral  
14 revolution” to take place starting from men involving their bodies in care – what he calls  
15 “embodied care” (2002, p. 271). According to Hamington, embodied care, along with the  
16 reiteration of care practices that allow the touching bodies—of the caregiver and the care  
17 receiver—to learn from each other, gives men the chance to take on a different place, not  
18 just in families through fathering, but in broader social relations. This place, according to  
19 Hamington, implies accessibility and kindness and considers the body as the primary gate  
20 to new ways of relating with others based on intersubjectivity and reciprocity.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Not all work on involved fatherhood, however, has documented this gendered shift.  
37 For instance, Doucet (2006, 2016) discovered processes of “internal complexity and  
38 contradiction” taking place among the stay-at-home fathers she interviewed. While these  
39 fathers living and working for sustained periods as primary carers are in unique positions to  
40 create new configurations and understandings of masculinity, Doucet found that her  
41 interviewees were quite keen, in their narratives, to distinguish themselves as men,  
42 heterosexual, masculine, and fathers as distinctly opposed to mothers. Doucet observes that  
43 these fathers spoke as embodied subjects and agents in their parenting by emphasizing  
44 physical activities with the children, which drew on notions of masculine embodiment as  
45 “strong, physical and muscle-bound” (Doucet 2006, p. 711). According to her, embodiment  
46 has moral dimensions as well: caring for children involves networking around one’s own  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 children, other parents and other children, and these networks are often dominated by  
4 mothers. As a consequence, fathers may feel their presence to be potentially disturbing, as  
5 men's bodies and presence are more likely to be interpreted as potentially aggressive and  
6 sexually threatening. Here, for instance, men in Doucet's (2006) study spoke about fears of  
7 "moral" judgement or suspicion.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Finally, Doucet observes that there are parenting situations in which bodies do  
16 matter and others in which they do not: when a father is attending to children by performing  
17 all kinds of material care, even the most hands-on activities such as feeding or bathing them,  
18 gendered embodiment can be negligible. In other situations, however, as anticipated, the  
19 social gaze upon men's movements with children is tinged with suspicion and surveillance  
20 as men move in spaces in which women are more dominant, and there, in public, is where  
21 men's bodies matter the most (see also Doucet, 2009a, 2009b). These problematic aspects  
22 are also at the center of Gabb's (2013) reflections on gendered bodies and parenting.  
23 Disagreeing with Doucet when she claims that bodies sometimes matter and sometimes do  
24 not, Gabb argues that gendered bodies always matter, and are crucial in shaping perceptions  
25 and practices of fatherhood. Gabb contends that physical intimacy is always at risk of being  
26 misunderstood, and certain interactions are more at risk than others: one case in point is  
27 family bathing, which involves nudity and therefore must be framed non-sexually, involving  
28 displays of social appropriateness.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 According to this body of scholarship, if it is possible to say that men are indeed  
48 capable of engaging with material childcare practices involving bodily contact and  
49 intimacy, an important question emerges: what happens when they do? On the one hand, a  
50 relevant involvement in care might mean for men to appreciate care work in general, to  
51 review the boundaries of their bodies, and eventually, maybe, to embrace an ethics of care.  
52 On the other, men's gendered embodiments, embedded in a gender order based on  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 hierarchical relations within and between genders, implies that performances of certain  
5  
6 practices will be situated and understood as problematic. These contributions are  
7  
8 fundamental to the investigation of the object of this paper. As will become clearer in the  
9  
10 results section, reflections on the potential of fathers' participation in hands-on material care  
11  
12 practices for a revision of broader gender relations have guided my research question, but  
13  
14 the concerns that some scholars have expressed for the problematic aspects of men's  
15  
16 gendered embodiment are operating here as well.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## 22 **DATA AND METHODS**

23  
24 The data are composed of semi-structured discursive interviews collected in 2016 on a  
25  
26 sample of thirty-three Italian fathers, and a focus group organized in 2017, in which five of  
27  
28 the thirty-three interviewees were involved. The fathers who participated in the study were  
29  
30 all heterosexual cisgender men living in two (mainly urban) areas of Piedmont, a region in  
31  
32 north-western Italy, employed and living with the mothers of their children (in most cases  
33  
34 the women were employed as well). The sample was constructed in three ways: personal  
35  
36 acquaintances, snowballing, and an institutional channel, the Integrated Educational System  
37  
38 Service 0-6 years of the Educational Services Office of the City of Turin. This office put  
39  
40 me in contact with directors of municipal public nursery schools, who promoted my research  
41  
42 within their facilities and provided me with contacts of fathers willing to participate. After  
43  
44 completing the interview, I asked respondents whether they would be available to  
45  
46 participate in a focus group as I was interested in investigating processes of meaning  
47  
48 constructions around fatherhood in interactions with other fathers. Originally, eighteen  
49  
50 fathers expressed their interest. Due to time restraints and incompatibility with working  
51  
52 hours, only five of these eighteen men were able to participate in the focus group.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 I took a few characteristics into account in selecting a sample of Italian fathers. First,  
5  
6 I collected men who had only one child, whose age had to fall between zero and three years.  
7  
8 I did this because young children require a specific commitment to material care practices,  
9  
10 and fathers' participation in those practices is the specific focus of this article. Additionally,  
11  
12 longitudinal studies on dual-earner couples facing and experiencing a transition to  
13  
14 parenthood show that the transition to parenthood and the first few years after childbirth are  
15  
16 crucial moments for the construction of gender, often resulting in a strengthening of  
17  
18 traditional views on gender roles (Fox, 2009; Miller, 2011a; Naldini, 2015). Therefore, a  
19  
20 deeper focus on fathers' experiences in the first years of their children's lives illuminates  
21  
22 this critical period of time in examining the gendered aspects of material and bodily  
23  
24 involvement of fathers in childcare practices.  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 The interviews and the focus group were all conducted by the author, audio recorded  
30  
31 and transcribed. All interactions were in Italian, and I translated excerpts presented in this  
32  
33 article into English. The interviews were semi-structured, and they addressed four primary  
34  
35 themes: (1) everyday routine experiences of fathering, (2) retrospective examinations of the  
36  
37 first emergence of their desire for parenthood, pregnancy and preparation for the arrival of  
38  
39 the child, (3) narrations of the experiences and representations of fatherhood and  
40  
41 motherhood, and (4) considerations of references for the construction of representations of  
42  
43 fatherhood.  
44  
45  
46

