

Loving Fathers

Relationships, Care and Support: Exploring Love in the Everyday
Geographies of Fathering

By

Alice Emmeline Menzel

A Thesis Submitted to
The University of Birmingham
For the Degree of
MASTER OF RESEARCH

Department of Geography
School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences
College of Life and Environmental Sciences
The University of Birmingham
August 2018

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

Abstract

Seeking to contribute to the as yet heavily underdeveloped geographic scholarship on fathering and responding to calls for critical interrogations of love within Geography (Morrison et al., 2012), this thesis is concerned with exploring how fathers construct and perform love in and across everyday spaces. It draws upon data gathered via an intensive mixed-method qualitative research project utilising a melding of narrative and ethnographic methods which captured everyday experiences of father-child relationships, conducted over January-May 2018 with a small cohort of six fathers in Birmingham (UK). Focusing on how these fathers 'do' love through everyday spatial practices/interactions, this research furthers current academic understandings of contemporary fathering relationships and parenting practices. It offers exploratory insight into the everyday geographies through which fathers care for, build/maintain intimate relationships and 'do' love, particularly through examination of the various geographies embroiled within their provision of intimate care, emotional support, playfulness and imparting moralities. Through examination of these and informed by literatures (in and beyond geography) on parenting, fathering especially, intimacy/care, and masculinities, I ultimately demonstrate and develop a critical thesis of the spatiality of love as it is performed in everyday contemporary fathering geographies.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I wish to thank each and every one of the fathers who participated in this research, for expressing their incredible interest and support throughout its execution, and for the amazing insight they have given me into their everyday lives as fathers. Without all of you, this research would not have been possible and the understanding I have come to develop would have been nowhere near as rich. In especially I would therefore like to express my appreciation to those who were able to participate in a go-along- which were, for me, the greatest of fun!

Thanks additionally go to the group leads who invited me to attend the parent groups in the early stages of this research and for all of their help and support in the recruitment of these fathers.

I would also like to say a huge thank you to my supervisor Professor Peter Kraftl for his great patience in the drafting (and redrafting) of this thesis, for his constructive feedback, guidance and for lending me his books. Thanks also go to Dr. Pat Noxolo for her contributions.

I wish to further acknowledge those scholars who were involved in the Emotions Across Disciplines Seminar Series at Oxford Brookes University- and express great thanks to Dr. Jessica Pykett for making me aware of its occurrence!- whose discussions in the seminar on Fatherhood and Love piqued really my interest in love and provoked me to deeply consider my research through this fascinating lens.

Finally, I would like to show my enormous appreciation to my family, who have always provided me with a space of support and love, particularly during the months of writing this thesis, as did my friends. However, my most profound and heartfelt thanks go to my dad, Alex, not only for the many (many) hours he spent listening to my rambles as I tried to make sense of my thoughts throughout this research- of the data and the thesis as a whole- but for the many times he made me understand exactly how Cassie felt on page 52, revived knowing a supportive, loving father was there, ready to catch us, should we need him to.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. Justification	2
1.3. Research Aims and Objectives	3
1.4. Thesis Outline	4
Chapter 2 Literature Review	5
2.1. Introduction	5
2.2. Feminist Philosophy and Geography	6
2.3. Theorising the Spatiality of Love	6
2.3.1. Geographies of Care	8
2.3.2. Geographies of Intimacy	9
2.3.3. Situating Love as Spatial	10
2.4. Spatialities of Familial Love	11
2.5. (Gendered) Geographies of Parenting	13
2.6. Theorising the Spatialities of Fathering	14
2.7. Situating the Thesis, Framing the Geographies of Loving Fathering	18
Chapter 3 Methodology	20
3.1. Introduction	20
3.2. Feminist Research Philosophy, Methodology and Praxis	21
3.3. Research Design	22
3.4. Recruiting Participants	22
3.5. Participants	23
3.6. Research Process and Sequence of Data Collection	25

3.6.1. Initial Meeting	25
3.6.2. Interview	26
3.6.3. Participant Diary	27
3.6.4. Catch-up	27
3.6.5. Go-along	28
3.7. Data Analysis	29
3.8. Ethics	30
3.9. Positionality	30
3.10. Summary and Discussion Outline	32
Chapter 4 Intimate Geographies of Care in Everyday Fathering	34
4.1. Introduction	34
4.2. Intimate Care, Trust, Familiarity and Belonging: Creating a Loving Home	35
4.3. Intimate Spaces, Emotional Give-and-Take, Caring Masculine Subjectivities	39
4.4. Stretching Love: Loving, Intimate Fathering Spaces Beyond Home	42
4.5. Conclusion	43
Chapter 5 Playful Geographies: Love, Fun and Support	45
5.1. Introduction	45
5.2. Positive Experiences, Emotional Engagement and Playful Spatial Interactions	46
5.3. 'Masculine' Carescapes, Playful Adventures and Spaces of Love and Support	48
5.4. Conclusion	53
Chapter 6 Moral Carescapes: Instilling Love in Everyday Spaces	55
6.1. Introduction	55
6.2. Sharing and Caring: Fostering Moral Interactions in Everyday Spaces	56
6.3. Ethical Playful Mobilities: Stewardship and Love for the World	60

6.4. Conclusion	61
Chapter 7 Conclusion	63
7.1. Summarising Findings	63
7.2. Methodological Implications	64
7.3. Theoretical Implications for Future Research	64
References	66
Appendices	87
Appendix A: Participant Information Sheet	88
Appendix B: Summary of Participants	90
Appendix C: Interview Schedule and Prompting Questions	91
Appendix D: Participant Solicited Diary Guidance Notes	93

Chapter 1

Introduction

Cassie curls herself up as Corey lifts and deposits her, and then Eli [friend] into the 'spiderweb-swing'...he moves behind, pushing the swing into motion...Cassie makes soft noises of joy, her eyes closed with a big smile on her face...Suddenly she turns, "Daddy?" "Yes Cass?" "I love you!" There's a brief pause, then Corey laughs. He replies, "I love you too, darling". (Corey go-along)

1.1. Introduction

This thesis is concerned with the spatialities of love, specifically the spatialities of love within everyday fathering. Whilst scholars have noted that "contemporary fathering...might be taken to include 'spending time with children, developing relationships with them, and providing parental guidance, discipline *and love*' (Baxter, 2012:189)" (Meah and Jackson, 2016:496, emphasis added), little is known about the geographies configured within this. This thesis, therefore, aims to explore how fathers 'do' love in and across space through various everyday spatial practices/interactions, focusing particularly on fathers with young (pre-school-aged) children. It seeks to contribute to the rather underdeveloped scholarship on the geographies of fathering (Meah, 2017, Meah and Jackson, 2016; Aitken, 2009, 2005, 2000)- and by extension the geographies of parenting (Jupp and Gallagher, 2013)- bringing these into explicit dialogue with geographical discussions of love (Morrison et al., 2012; Thien, 2011; 2004). Through exploration of the everyday geographies through which fathers 'do' love, I develop a critical thesis of the complex spatialities of love, *empirically* situating it as a fundamentally *geographical* phenomenon.