47 After transcription, I analyzed the data with a thematic approach, first selecting  
48  
49 sections of the interviews based on their content, qualifying them by means of a set of codes,  
50  
51 and finally looking for relations between the codes attributed to the segments of content  
52  
53 (Cardano, 2011). I relied on the qualitative analysis software Atlas.TI to identify and  
54  
55 retrieve quotations, and codes were created on the basis of recurrent themes and contents  
56  
57 during the process of analysis. To synthesize information on the interviewees and create  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 individual profiles to cross with the thematic analysis of the interviews, I produced  
4 individual synopses for each father, including socio-demographic data, information on  
5 education and employment status of partners when available, and content on some  
6 dimensions of analysis: work/care arrangements, childcare practices, desires and  
7 anticipations for fatherhood, narratives of pregnancy and birth, acknowledgment of  
8 becoming a father, meanings of fatherhood and public depictions of fatherhood.  
9

10  
11 The single focus group was analyzed with the same content-based principles.  
12  
13 Though, as I was only able to organize one focus group, I am not able to analyze the  
14 recurrence of themes in homosocial interaction around fatherhood. However, I was able to  
15 capture how some of the themes addressed in individual interviews were (or were not)  
16 mobilized by fathers in interaction with other fathers. For these reasons, I focus primarily  
17 on the content rather than the shape of the discussion and the relational dynamics that took  
18 place among the participants (i.e., Cardano, 2011; Frisina, 2010).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

39  
40 The following sections are devoted to the presentation of the main findings of the  
41 study in terms of fathers' participation in childcare, their narratives around the meanings  
42 attached to it, and specific issues of gendered embodiment in fathering. Here, I summarize  
43 the ways Italian fathers in this sample expressed affection and emotional attachments  
44 through embodied practices of care for their children. Subsequently, I examine the ways  
45 Italian fathers described embodied fathering practices they perceived as gender  
46 transgressions or described being interactionally made to feel as though they had  
47 transgressed the boundaries of acceptable and culturally intelligible masculinity.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### **Childcare practices, bodies and affection**

In this section, I explore fathers' narratives around childcare practices, with the aim of reconstructing the meanings attached to childcare and its relevance in the embodied construction of fatherhood. My interviewees demonstrate that when men regularly perform material childcare practices, and when these are laden with – and express – affection (Hamington, 2002), they express recognition of their own place in a unique and exclusive relationship with their children.

To investigate the interviewees' participation in routine care practices, I asked them to describe in detail their previous day, or the most recent standard working day in case the day preceding our meeting had been non-standard for some reason. Through this, I elicited narrations of activities they usually performed, but also of those activities that were unusual, or unusually acted out by themselves or their partners, and therefore opening discussion on the ways care work was allocated within the couple (and, occasionally, among external actors). Only a minority shifted their involvement in paid work in terms of reducing working hours, and none were the primary caregiver of their children.

Despite this, most of the fathers reported being regularly involved in some daily material care “instrumental” practices (Tanturri & Mencarini, 2009) such as feeding, dressing, changing, washing, and putting their children to sleep. When describing their involvement in material care practices, an interesting connection with physical closeness, bodily involvement and affection emerged in the fathers' descriptions of this work, especially in the relevance ascribed to bodily contact and the expression of physical affection in the construction of a father's role based on intimacy (e.g., Dermott 2008).

Across the interviews, care practices and physical contact were described in three different ways. First, fathers discussed engaging in material childcare without explicitly mentioning physical contact. Second, fathers stressed care activities involving physical

1  
2  
3  
4 contact, and especially material expressions of affection such as hugs and kisses, but without  
5  
6 overlapping. Finally, another group of fathers addressed care practices and physical contact  
7  
8 together and as overlapping. In this latter case, taking up one third of the sample, bodily  
9  
10 contacts between father and child, experienced during material care activities, were  
11  
12 described as laden with emotional and affective content. Two interviewees, Vincenzo and  
13  
14 Armando, illustrate this clearly. Vincenzo is a university professor, and also explained that  
15  
16 thanks to his flexible working hours, he is regularly involved in routine care activities. For  
17  
18 him, becoming a parent has been an experience full of emotional meanings, a time when he  
19  
20 can finally openly express his affection, in his words “an affective re-signification.” In  
21  
22 telling me about his day, he recounted:  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 Sometimes it happens to me in the morning for example, to wake up with some  
31  
32 anxieties because of work, and... I hear my child calling me and it's like, it's  
33  
34 like a shock running through me, shaking my anxieties off, (...) he shakes me,  
35  
36 he urges me, he mobilizes me, he calls me to contact, he calls me to affection,  
37  
38 and I hold him in my arms, he's still warm from the night, you know?, like  
39  
40 that... and he leans all against me, and I really feel these anxieties melt down,  
41  
42 you know? (Vincenzo, 48, son aged 2 years and 5 months, professor)  
43  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 Here, Vincenzo explains how embodied interactions with his son help to center him and put  
49  
50 him at emotional ease. Similarly, Armando, a self-employed electrician who - in contrast to  
51  
52 Vincenzo - works long hours outside his house, speaks about childcare in terms that make  
53  
54 clear the affective meaning he attaches to physical contact expressed through care practices:  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Changing diapers, it's something that I always enjoyed doing, meaning bathing  
5 her, or (...) spreading cream on her. Yes, I like it... I enjoy doing it, (...) it's a  
6 relationship, it's something that, let's say... (...) it's a moment when, you know,  
7  
8 I take a mental picture of her, of her phases. (Armando, 41, daughter aged 2  
9  
10 years and 4 months, electrician)  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 Vincenzo and Armando are two different cases. They describe embodied care practices in  
19 different ways and their different working conditions shape their involvement in childcare.  
20  
21 They also have different educational backgrounds, and therefore different cultural  
22 instruments with which to make sense of this relationship and transformation. So, they rely  
23 on different words in their narration. Nevertheless, *these fathers* seem to convey similar  
24 kinds of meaning in *their* embodied practices of fathering: physical contact embedded in  
25 care practices plays a fundamental role for the construction of a unique and un-mediated  
26 relationship with their children (Hamington, 2002). For these men, material care is not just  
27 "women's work," or inherently distant from their capabilities, even if Armando's "Yes, I  
28 like it" might imply that he also understands the work or his feelings about the work as not  
29 fully compatible with masculinity. Rather, material care, for these men, exists as an activity  
30 that contributes to defining their being parents: caring "about" their children equals caring  
31 "for" them (Tronto, 1993). *While Vincenzo and Armando are only two of my respondents,*  
32 *11 interviewees expressed similar sentiments regarding the affective and emotional content*  
33 *of embodied care practices, and a total of 19 fathers in my study explicitly recounted*  
34 *showing affection to their children in a physical way.*  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### **Crossing bodily boundaries: issues of legitimation**

Participating to childcare practices means, in some cases, crossing the borders of what has been called the “feminine province” (Hauser, 2015) of caregiving, and bodily contact is a predominant feature of this province. The most pervasive and commonsense view of parenting roles, usually based on naturalized and essentialist understandings of gender, implies that (biological) motherhood brings a revision of bodily boundaries, made fluid and permeable by pregnancy and breastfeeding, not required by fatherhood (Lupton & Barclay, 1997). Just as Armando *situated* his enjoyment of intimate care work as possibly understood as at odds with his masculinity (“... Yes, I like it), this analysis of fathers’ narratives of their engagement with territories of intimate, “motherly” contact with their children highlights how fathers’ involvement in certain bodily care practices can expose the tension between hegemonic understandings of masculinity and emerging models of caring fatherhood.

### ***Invading motherhood***

Some scholars (e.g., Hodkinson & Brooks, 2018; Ranson, 2015) have highlighted that a high participation of fathers in childcare could be summarized as doing “everything but breastfeeding.” Indeed, breastfeeding, according to most of my interviewees, is an activity that mothers themselves consider relevant for their own experiences of mothering and are not eager to delegate. For some interviewees, their involvement in bottle feeding with expressed milk or formula was due to the impossibility for the mother to breastfeed naturally. For a few, though, it could also be a part of a routine involvement in childcare. Massimiliano, a new father whose child is only two months old, illustrates this kind of involvement. His story makes it clear, though, that feeding a newborn child implies the need for a legitimation that is not always readily available: in telling me about his day, Massimiliano recalls that