1.2. Justification

Since the 1990s, research on fathering across the Social Sciences has grown exponentially, particularly following changing family dynamics (Adamsons and Palkovitz, 2014, early work including Laqueur, 1992; LaRossa, 1992). However, this growth has largely not been extended to Geography, where literatures on parenting remain predominantly focused on mothering (Jupp and Gallagher, 2013). Concerned with the large conflation of 'parenting' with 'mothering' and critically interrogating fathers' 'imprecise' 'hesitant' everyday parenting, Aitken (2009) asserts that fathering is fundamentally a "daily emotional practice...negotiated, contested, reworked and resisted differently in different spaces" (p.230). Indeed, consequent to much research being "framed by a conception of caregiving built around maternal parenting" (Palkovitz et al., 2014:408) parental *love* is frequently theoretically associated with mothers (Thien, 2011; Gabb, 2004). The limited examination of fathering thus has significant ontological/epistemological implications for understanding of how *fathers* 'do' love, resulting in a research gap this research begins to address.¹

Moreover, in attempting to make sense of 'new' fatherhood (see Miller, 2011a), and contemporary practices of fathering, Social Scientists have drawn upon various concepts as analytical tools, in particular the concepts of intimacy (Dermott, 2008, 2003), nurturance (Marsiglio and Roy, 2012) and care (Philip, 2013). They have not tended to engage with love, perhaps because love remains regarded as a 'fuzzy', 'weak' and somewhat feminised concept (Thien, 2011). However, engaging with love as an analytical frame may offer deeply critical and novel insights (ibid., Morrison et al., 2012; hooks, 2004, 2000). Thus, through a focus on love, I do not seek to merely offer an (overly)romanticised account of fathering, but rather critical interpretations of how men, as fathers, perform, experience and instil love in everyday spaces/places.

¹ However, this does not, to my mind, infer that 'paternal' love is qualitative *different* from 'maternal' love. That is, parental love, for me, is performed and *expressed* in gendered ways, rather than being *determined* by gender (Gabb, 2012).

Focusing on father-child relationships is also of both theoretical and practical significance since “governments...[are]...increasingly implementing policies that encourage early father-infant bonding” (Brady et al., 2017:69; Shannon et al., 2006), much research informing British policy stemming from psychological studies on the impact of father-involvement on children’s lives (Featherstone, 2009). Yet beyond psychology, scholars are frequently highlighting the importance of men understanding their identities as fathers, some even considering this through consideration of social spaces (Creighton et al., 2017; Marsiglio and Roy, 2012; Marsiglio et al. 2005). Geographers can make an excellent contribution to this field.

However, by focusing on fathering, I do not undermine existing research on mothering, nor do I contest the significant role mothers play in childrearing and love. Rather, it is my belief that current scholarly work insufficiently captures fathering experiences and would greatly benefit from more critical inclusion of fathers’ narratives, potentially offering new, exciting insights into contemporary family life and composite geographies. Thus, although arguments made may also be relevant to mothering, this research project was not intended to draw such conclusions.

1.3. Research Aims and Objectives

With the overall aim of exploring love in the everyday geographies of fathering my theoretical contributions are two-fold: to demonstrate, conceptually and empirically the spatiality of love, and to explore how fathers perform, experience and instil love through their everyday geographies. The specific objectives of this thesis are as follows:

1. To explore everyday fathering interactions through the lens of love.
2. To critically demonstrate the intertwinings between space, love and the production of particular masculine subjectivities.
3. To demonstrate, theoretically and then empirically that love is spatial, developing a thesis of its complex spatialities, ultimately situating love as geographical.

1.4. Thesis Outline

In order to meet these aims, this thesis is structured thus. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 provides the Literature Review, examining the key literatures informing this research; Chapter 3, the Methodology, describing the methodological rationale. Drawing upon the theoretical debates and empirical data described, the Discussion is split into three separate but interconnected chapters. Chapter 4 discusses the intimate geographies of care through which fathers 'do' love; Chapter 5 building on this through a focus on playful geographies. Chapter 6 then offers a critical insight into the meaning of 'love' within fathering, uncovering how fathers aspire to raise moral, loving children. These discussions are drawn together in the Conclusion in Chapter 7, where I summarise the arguments and develop a thesis of the spatialities of love in everyday fathering, reflecting on the methodological implications and making recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

This chapter provides the theoretical literary background for this research, introducing and reviewing the key bodies of existing scholarship relevant to this thesis, demonstrating where it fits within the academic literature. Crucially, however, this chapter is not merely a list of previous research, but an *analysis* of the themes/concepts and debates underlying these areas which are particularly relevant to my discussion. It is also therefore a critical *appraisal* of existing research, and an analysis of its short-falls, identifying research gaps which I address through my thesis. Although this thesis is concerned with exploring love in the everyday *geographies* of fathering, given the largely limited existing geographical literature on these- and the transdisciplinary interest in these areas- throughout this chapter I also draw upon literatures from other academic disciplines (in especially sociology, but also studies of family, leisure and gender/masculinities) grounding these in their spatial nature.

I first provide an overview of the feminist philosophical position intimately informing this research (theoretically and methodologically), noting its ontological/epistemological contributions to geographical foci central to this thesis. I then begin to spatialise love theoretically; drawing upon a lexicon of *love-like* literatures- specifically those of care and intimacy- in the absence of an extensively established body of literature on love, literatures which I theorise as being intimately entangled in a geographical conceptualism of love. I then provide an examination of the geographies of 'familial' love and discuss existing scholarship within its sub-discipline geographies of parenting, highlighting its gendered nature (Jupp and Gallagher, 2013). This provides an effective bridge for honing in on theorising the spatiality of fathering where I discuss the complex spatialities and carescapes of contemporary (intimate) fathering (Dermott, 2008, 2003) and its, at times contradictory, intertwinings with masculinity (Meah and Jackson, 2016; Aitken, 2005). Ultimately, through this chapter, I develop a conceptual framework for how I understand and theorise love and its

interlinkages with fathering; this chapter subsequently being the *beginning* of my developing a thesis of love in the everyday geographies of fathering.