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 At a certain point [my child] started to cry and I understood he was hungry,  
7  
8 because we can more or less recognize his crying now. Like during his first  
9  
10 month he had a colic and there we could understand that he was whining about  
11  
12 that. Now when he cries, it's usually because he's either very bored, or he's  
13  
14 hungry, and in that case, I understood that he was hungry. So I took the milk out  
15  
16 of the freezer, his mother's expressed milk, defrosted it, put it in a bain-marie,  
17  
18 filled the bottle up, and then I bottle fed him, with my dad there telling me "you  
19  
20 are such a pretty mommy" [*laughs*], And once he was done I put him down in  
21  
22 his cradle, (...) and then he started whining again, I held him up again and I kept  
23  
24 holding him in my arms until he fell asleep on me... he often falls asleep on my  
25  
26 chest because he feels my warmth, my heart. At night, too, sometimes I put him  
27  
28 on my chest. (Massimiliano, 45, son aged 2 months, employee)  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Massimiliano's story is uncommon among fathers in this study in how he speaks about  
37  
38 childcare: he expresses a special competence at recognizing his child's needs, he describes  
39  
40 in detail the actions required for providing care, and he mentions being physically involved  
41  
42 in comforting and soothing his child. What is most interesting, though, is that he is aware  
43  
44 of the fact that his crossing boundaries with mothering could be questioned: his father  
45  
46 reminded him of it, by seemingly disparaging him jokingly as "a pretty mommy." While  
47  
48 Massimiliano laughed when he shared this, he is also demonstrating his understanding of  
49  
50 this kind of care work as transgressing gendered boundaries around fatherhood and  
51  
52 motherhood. And this work also illustrates the power of interactions that work to effectively  
53  
54 police the gendered boundaries of fathering for men.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 Different scholars (e.g., Magaraggia, 2012; Steinour, 2018) have pointed out the  
5  
6 relevance of language for the definition of fathering practices in relation to masculinity. As  
7  
8 Magaraggia (2012) points out in discussing Italy, the lack of specific terms to define a “male  
9  
10 caregiver” encourages fathers who participate in childcare to rely on androgynous language,  
11  
12 as care is invariably attached to femininity, even at the level of language. Massimiliano’s  
13  
14 child is too young to interact, but he is very involved in childcare, so he confesses he finds  
15  
16 it hard to define himself a father: rather, he thinks of himself as a “male babysitter.” This  
17  
18 has dual implications: (1) designating the babysitter role as requiring a gendered qualifier  
19  
20 implies a feminine role, and (2) this framing symbolically works to resituate mothers as  
21  
22 primary parents and fathers as “helpers.” According to Magaraggia (2012), the diffusion of  
23  
24 neologisms such as “*mammo*” (in Italian, the grammatically masculine form of “*mamma*”—  
25  
26 mom) describes fathers who share childcare work, and it expresses an ambivalence, as on  
27  
28 the one hand it evidences a change in fathers’ roles, while on the other it highlights a  
29  
30 “continuing discrepancy between changes in fatherhood and masculinity” (ibid., p. 80).  
31  
32 Bottle feeding a child represents, especially in the eyes of a father from an older cohort, as  
33  
34 Massimiliano’s case shows, an “invasion” of a feminine field: for Massimiliano, it meant  
35  
36 being called a “pretty mommy,” in an emasculating definition of fathering (Steinour, 2018).  
37  
38 Similar feelings of “trespassing” in mothers’ territories, when describing care practices  
39  
40 (even if with different degrees of involvement) and father-child relationships, have been  
41  
42 expressed by 21 men in my study.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

### ***Skin to skin***

52  
53 According to these interview data, bodily involvement takes on special relevance in defining  
54  
55 fathering practices and the meanings men attach to them. Expressing affective attachment  
56  
57 through the performance of material care, and a recognizable investment in the latter, might  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 initially seem a manifestation of “caring masculinity” (Elliott, 2016). And, as I have shown,  
4 this is an important component of what is happening. Despite this, physical closeness is still,  
5  
6 however, a controversial theme, especially when proposed in interactions with other men,  
7  
8 as my focus group of Italian fathers demonstrates.  
9  
10  
11

12  
13 Other research work has pointed out how the experience of the focus group is a  
14 protective setting that may allow men to make visible practices of intimacy with children  
15 that question some traditional boundaries of masculinity, such as the relationship with one’s  
16 own body and emotions through contact with someone else (e.g., L. Allen, 2005; Ferrero  
17 Camoletto & Bertone, 2016). Yet, focus groups of men are also opportunities to examine  
18 masculinity in interaction. Indeed, speaking about one’s body while talking with other men  
19 about children and childcare can cast doubt on the “appropriateness” of a certain level of  
20 physical intimacy, doubts that have to do with hegemonic constructions of masculinity that  
21 imply sexual aggressiveness and the integrity of bodily boundaries. During the focus group  
22 discussion, bodily contact and its relationship with fathers’ involvement in childcare was  
23 introduced by one of the participants, Raimondo, in what sounded like a request for  
24 legitimation from other fathers. The following transcript from the group interaction provides  
25 extremely useful insights and cues for the interpretation of fathers’ embodiment in care  
26 practices:  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 **Raimondo:** I wanted to ask you, do you guys take baths or showers, naked, with  
48 your children?  
49

50  
51 **Oreste:** Yes, yes.

52  
53 **Saverio:** Yes.

54  
55 **Raimondo:** Even if it’s a girl? Even though she looks at your wiener?  
56

57  
58 **Oreste:** Looks at it?! She always wants to play with it...  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 **Saverio:** That's right! I have risked several times to... *[mimics a strong pull]*

5  
6 (...)

7  
8 **Raimondo:** And doesn't it occur to you to doubt whether it is healthy to...

9  
10 **Saverio:** Yes, yes, it occurs to me, it's occurred to me.

11  
12 **Oreste:** No, I had a doubt about, understanding what kind of reaction my child's  
13 mother could have, but she didn't have a reaction, she had the same reaction I  
14 had, so I thought, OK, as long as we are both OK with it...

15  
16 **Rodolfo:** (...) My wife was never against it, the opposite: 'take a shower  
17 together so you make it faster, please.' *[laughter]*

18  
19 **Saverio:** That's right. It's always a matter of necessities in the end.

20  
21 **Rodolfo:** It's necessities, not a problem *[laughter]* mostly necessities.

22  
23 **Oreste:** 'Oh, so you're taking a bath? Here, take her.'

24  
25 **Rodolfo:** You make it faster, two for the price of one and problem solved!

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 This discussion is marked by the breaking of two symbolic gendered boundaries: one is that  
37 of men's bodies, that can, apparently, be engaged in intimate contacts with children,  
38 contacts that imply mutual nudity; a second boundary is that of legitimate discourses in  
39 homosocial interactions: speaking with other men about showering with their daughters is  
40 possible. In this discussion, however, these gendered boundary transgressions were  
41 simultaneously authorized and upheld. Firstly, with humor, a very powerful instrument for  
42 constructing complicity (i.e., Ferrero Camoletto, 2013), the men jokingly justified an  
43 intimate embodied parenting practice (bathing with children). Secondly, as already  
44 observed for breastfeeding, by referring to mothers' roles in authorizing that kind of contact,  
45 thus sustaining an understanding of women as mediators of fathers' relationships with their  
46 children (Donatiello & Santero, 2015).  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 In what has been received as a less relatable narrative by the rest of the group,  
5  
6 Raimondo explained how his interest in physical closeness with his child was hard to accept  
7  
8 in his family environment:  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 **Raimondo:** For example, I remember caressing my daughter in order for her to  
14  
15 enjoy it, you know? To really make her feel... [*mimics a caress*] and my sister-  
16  
17 in-law was shocked, as if to say... well, (...) like, a pedophile, you know?  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 Raimondo is the father of a very long desired 2-year-old girl. He was very reflexive about  
23  
24 his experience as a father during our interview, and – a unique case in my sample – he took  
25  
26 a 4-month break from work in order to take care of her, together with his partner, after her  
27  
28 birth. His account of public display of physical contact could be interpreted, with Doucet  
29  
30 (2006), as a consequence of the domination of women in childcare: men's embodiment can  
31  
32 be interpreted as potentially aggressive and sexually threatening, especially when enacted  
33  
34 in public. In Raimondo's case, caressing his daughter in the presence of his sister-in-law put  
35  
36 him under a gaze that made this controversy emerge. Similarly, the absence of comments  
37  
38 from other participants in the focus group about his story signaled a lack of available  
39  
40 discourses to oppose this framing. As these data show, consistent with previous research,  
41  
42 the relationship between masculinity and embodiment in relation to childcare is complex.  
43  
44 If, on the one hand, hands-on care does make way for a revision of the boundaries of fathers'  
45  
46 bodily involvement, on the other the meanings culturally attached to the male body, of  
47  
48 aggressiveness and sexual potency, may hinder a full legitimation of men's physical  
49  
50 involvement with their children (Gabb 2013).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this work, I investigate men's bodily involvement in childcare in a national context, Italy, in which fathers' participation in childcare practices is still far from comparable to mothers'. The implications of fathers' gendered embodiments in fathering have been less examined by existing scholarship on fatherhood. Contrary to most international research, the fathers in my sample are not stay-at-home, primary caregivers, who decided – for whatever reason – to step away from “traditional” arrangements based on masculine provider roles and feminine caregiver roles—a model still prominent in Italy. They are, instead, mostly full-time workers, some of them are the sole providers in their households, and the vast majority did not take any significant break from work when their first child was born. Yet, in their narratives of daily routines, I identify some important hints of how hands-on care might transform the meanings attached to fatherhood in Italy; of how problematic, from a gender perspective, some care practices are in reproducing gender inequality; and of the ways Italian fathers navigate different and sometimes conflicting expectations of their involvement in hands-on care. According to these data, embodied care practices are sets of bodily practices and behaviors that, as other scholarship on care work has demonstrated, can be learned. It also seems, however, that gendered embodiment, and specifically the cultural and symbolic meanings that men's bodies carry, makes it harder for men to engage in certain care practices, especially in public.

Most of the fathers whose stories I collected are, to some degree, involved in hands-on care even when most of their time is dedicated to paid work, and many described their participation in material care practices as having a role in the construction of their experience of fatherhood as first and foremost aiming to develop an intimate relation with their children (Dermott, 2008).