2.2. Feminist Philosophy and Geography

This thesis is written fundamentally from a feminist philosophical/epistemological position, informed by the tenets of feminism, as I interpret them. Feminist approaches emerged within Geography as a response to the male-dominated nature of the discipline, critiquing how it was a discipline historically written by, about, even *for* men, (Hopkins and Noble, 2009; van Hoven and Hörschelmann, 2005) interrogating the significant epistemological consequences of how this influenced what constituted ‘valid’ areas of enquiry, and by consequence, what did not (Graham, 2005; WGSG, 1997; Rose, 1993). Gaining momentum in the 1980s, feminist geographers have been instrumental in advancing the discipline, invoking a plethora of historically neglected foci to geographic scrutiny (Domosh, 1998) from so-called ‘feminine’ spheres of life (i.e. family); ‘feminine’ ways of knowing (e.g. emotion) and incorporating the voices of previously excluded ‘Others’ into geographical research (particularly women/children) (Dixon and Jones, 2006; WGSG, 1997; Rose, 1993, see next chapter). Through this, and advocating for research which was more aligned to addressing issues raised in feminist politics- not least issues of inequalities, particularly those based on gender (ibid.; Blunt and Willis, 2000)- feminist geographers have long contested the ‘masculinist’ implication that our experiences of the socio-spatial world are universal, instead demonstrating the difference and subjectiveness of spatial encounters (Thien, 2011) which, importantly for this thesis, *includes* the (gendered) experiences of men (Gorman-Murray and Hopkins, 2014; Hopkins and Noble, 2009; van Hoven and Hörschelmann, 2005; McDowell, 1999).

2.3. Theorising the Spatiality of Love

Of all feelings, love is perhaps “the one most strongly coded as feminine” (Thien, 2011:316). This does not mean that only women- and not men- love but rather that love has been historically *feminised*, arguably devalued; deemed too fatuous for ‘serious’ academic scrutiny, accounting for its general absence (Morrison et al., 2012). Love was brought onto the academic agenda under second-wave feminism through arguments

that, as an invention of patriarchy, it “obscures gender inequalities and women’s oppression in intimate heterosexual relationships” (ibid.:507), although feminist scholars have also interrogated how patriarchy and the (historical) feminisation of love have (and somewhat continue to) constrain and oppress men (hooks, 2004). Using love as a *critique*, feminist scholars have argued that intimate relationships should (ideally) be spaces of democratic, egalitarian belonging-ness and security (Gabb, 2010; Jamieson, 1998), sparking extensive theorising of the politicisation and transformations of relationships in modern societies (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2002, 1995; Giddens 1992, see Gillies, 2003 for a summary). Indeed, French feminist theorist Irigaray (1996) even re-coined the phrase ‘I love you’ into ‘I love to you’, deconstructing the suggestion that in relationships, beings are either possessing or possessed (Morrison et al., 2012; Thien, 2011, 2004).

In its everyday meaning, love typically refers to a feeling or emotional/affectual bond (shared) with somebody/thing, with deeply emotional connotations. As such, for Thien (2011), building on her “feminist geography of love” in Thien (2004) (Bondi et al., 2005:8), love is an ontology, an *emotional* way of knowing another/others (Morrison et al., 2012). However, despite her assertion that love “offers a...vantage point from which to think about the spatialities of subjectivity, gender and emotion” (Thien, 2004:43), geographers’ engagement with love remains slim. That is, although there exist some excellent geographical discussions of love (Morrison et al., 2012; Thien, 2011, 2004, even Waitt, 2015), these remain highly theoretical and rather abstract, and, to date, there are little-to-no *empirical* investigations of love’s spatialities, nor how it is performed in and across everyday spaces. This thesis begins to address this gap.

Geographers *have* frequently *referred to* love, but often through consideration and empirical investigation of supposedly more ‘critical’ love-like concepts such as those of care and intimacy. For example, following Jamieson (1998), (feminist) geographers Valentine and Hughes (2012) broadly define intimacy as “*knowing, caring for* (emotionally as well as practically) and *loving* another/others” (p.243, original emphasis). This ultimately suggests that love may be understood as being interrelated and entwined with both care and intimacy, perhaps even as being a complex

combination of these (though these are not necessarily reducible to one another (Philip, 2013)). Indeed, linking to the arguments above, feminist philosopher hooks (2004:80, also 2000:7-8) describes love *as* “a combination of care, commitment, knowledge, responsibility, respect and trust”. As such, a useful starting point in conceptualising love’s spatialities is through consideration of the (emotional) geographies of care and intimacy.

2.3.1. Geographies of Care

Research dubbed under the geographies of care examine the interconnections between space, and the emotional/practical care given between people (Milligan, 2014; Bowlby, 2011, 2010)- which, under its feminist origins, is conceptualised as *labour*, (even the labour of *love*) (Philip, 2013; Smith, Jamison and Dwyer, 2008)- revealing how care takes place in particular spaces (Milligan, 2014). For example, as noted by Conradson (2003), Twigg’s (2000) research on intimate care work, specifically bathing elderly/disabled dependents reveals the significant domestic spatiality of this type of care for it takes place in specific spaces, (predominantly) within the home.

Moreover, given the “centrality of emotions to care” (Bowlby, 2010:135), such geographical research frequently intersects with work on emotional geographies (Bondi et al., 2005; Anderson and Smith, 2001), as the relationship between caregiver/care-receiver always has some elements of emotional reciprocity, whether positive or negative (Bowlby, 2011; Milligan et al., 2007, see for example England, 2010; Dyer et al., 2008), particularly so in loving relationships where care is typically regarded as ‘something you just do’ (Milligan and Wiles, 2010). Yet not only does this area of research highlight that care occurs in particular places, shaping our (emotional) experiences of such spaces (Milligan, 2014), it also argues that certain spaces *enable* caring interactions (Milligan and Wiles, 2010). Ultimately, fundamental to this area of research on the (everyday) spatialities of care, the *landscapes* of care (ibid.), is the notion of ‘carescapes’- also referred to as ‘caringscapes’- a conceptual frame which encompasses the informal geographies of care which occur, spatially and temporally through various intimate interactions/relationships (see Tarrant, 2013; Jupp, 2012; Bowlby, 2011).