1  
2  
3  
4 Yet, it is worth looking more closely at those situations when men engage in what  
5  
6 Gabb (2013) refers to as the “risky” business of physically and emotionally engaged  
7  
8 parenting, by either crossing borders with the most celebrated cornerstone of naturalized  
9  
10 mothering (breastfeeding) or by bringing to light the thorny issue of men’s bodies in  
11  
12 intimate contact with children’s. The fathers whose stories I present here, and who discussed  
13  
14 these kinds of gendered boundary transgressions in their parenting practices, are also  
15  
16 atypical, at least for the Italian context, in the ways they think of themselves as “involved”  
17  
18 fathers. Massimiliano, for example, plans to take a few months of parental leave, and  
19  
20 Raimondo took a four-month break from work when his daughter was born. In their  
21  
22 accounts of material care and bodily involvement, they all struggled in different ways and  
23  
24 to different degrees with legitimating their interpretations of fatherhood. This kind of  
25  
26 legitimacy is interactionally produced, and the fathers in this study discussed not being fully  
27  
28 granted legitimacy from peers and significant others alike, alongside with what has been  
29  
30 noted to be a more general discomfort at seeing men in culturally feminized roles and  
31  
32 spaces associated with parenting (e.g., Doucet, 2006; Steinour, 2018). Considering these  
33  
34 fathers’ narratives, it may seem therefore that some practices might be most enacted when  
35  
36 nobody is watching: as Jacqui Gabb put it, “intimate fathering should be *done*, but *not seen*  
37  
38 to be done” (Gabb, 2013, p. 652, original italics).  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 On the one hand, then, consistent with previous research, fathers’ involvement in  
46  
47 routine, material care practices, and the experience of touching bodies through care, can  
48  
49 play a role in revisioning cultural meanings attached to fatherhood. The men who are  
50  
51 involved seem to comply with an ethics of care that recognizes interdependence and the  
52  
53 relevance of a relationship built and maintained through care. On the other hand, however,  
54  
55 men’s trespassing in territories culturally understood as women’s realms or feminizing,  
56  
57 those that imply a notion of the permeability of bodily boundaries, raises and exposed  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 gendered boundaries surrounding authority and legitimacy in parenting: around male  
5  
6 bodies, around the cultural representation of acceptable masculinity, and around the bodies  
7  
8 of children as well, who are “safer” in women’s hands (Willett, 2008).  
9

10  
11 In these men’s narratives, women appear to be situated as primarily policing those  
12  
13 boundaries. Indeed, women are often likely to be presented in this way, consistent with the  
14  
15 notion of “maternal gatekeeping” (i.e., S. M. Allen & Hawkins, 1999; Hauser, 2012), within  
16  
17 which men’s bodies are denied cultural legitimation for their involvement in care. It is not  
18  
19 the aim of this paper to advocate for misunderstood, well-intentioned caring fathers. Rather,  
20  
21 my aim is to widen the discussion of what could be interpreted as a double standard in  
22  
23 existing social and cultural policing around embodied parenting practices (Faircloth &  
24  
25 Murray, 2015). For women, mothering is supposed to be an overwhelming, totalizing  
26  
27 activity (Hays, 1996), and the body’s involvement in it is often ground zero for the very  
28  
29 definition of proper motherhood (Naldini, 2015). Conversely, for men, social prescriptions  
30  
31 around proper fathering have wider margins of tolerance. “Good fathers” are such when  
32  
33 they are involved enough in childcare practices to demonstrate an interest in the well-being  
34  
35 of their children as well as an investment in gender equality within the couple (Hodkinson  
36  
37 & Brooks, 2018), but only as long as they respect certain levels of physical distance.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Men’s bodies in caring, intimate contacts with children’s are socially and culturally  
45  
46 framed as problematic—not because they are inherently unfit for caring, but because *their*  
47  
48 care work (particularly when embodied) exists in tension with cultural understandings of  
49  
50 masculinity that cast doubt on the legitimacy of the existence and displaying of those caring  
51  
52 capacities. Not only, then, is gender always at stake, but it is at stake in certain practices  
53  
54 more than in others. This is not (or not only) because women do not allow men access, but  
55  
56 because some practices expose more than others the lack of cultural instruments of  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 legitimization, and especially that of naturalizing the physical connection between adult  
5  
6 men's bodies and children's (Lupton & Barclay, 1997).  
7

8           These are important findings, but there are some limitations to this research. The  
9  
10 sample of white, heterosexual, mostly middle- to upper-class men makes analyzing racial  
11  
12 dynamics in these findings challenging and this was not a part of my analysis. Additionally,  
13  
14 this work examined fathers' narratives of participation in childcare practices rather than  
15  
16 observing those practices, and mothers and partners were not interviewed. While this choice  
17  
18 was based on the intent of investigating men's own ways of constructing and representing  
19  
20 their experiences of fathering, observational data would have helped establish the extent to  
21  
22 which fathers render their bodily involvement in childcare practices accurately and how  
23  
24 they construct meaning around gender and parenting through different constellations and  
25  
26 patterns of involvement in care. Finally, I believe that further research on spaces, both  
27  
28 private and public, where parenting practices are performed, and men's and women's use  
29  
30 of those spaces from a gendered embodiment perspective, would add useful contributions  
31  
32 to the discussion on masculinities, parenting and the legitimization of men's bodies caring for  
33  
34 children's.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 **Declaration of interest**

46  
47 The author declares no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship,  
48  
49 and/or                   publication                   of                   this                   article.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## References

- Allen, L. (2005). Managing Masculinity: Young Men's Identity Work in Focus Groups. *Qualitative Research* 5(35): 35–57.
- Allen, S. M., & Hawkins, A. J. (1999). Maternal Gatekeeping: Mothers' Beliefs and Behaviors That Inhibit Greater Father Involvement in Family Work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61(1): 199–212.
- Anderson, E., & McCormack, M. (2018). Inclusive Masculinity Theory: overview, reflection and refinement. *Journal of Gender Studies* 27(5): 547–561.
- Arxer, S. L. (2011). Hybrid Masculine Power: Reconceptualizing the Relationship Between Homosociality and Hegemonic Masculinity. *Humanity & Society* 35: 390–422.
- Bertone, C., Ferrero Camoletto, R., & Rollé, L. (2015). I confini della presenza. Riflessioni al maschile sulla paternità. In M. Naldini (Ed.), *La transizione alla genitorialità. Da coppie moderne a famiglie tradizionali* (pp. 161–181). Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Bridges, T., & Pascoe, C. J. (2014). Hybrid Masculinities: New Directions in the Sociology of Men and Masculinities. *Sociology Compass* 8(3): 246–258.
- Cannito, M. (2019). Beyond “Traditional” and “New”: An Attempt of Redefinition of Contemporary Fatherhoods through Discursive Practices and Practices of Care. *Men and Masculinities* 23(3-4): 661-679.
- Cardano, M. (2011). *La ricerca qualitativa*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Oxford: Blackwell Polity Press.
- Connell, R. (1995). “Politics of Changing Men.” *Australian Humanities Review*. Retrieved on September 16, 2020. Available at: <http://australianhumanitiesreview.org/1996/12/01/politics-of-changing-men/>
- Crespi, I., & Ruspini, E. (Eds.). (2016). *Balancing work and family in a changing society: the fathers' perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Della Puppa, F., & Miele, F. (2015). Beyond (but not too much) the male breadwinner model: a qualitative study on child care and masculinities in contemporary Italy. *Modern Italy* 20(2): 167–184.
- Demetriou, D. Z. (2001). Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: A Critique. *Theory and Society* 30(3): 337–361.
- Dermott, E. (2008). *Intimate Fatherhood. A Sociological Analysis*. London: Routledge.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Donatiello, D., & Santero, A. (2015). La paternità nei discorsi femminili. In M. Naldini  
5 (Ed.), *La transizione alla genitorialità. Da coppie moderne a famiglie tradizionali*  
6 (pp. 183–204). Bologna: Il Mulino.  
7  
8  
9 Doucet, A. (2004a). Fathers and the responsibility for children: A puzzle and a tension.  
10 *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice* 28(2): 103–114.  
11  
12 Doucet, A. (2004b). “It’s Almost Like I Have a Job, but I Don’t Get Paid”: Fathers at  
13 Home Reconfiguring Work, Care, and Masculinity. *Fathering* 2(3): 277.  
14  
15 Doucet, A. (2006). “Estrogen-filled worlds”: Fathers as primary caregivers and  
16 embodiment. *Sociological Review* 54(4): 696–716.  
17  
18  
19 Doucet, A. (2009a). Dad and Baby in the First Year: Gendered Responsibilities and  
20 Embodiment. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*  
21 624(1): 78–98.  
22  
23  
24 Doucet, A. (2009b). Gender equality and gender differences: Parenting, habitus, and  
25 embodiment. In *The 2008 Porter Lecture* (Vol. 46, pp. 103–121).  
26  
27  
28 Doucet, A. (2013). A “Choreography of Becoming”: Fathering , Embodied Care, and New  
29 Materialisms. *Canadian Review of Sociology* 50(3): 285–305.  
30  
31  
32 Doucet, A. (2016). “The choice was made for us”: stay-at-home dads and relationalities of  
33 work and care in Canada and the United States. In *Balancing work and family in a*  
34 *changing society: the fathers’ perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.  
35  
36  
37 Duncanson, C. (2015). Hegemonic Masculinity and the Possibility of Change in Gender  
38 Relations. *Men and Masculinities* 18(2): 231–248.  
39  
40  
41 Elliott, K. (2016). Caring Masculinities: Theorizing an Emerging Concept. *Men and*  
42 *Masculinities* 19(3): 240–259.  
43  
44  
45 Ferrero Camoletto, R. (2013). Ridere e parlare di sesso: una costruzione plurale delle  
46 maschilità eterosessuali. *Salute e Società* 12(2): 59–76.  
47  
48  
49 Ferrero Camoletto, R., & Bertone, C. (2016). Tra uomini: indagare l’omosocialità per  
50 orientarsi nelle trasformazioni del maschile. *AG - About Gender* 6(11): 45–73.  