2.3.2. Geographies of Intimacy

Relatedly, the geographies of intimacy interrogate the spatialities of people's close, personal relationships (Valentine, 2008). Although having some sexual connotations (Gabb, 2010), intimacy refers to the quality or *closeness* of a relationship (Meah, 2017), with Jamieson (1998) defining intimacy as "a very specific form of knowing, loving and 'being close to' another person" (p.1). Intimate relationships (of love) therefore, involve a sense of familiarity, a (shared) sense of 'togetherness', (ideally) founded on trust, security and reciprocal support/disclosure (Liu, 2017, hooks, 2004). Together these are elements which Jamieson and Milne (2012) note as being the crux of relationships, building upon (feminist) theorising of relationships as (democratic) spaces of security and belongingness (Gabb, 2010; Jamieson, 1998). Indeed, in Valentine and Hughes' (2012) research on family intimacy and internet gambling, family members expressed feeling a 'lost' sense of intimacy/closeness and trust when such addictions were revealed.

Sociologists theorise that intimacy is built and performed through socially-recognised practices (Morgan, 2011; Tomlie, 2010), for example sharing meals (Liu, 2017) which geographers assert are *spatial* practices, taking place in and across particular spaces and places (Meah, 2017; Hallman, 2010; Luzia, 2013, 2010).² However, intimacy also has deeply scalar spatial connotations of proximity, acting as something of a spatial metaphor, implying a *feeling* of being (physically/emotionally) close to somebody/thing, which does not necessitate being proximate in space (Liu, 2017; Valentine, 2008). Indeed, although geographers note the significance of space to practices of intimacy, they have also been instrumental in highlighting how intimacy is 'stretched' across (vast) spatial scales (ibid., see also Felton, 2014) for example, through the use of media spaces/technologies such as the internet which *facilitate* a sense of togetherness (Valentine, 2008, 2006; Binnie, 2000), or 'co-presence' (Baldassar et al., 2016; Baldassar, 2008). Geographers have even shown how intimacy may be maintained

² Although, this does not mean that intimacy may be *reduced* to a particular *set* of spatial practices (Gabb 2010).

over time through memory-work (see Meah, 2017, also Jacobson, 2014), contending that the “geographies of intimacy are complex” (Liu, 2017:98).

2.3.3. Situating Love as Spatial

Conceptualised as a melding of care and intimacy- experienced and performed through the everyday spatialities and practices of these- love, understood as emotion(al)/practice is given a “distinctly geographical tint” (ibid.). That is, love clearly happens, is experienced and ‘done’ *somewhere*, in and across everyday spaces/places, perhaps most obviously- given its inherent emotionality (Thien, 2011, 2004)- through the body, but also through more physical social spaces of everyday carescapes (Morrison et al. 2012; Morrison, 2012a; Milligan and Wiles, 2010). For example, through examination of the haptic geographies of embodied touch, as *expressions* of love/affection, Morrison (2012a) discusses how these typically take place within the home, demonstrating love’s complex (inter)scalar spatiality, with such interactions even *creating* a (shared) sense of home and belonging-ness between intimates.

Yet, whilst evoking a sense of closeness and small-scale proximity, much like intimacy, love may also be ‘stretched’ and spatialised beyond immediacy (Kraftl, 2015). Indeed, through discussion of coastal landscapes, Wylie (2009) considers love through the geographies of absence, illustrating love’s complex scalar/temporal spatialities, for (as with care/intimacy) love can still be felt, performed and given even in the (physical) absence of an intimate (Meah, 2017). For example, Longhurst (2016, 2013) discusses how (mothers) provide love/care, maintaining a sense of intimacy and closeness with their children through media spaces, engaging in (emotional) ‘labour(s) of love’ through intimate care across spatial scales, though there is much less consideration of how fathers may similarly do so (Marsiglio et al., 2005:23).

Moreover, love may also be understood as geographically ‘stretched’ through (ethical care) habits (Kraftl, 2015). For example, consumption of fairtrade products (Hall, 2016, 2011) can enable the performance of care/lovingness at a distance (even to beings we do *not* intimately ‘know’), love being *habitualised* and internalised over time (Kraftl, 2015). In essence, love is geographically complex, performed/experienced through

spaces/places, across spatial scales, time and over landscapes. These are concepts which are central to geographical thinking (see chapters in Clifford et al., 2009) fundamentally situating love as an implicitly *spatial* phenomenon (Morrison et al., 2012). Through this thesis, I demonstrate empirically how love is spatialised, specifically through exploration of the everyday geographies of fathering. First, however, I now discuss the key areas of geographic scholarship such a focus contributes to.

2.4. Spatialities of Familial Love

Geographers have examined a plethora of loving intimate/caring relationships, such as those within romantic/sexual relationships (Morrison, 2013, 2012a), friendships (Trell and van Hoven, 2014; Wilkinson, 2014; Bunnell et al., 2012); even people's relationships with non-human beings, for example, pets (Malone, 2016; Haraway, 2003). However, more specific to this thesis are the relationships (of love) within families, on which geographers have conducted rather substantial work, although not specifically through the lens of love (Liu, 2017; Valentine, et al., 2015; Harker and Martin, 2012; Valentine et al., 2012; Valentine and Hughes, 2012; Gabb, 2010; Hallman, 2010; Aitken, 1998). Indeed, some have suggested that 'family' is the very pinnacle of intimate relationships (Valentine, 2008) with Kraftl (2015), for example, theorising loving/intimate intergenerational friendships formed within alternative education spaces as having a 'family-like' atmosphere; others even arguing how people *create* 'family' through other intimate relationships, particularly friendships (Wilkinson, 2014; Harker, 2010:2633). Although clearly changing in complex ways, family- in its more traditional sense- "continues as a space of intimacy, love and morality, within which young children may find care and nurturing" (Aitken, 2000:581). However, within literatures on the geographies of family, fathers remain a largely absent-presence, particularly as givers of love (Meah, 2017; Aitken, 2009, see also Gover, 1992), a short-fall attended to through this thesis.

For geographers "space is a dynamic resource in the 'doing' of family" (Valentine and Hughes, 2012:253; Aitken, 1998). Building upon sociological conceptualisations of family-as-practice- something that people '*do*', rather than something people '*are*' (Morgan, 1996)- geographers assert that family is an implicitly *spatial* practice; people

'do' family but they do it *somewhere*, in particular spaces/places (Luzia, 2013, 2010; Hallman, 2010). For example, geographers have noted how family is done particularly- though not exclusively- within the home, discussing this as a key everyday space of doing/building familial intimacy and 'togetherness' (Dowling and Power, 2012; Valentine and Hughes, 2012; Gabb, 2010) and a deeply emotional space (Davidson and Milligan, 2004). Although, in feminist scholarship such a romanticised interpretation of home is quite contested (see Ahmet, 2013; Brickell, 2012; Blunt and Dowling, 2006), emphasising instead that the home is a gendered space of (emotional/practical) (care) work in 'doing' family and intimacy (Liu, 2017; Meah, 2017; Valentine and Hughes, 2012). However, "home is not the only locus of care-giving", intimacy-building or 'doing' love within families (Milligan et al., 2007:136).

Geographers have interrogated a range of changing spatialities and carescapes of 'doing' family and familial togetherness/intimacy in contemporary (Western) societies, examining for example 'public' leisure spaces such as zoos (Hallman and Benbow, 2010, 2007); hospitality spaces (Lilius, 2017, 2016; Lugosi et al., 2016) and shopping centres (Pospěch, 2017), even practices of 'doing' family through holiday spatialities (Hall and Holdsworth, 2014). Indeed, geographical understandings of the intimate spatialities and complex carescapes of family are still evolving, with geographers engaging in debates on mobility (see Sheller and Urry, 2006), demonstrating how we 'do' family somewhere-on-the-move, situating mobile spaces such as cars as intimate spaces of familial care (Waitt and Harada, 2016; Holdsworth, 2013; see also Rau and Sattlegger, 2018).

Examining how parents on family leave negotiate public spaces of the inner city through their everyday spatialities- spaces historically coded as 'masculine' (versus the 'feminine' spaces of home/suburbs) (McDowell, 1999; Aitken, 1998)- Lilius (2016) discusses how practices of 'doing' family are becoming increasingly visible across social landscapes. Deconstructing and blurring the socio-spatial dichotomies of 'public/private', 'masculine/feminine', she develops a thesis of 'domesticfication', indicative of the ways in which the increasingly visible geographies of parental/family care in public spaces are situating these as socially-recognised spaces for 'doing' family

and parenting (see also Doucet, 2006:705). This alludes to how family care/intimacy (and, as I conceptualise it, love) not only takes place in space, but also how *practices* of love, such as parental bonding, *changes* and shapes the spaces in which they occur, reinscribing them with new meaning (Lilius, 2016). This is arguably indicative of the socio-spatial dialectic ontology fundamental to geography (Soja, 1980), where the social shapes the spatial whilst *simultaneously* the spatial shapes the social (Lilius, 2016; Hallman, 2010; Aitken, 1998).

2.5. (Gendered) Geographies of Parenting

As a significant intimate familial relationship- itself a spatial practice, 'done' in and across space- encompassed within family geographies is the subdiscipline of the geographies of parenting (Valentine, 2008), an area of research concerned with "how parents create, experience and negotiate space and place *as parents*" (Luzia, 2013:245, original emphasis; Jupp and Gallagher, 2013). Of significance to this area of scholarship (and of particular relevance to this thesis), is the claim that parenting is a heavily gendered spatial practice, "mapped onto particular gendered identities" (Jupp and Gallagher, 2013:156), with (feminist) geographers long arguing that parental spatialities, carescapes, and practices of 'doing' intimacy/care are performed differently by mothers and fathers (McLaren and Parusel, 2015; Barker, 2011; Valentine, 1997).

It is interesting, therefore, that in a special issue on the so-called 'new' geographies of parenting (Jupp and Gallagher, 2013), not one paper was dedicated to fathering, despite recognition that fathers are increasingly participating in parental carescapes (Barker, 2011), with only Gambles (2013) incorporating father narratives into her discussion in any real depth, although the term 'new' alludes more to the contemporary diversity of parenting, demonstrated through Luzia's (2013) contribution on same-sex (lesbian) parenting couples (see also Luzia, 2011, 2010; Gabb, 2004). Indeed, it has been noted that the geographies of parenting focuses, in the main, on experiences of mothering (Jupp and Gallagher, 2013; Luzia, 2013, 2010) from early work including Dyck (1990), England (1996), and Holloway (1998) to more contemporary research, for example, Clement and Waitt's (2018, 2017) and Boyer and Spinney's (2016) work on 'mobile mothering' through walking practices.

Comparatively, literatures explicitly discussing fathering geographies remain significantly less well developed, practically limited to Meah (2017), Meah and Jackson (2016), Aitken (2009, 2005, 2000) and Barker (2008).³ Thus, whilst Valentine (2008) notes that there has been rather limited geographical attention to family relationships beyond parent/child it is perhaps more accurate to state that much less attention has been given to relationships beyond *mother/child*- though see more recently, Tarrant (2016, 2014a, 2013) on grandfathering and Bacon (2012); Evans (2012) on siblings. By exploring the geographies of *father/child* relationships, I seek to contribute to addressing this heavily neglected aspect of family/parental geographies. In the next and final sections of this chapter, I review discussions of the everyday spatialities through which fathers may be understood to 'do' intimacy/care, providing the background for a conceptual framework of how they 'do' *love*.

2.6. Theorising the Spatialities of Fathering

Firstly, it is important to distinguish between three key, interrelated concepts: 'fatherhood', the socially-constructed *roles* and *expectations* of being a father; 'fathering', social *practices* of 'doing' parenting by fathers and 'father', the *individual* performing these (Meah, 2017; Aitken, 2009; Kay, 2009b). Over the last few decades especially, expectations on fathers have changed dramatically, linked to changing gender roles following feminist social movements (Kay, 2009b; Gorman-Murray, 2008). Thus, when discussing and theorising fathering, in particular its spatialities, consideration of debates on masculinities abound (Gabb, 2012), for masculinities and fatherhood are intimately entangled (Gorman-Murray, 2008). That is, although it is important not to conflate these, it is also important not to disassociate them either (Featherstone, 2009; Dermott, 2008) for dominant discourses of masculinity- or what Connell (1995) termed 'hegemonic masculinity'- significantly shapes expectations of fatherhood, (Doucet and Lee, 2014; Brandth and Kvande, 1998), some scholars even

³ However, some of these did not have their origins in researching fathering. Meah and Jackson's (2016) contribution for example originated as a geographical study on (domestic) masculinities, concerning representations of 'being a man', which for many participants, centred around being a *father*. Also, Moran et al.'s (2017) research on carceral geographies has considered inmate's experiences as fathers.

suggesting that changes to *fathering* may (re)shape hegemonic ideals of masculinity (Brannen and Nilsen, 2006; hooks, 2004).