51  
52  
53 Fine, M., & Glendinning, C. (2005). Dependence, independence or inter-dependence?  
54 Revisiting the concepts of ‘care’ and ‘dependency’. *Ageing and Society* 25(4): 601–  
55 621.  
56  
57  
58 Fox, B. (2009). *When couples become parents. The creation of gender in the transition to*  
59 *parenthood*. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Gabb, J. (2013). Embodying Risk: Managing Father-child Intimacy and the Display of  
5 Nudity in Families. *Sociology* 47(4): 639–654.  
6  
7 Grunow, D., & Evertsson, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Couple's transitions to parenthood:*  
8 *analyzing gender and work in Europe*. Cheltenham: Elgar.  
9  
10 Hamington, M. (2002). A Father's Touch. Caring Embodiment and a Moral Revolution.  
11 In N. Tuana, W. Cowling, M. Hamington, G. Johnson, & T. MacMullan (Eds.),  
12 *Revealing Male Bodies* (pp. 269–285). Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana  
13 University Press.  
14  
15 Hauser, O. (2012). Pushing Daddy Away? A Qualitative Study of Maternal Gatekeeping.  
16 *Qualitative Sociology Review* 8(1): 34–59.  
17  
18 Hauser, O. (2015). Maintaining boundaries: Masculinizing fatherhood in the feminine  
19 province of parenting. *Qualitative Sociology Review* 11(3): 84–104.  
20  
21 Hays, S. (1996). *The cultural contradictions of motherhood*. New Haven: Yale University  
22 Press.  
23  
24 Held, V. (2006). *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global*. New York: Oxford  
25 University Press.  
26  
27 Hobson, B. (2002). *Making Men Into Fathers. Men, Masculinities and the Social Politics*  
28 *of Fatherhood*. (B. Hobson, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
29  
30 Hodkinson, P., & Brooks, R. (2018). Interchangeable parents? The roles and identities of  
31 primary and equal carer fathers of young children. *Current Sociology*.  
32  
33 Kim, A., & Pyke, K. (2015). Taming Tiger Dads: Hegemonic American Masculinity and  
34 South Korea's Father School. *Gender and Society* 29(4): 509–533.  
35  
36 Kittay, E. F. (1999). *Love's Labor. Essays on Women, Equality, and Dependency*. New  
37 York, London: Routledge.  
38  
39 Lupton, D. (2012). Infant embodiment and interembodiment: a review of sociocultural  
40 perspectives. *Childhood* 20(1): 37–50.  
41  
42 Lupton, D., & Barclay, L. (1997). *Constructing Fatherhood: Discourses and Experiences*.  
43 London: Sage Publications.  
44  
45 Magaraggia, S. (2012). Tensions between fatherhood and the social construction of  
46 masculinity in Italy. *Current Sociology* 61(1): 76–92.  
47  
48 Miller, T. (2011a). Falling back into gender? Men's narratives and practices around first-  
49 time fatherhood. *Sociology* 45(6): 1094–1109.  
50  
51 Miller, T. (2011b). *Making sense of fatherhood: Gender, Caring and Work*. Cambridge:  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511778186>
- 5 Musumeci, R., & Santero, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Fathers, Childcare and Work. Cultures,*  
6 *Practices and Policies.* Somerville, MA: Emerald Publishing.
- 7  
8  
9 Naldini, M. (Ed.). (2015). *La transizione alla genitorialità. Da coppie moderne a famiglie*  
10 *tradizionali.* Bologna: Il Mulino.
- 11  
12 Randles, J. (2018). “Manning Up” to be a Good Father: Hybrid Fatherhood, Masculinity,  
13 *and U.S. Responsible Fatherhood Policy.* *Gender and Society* 32(4): 516–539.
- 14  
15 Ranson, G. (2015). *Fathering, Masculinity and the Embodiment of Care.* Basingstoke,  
16  
17 New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 18  
19 Steinour, H. (2018). ‘I am not Mr. Mom:’ a qualitative analysis of at-home father’s  
20  
21 struggle for legitimacy. *Journal of Gender Studies* 27(4): 388–400.
- 22  
23 Tanturri, M. L., & Mencarini, L. (2009). *Fathers’ involvement in childcare activities in*  
24 *Italy: does a work-family reconciliation issue exist?* *Child* (Vol. 22).
- 25  
26 Tronto, J. C. (1993). *Moral Boundaries. A Political Argument for and Ethic of Care.* New  
27  
28 York, London: Routledge.
- 29  
30 Ungerson, C. (2006). Gender, Care, and the Welfare State. In K. Davis, M. Evans, & J.  
31  
32 Lorber (Eds.), *Handbook of Gender and Women’s Studies* (pp. 272–286). London:  
33  
34 Sage Publications.
- 35  
36 Willett, J. A. (2008). “A Father’s Touch:” Negotiating masculinity and sexual subjectivity  
37  
38 in child care. *Sexuality and Culture* 12(4): 275–290.
- 39  
40 Zajczyk, F., & Ruspini, E. (Eds.). (2008). *Nuovi padri? Mutamenti della paternità in*  
41 *Italia e in Europa.* Milano: Baldini Castoldi Dalai.
- 42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60