For example, to characterise a little grossly, historically fatherhood has been associated with breadwinning and providing financially,⁴ a role grounded in (capitalist) societal expectations of ‘being a man’ and ‘masculine honour’, conducted in spaces predominantly *away* from the home in ‘masculine’ places of work (Meah and Jackson, 2016; Miller, 2011b; Brandth and Kvande, 1998), with domestic/child-related fathering responsibilities being largely limited to instilling discipline and providing spiritual/religious moral guidance (Gillis, 2000) whilst day-to-day carework fell to mothers (Brady et al., 2017; Tanfer and Mott, 1997, see England, 1996; Dyck, 1990). However, contemporary fatherhood is increasingly associated with active involvement in practical/emotional carework and with emotional, caring masculinities (Brandth and Kvande, 2018; Eerola, 2014; Miller, 2011a, 2011b), with so-called ‘new fathers’ embodying ideals of the ‘new man’ (Gorman-Murray, 2008). Yet involved fathers are conceptualised as “those who engage in hands-on care while continuing employment” (Brandth and Kvande, 2018:75), speaking to the ongoing pervasiveness of the breadwinner model- and the complex moral geographies of where and how fathering ‘should’ be done (Lilius, 2016; Bryan, 2013; Shirani et al., 2012; Aitken, 2009) and the multifaceted nature of masculinities (Hunter et al., 2017; Miller, 2011b; Hopkins and Noble, 2009; Wall and Arnold, 2007).

Dissatisfied with the ambiguity of the term ‘involved’, Dermott (2008, 2003) proposed the model of ‘intimate fatherhood’, encompassing contemporary fathering practices which comprise close, high-quality father-child relationships, characterised by spending time, developing emotional-connection, as well as affection and care (Brandth and Kvande, 2018, 1998; Creighton et al., 2017, 2015; Eerola, 2014; Miller, 2011a, 2011b). In attempting to foster such qualities into their parenting repertoire, several have claimed that contemporary fathering is becoming increasingly affiliated and

⁴ Although historian Strange (2015) offers an alternative narrative of Victorian and Edwardian fatherhood, as one shaped by affection, duty and labour, even love (or attachment, as she more frequently refers to) rather than absence, as was covered in the Emotions Across Discipline seminar on Fatherhood and Love.

blurred with understandings/expectations of *mothering* practices (Brandth and Kvande, 2018, 1998; Brandth, 2016; Aitken, 2000). As a consequence, many have also argued that mothering is the benchmark against which contemporary fathering is consistently positioned, the latter remaining largely secondary to, and often less than, the former (Meah and Jackson, 2016; Palkovitz et al., 2014; Aitken, 2009, 2005, 2000). However, the suggestion that contemporary fathering may be *conflated* with mothering is rather contested, particularly around criticisms of fathers' supposed preference for partaking in emotional practices of 'caring about' over the more practical 'caring for', shaping their (gendered) parenting carescapes (Brandth and Kvande, 2018; Aitken, 2000, see Milligan and Wiles, 2010; Craig, 2006; Ruddick, 1992, also Boyer et al., 2017 and responses). This complex association between mothering/fathering arguably accounts for the emphasised consideration of masculinities within research on fathering (Doucet and Lee, 2014).

That is, whilst some have suggested that "the act of fathering as a practice of intimacy, nurturing and care is still associated with femininity in many contexts" (Lilius, 2016:1765; Wall and Arnold, 2007), many others have discussed how in order to reconcile this paradox between hegemonic expectations of masculinities and care, "fathers do caregiving that is qualitatively different from that of mothers" (Creighton et al., 2015:562; Brandth and Kvande, 2018, 1998; Brandth, 2016; Barker, 2011). For example, researchers have emphasised fathers engagement in fun/leisure activities as spaces to spend time and bond with their children, such as through sports and play (see Kay, 2009a for an excellent edited collection), into which (hegemonic) masculine discourse can be easily incorporated through, for example, rough-and-tumble style play, encouragement of risk-taking and independence (Creighton et al., 2017, 2015; Andreasson and Johansson, 2016; Newland et al., 2013). Such practices, it is argued, *distinguishes* fathers' nurturing, intimate parental care from 'mothering' (ibid.). Similarly, Barker (2011, 2008) demonstrates how fathers incorporate performances of masculinity into everyday childcare, such as through driving fast when escorting children to school, recreating the car into an explicitly *masculine* parental carescape, simultaneously constructing 'domestic' forms of masculinity- although, to my mind, his

use of the term 'escort' evokes a sense of emotional detachment and clinicism, removed from the emotional geographies supposedly inherent to carescapes (Milligan et al., 2007), at odds with the suggestion that fathers predominantly engage in emotional practices of caring about, rather than practical caring for (though see Waitt and Harada, 2016:1088).

Noting the "importance of fatherhood to domestic masculinity" (Gorman-Murray, 2008:370) and how "the private space of home enable[s] men to negotiate alternative masculinities, where they [can] be expressive, emotive and engaged in domestic labour and childcare" (ibid.:369), scholars are also increasingly interrogating fathers' participation in domestic work as spaces for 'doing' intimacy and care (Liu, 2017; Meah, 2017; Meah and Jackson, 2016).⁵ Gorman-Murray's (2013) paper on urban homebodies and performances of domestic masculinities, for example, at times heavily intersects with fathering, particularly through his analysis of how, for one participant, "acts of interpersonal touch with his wife and son underpinned [his] wellbeing and happiness...the importance of a daily shared bath with his son as a means of building physical and emotional closeness" (p.142). Like Morrison (2012a), this situates how haptic geographies of touch can act as expressions of love/intimacy, simultaneously creating a sense of belongingness to space and intimates and ultimately a sense of being at 'home' (Ahmet, 2013; Gorman-Murray, 2013; 2008, see also Ball et al., 2000 on father-infant co-sleeping).

However, such haptic spatial practices, particularly involving nudity, can be regarded as increasingly 'risky' for fathers over time (Gabb, 2012, 2010), highlighting how fathering practices of intimacy/care change over the life-course in response to children's needs (Meah and Jackson, 2016; Marsiglio and Roy, 2012; Palkovitz and Palm, 2009). Meah and Jackson's (2016) analysis of how a father does his daughters' hair is also an example of care that is explicitly intimate and haptic, though less 'risky'. They describe how "this task is all the more challenging because [his daughter is] of Afro-

⁵ In fact, quite a fair number of geographers examining domestic masculinities have engaged in discussions on fathering *implicitly* (for example, Cox, 2014; Richardson, 2014, see also Mann et al., 2016; Tarrant 2016, 2014a, 2013 on grandfathering), although fathering still remains a rather 'hidden' focal aspect of men's spatial lives (Meah, 2017; Meah and Jackson, 2016; Aitken, 2005).

Caribbean descent...[with]...hair-management requirements which he is less likely to be familiar with as a bald, White man” (p.503). Yet, he performs this with familiarity, confidence and tenderness, revealing how, in that moment, through that act of care- somewhat reflective of rather post-structural interpretations of identity (Blunt and Willis, 2000)- he is not merely ‘White’, not merely ‘man’, but *father*.

In another excellent paper Meah (2017) examines how fathers nurture and ‘do’ intimacy through the various spatial practices involved in foodwork, such as purchasing particular foods which have affective ‘love value’, somewhat drawing upon the notion of ‘gift-exchange’.⁶ Developing a thesis of the complex ‘circuits of intimacy’, she argues how, through foodwork, fathers ‘do love’ in and across space from the home and into supermarkets. This demonstrates the complex geographies of love and is an excellent- though rather specialised- example of how fathers ‘do’ love in their everyday geographies. This thesis extends this scope.

2.7. Situating the Thesis, Framing the Geographies of Loving Fathering

Researchers have theorised fathers’ supposed preference for ‘doing’ intimacy and bonding with their children through side-by-side activities; practices of spending time and doing things *together* (Brady et al., 2017; Baxter and Smart, 2011; Dermott, 2008, 2003), often conceptualising this as a more ‘masculine’ way of doing care and intimacy (Brandth and Kvande, 2018, 1998; Barker, 2011). Reflecting this, in her doctoral thesis on the social construction of paternal love, Macht (2017) fundamentally conceptualises fathers’ love as being embedded within processes of *emotional give-and-take*, constructed over time through engagement with their children. She notes that “spending time was considered good because it allowed for the bond to develop, and more time was understood as more opportunities for loving” (p.165).

⁶ The bestowing of material gifts or ‘sacrificial’ acts, as expressions of love/intimacy, (Gabb, 2010; Jamieson, 1998), though not uncontested by feminist scholars.

A review of existing literatures on fathering reveals that fathering is fundamentally a relational spatial practice, situated in (not unproblematic) opposition to mothering, but also, of great importance to this thesis, it is constructed in relation to interactions with children (Meah, 2017; Meah and Jackson, 2016; Palkovitz et al., 2014; Aitken, 2009, 2005, 2000). That is, “rather than representing a state of ‘being’, fathering is- in fact- a constantly evolving process of becoming” (Meah and Jackson, 2016:496); men ‘*become*’ father through particular interactions in and across space (Aitken, 2009, 2005). This reflects arguments of how fathering offers spaces for men to embody what Mann et al. (2016) claim to be ‘softer’ (rather than more ‘feminine’) discourse of masculinity, constructing new subjectivities of masculinity through emotional/practical childcare (Brandth and Kvande, 2018; Miller, 2011b; Brannen and Nilsen, 2006; hooks, 2004). I extend this understanding through this thesis, by demonstrating how, through loving interactions of intimacy/care in their everyday geographies, fathers ‘become’ ‘loving’ subjectivities of masculinity (Macht, 2017; Meah, 2017), subjectivities which are spatially produced (Gorman-Murray and Hopkins, 2014; van Hoven and Horschelmann, 2005).

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1. Introduction

Achieving the aims of this thesis- in particular given its novel, exploratory nature- required a melding of both theory and empirical data (King et al., 1994), specifically empirical data which articulated narratives and experiences of fathering relationships/interactions. Having provided the conceptual background in the preceding chapter, the following now details the methodological process through which such data were gathered, used to inform and support the arguments of the discussion and the thesis as a whole. In essence, this chapter is concerned with research design, encompassing the processes/methods of participant recruitment, data collection and analysis (Thomas, 2017; Clifford et al., 2010; Parsons and Knight, 2005).

Consequent to the intimate intertwinings of research philosophy, epistemology and methodology (Varanka, 2010; Aitken and Valentine, 2006; Graham, 2005), this chapter begins with a brief recap of the feminist philosophy underlying this research, explaining its influence on my methodological design and praxis (Hiemstra and Billo, 2017; Dixon and Jones, 2006). It then outlines how research participants were recruited, describing the ultimate composition of my sample and explains the research process/sequencing of data collection, discussing the key methods employed, with an overview of how the subsequent data were analysed. Reflecting how research ethics is an integral element of research design and a constant ongoing process (Matthews and Ross, 2010) ethical implications/rationales are discussed throughout, though an individual section is dedicated to ethical formalities, highlighting how this research has conformed to ethical standards. Given my feminist philosophical position, analysis of my positionality as a (young, female) researcher, and the practical interplays in conducting this research are discussed. This provides a good space to summarise the chapter in anticipation of the Discussion.

3.2. Feminist Research Philosophy, Methodology and Praxis

Noted previously, this research has been principally guided by a feminist philosophy, ontologically and epistemologically. Whilst feminist approaches in geography sought to challenge understandings of what were taken to be 'valid' areas of inquiry, they were also instrumental in reshaping beliefs of how geographic research 'should' (or could) be done (Dixon and Jones, 2006; WGSG, 1997), especially advocating for the adoption of 'new' methodologies, in particular more qualitative methods which could more accurately capture the complexity and diversity of experiences of geographical phenomena (ibid.; Doucet and Mauthner, 2008; McDowell, 1997). This also entailed incorporation of 'new' approaches to research praxis (Hiemstra and Billo, 2017; Smith et al., 2008) for example, placing greater emphasis on rapport-building and reciprocity, the *sharing* of experiences/stories between researchers and participants (Hall, 2014) grounded in the commitment to addressing concerns over potentially exploitative power relationships within research (Valentine, 2005; McDowell, 1997) as well as writing researchers into the research process through reflexive practices, in particular through discussion of positionality (ibid.; Hiemstra and Billo, 2017; Oakley, 1998). Thus, feminist research philosophy may be understood as being epistemologically interpretivist (Thomas, 2017:110-113), highlighting the subjectivity of our knowledge and experiences (Hiemstra and Billo, 2017), recognising that our knowledge of the world is always partial, always situated within our particular context (Rose, 1997).

For me, feminist philosophy is fundamentally about contesting and challenging (gendered) inequalities, and the exclusion of particular voices, equipping us with the necessary methodological tools to do so (ibid.; McDowell, 1997). This makes feminist philosophy highly pertinent to researching fathering (Macht, 2017; Miller, 2011a, see Connors, 2011), not least because feminist methodological approaches are broadly appropriate across much research- with many of its key tenets being largely accepted as 'good' academic practice across the social sciences (Dixon and Jones, 2006), including for conducting research on men's experiences (Hopkins and Noble, 2009)- but specifically because it facilitates the centring of the voices of a largely overlooked group in family research, fathers (Hiemstra and Billo, 2017; Aitken, 2005).

3.3. Research Design

Following ethical approval, this research project took place between January-May 2018. Consistent with my interpretation of feminist philosophy and my research aims, my research participants were the very people who are 'experts' in the everyday experiences of fathering relationships/interactions, fathers themselves (cf. Adamsons and Pasley, 2016; Dayton et al., 2016). Additionally, given the comparative lack of existing geographic research on fathering- particularly examining notions of love and relationships- and the subsequent exploratory nature of this thesis, I adopted an intensive research design, conducting research with a small number of fathers in great detail (Clifford et al., 2010).⁷ This research was consequently designed based on a qualitative mixed-method approach, deemed especially appropriate due to the complexity of parenting (fathering especially, see Meah and Jackson, 2016; Aitken, 2009). As such, the emphasis in this research was on the *depth*, rather than breadth of data, drawing upon techniques of data triangulation to strengthen and support the validity of findings (Clifford et al., 2010). Further, the nature of the phenomenon under study also necessitated a flexible research design (Robson and McCartan, 2016), for parenting is "uniquely *personal*, intimate and embodied" (Jupp and Gallagher, 2013:155, emphasis added).

3.4. Recruiting Participants

Participants were largely recruited through 'on-site recruiting' (Longhurst, 2010:109) over January 2018, via parent-groups in Birmingham listed on Netmums (<https://www.netmums.com/birmingham/parent-and-toddler-groups>). Group-leads (who acted as gatekeepers- Valentine, 2005:116), were contacted by e-mail briefly describing the research, requesting permission to attend a session in order to talk to and potentially recruit some fathers to participate. One group which had a number of comments remarking on how many dads frequently attend offered no email but

⁷ I therefore utilised something of a case study design frame to help structure this research (see Thomas, 2017; Baxter, 2016) where the 'subjects' of my case study are the participants who, as fathers, enable a particular insight into the fathering relationships, the 'object' of my research (Thomas, 2017, 2011).

provided a link to a Facebook group, which I messaged instead,⁸ receiving a response within a day inviting me to come along that week.

I received no replies from other groups via email, however, based on the success of contacting via social media, I instead tried to contact groups via Facebook, resulting in successful contact with a further two groups. At each group I talked to all of the fathers (and indeed many of the mothers) in attendance, handing out information sheets summarising the research (Appendix A) containing my contact details for potential participants. Despite trying to contact groups in areas with a range of socio-economic backgrounds the three gatekeeping groups were located in areas in geographic proximity to the University,⁹ affecting the participant sample.

Ultimately, six fathers agreed to participate in this research, four recruited directly from these parent-groups, the other two through snowballing, where existing contacts passed along the contact details of subsequent fathers who expressed an interest in participating. Upon receiving their contact details, these fathers were provided with an information sheet directly by myself and if they were still willing to participate, subsequent meetings were arranged.

3.5. Participants

All six of the fathers had at least one child with whom they were involved and had a relationship. They all described themselves as being White, British, heterosexual and were able-bodied (though one described having dyslexia). Participants all appeared to be economically comfortable, none identifying themselves to me as belonging to a particular class. Four were married and two were in a long-term relationship with the mother of their child(ren), cohabiting with them full-time. Fathers' ages ranged from 32 to 44; the oldest child was 10 years old (turning 11) and the youngest was- at the start of data collection- 2 weeks, with a median age of 3 years. Evidently, the participant

⁸ I reasoned that my contacting groups via social media was ethically appropriate, posing little risk to the safety of myself as my personal account is set to private, only allowing users not on my 'Friends' list to view certain details (including that I am a Masters' student at the University).

⁹ This may have had an impact on why they let me attend- a few of the group leads commented to me that they receive lots of requests from people doing research (one commenting that they rarely reply but thought my project sounded so interesting!).

sample varied little in terms of their socio-demographic background, however, despite being relatively demographically homogenous, my participant sample encompassed an interesting array of circumstances, summarised in Appendix B for accessibility.

Three fathers described themselves as the 'primary caregivers' of their child(ren); two, 'Shane' and 'Leo', identified as stay-at-home dads (both working part-time), the other, 'Corey', employed in the emergency services working both day and night shifts throughout the week.¹⁰ Of the other three fathers, two had relatively unusual work-patterns, 'Adam' having 'dropped' a day at work in order to spend time with and care for his daughter,¹¹ 'Jasper' working full-time, though typically working late on Fridays, having these mornings off as 'family-time'; the final father, 'Vince' worked the most 'standard' Monday-Friday/nine-to-five job, though this sometimes involved long hours and much travelling. Two of the fathers' partners worked full-time as academics at the University, with another working there part-time. Two of the other mothers also worked part-time and the final mother was in the army. Many of the fathers described having been to University (only one explicitly stating having not), one having at-least a Masters' degree. Additionally, three of the fathers were practising Christians.

Consequent to this limited participant sample, the empirical findings of this thesis may not generalisable to the broader population (particularly given the clear epistemological consequences of conducting research drawing upon narratives of a sample (largely) implicated within the academic community). However, as a small-scale, qualitative study, this was not the intention, rather, this research sought to provide new, *exploratory* insight, (Baxter, 2016; Matthews and Ross, 2010:111) providing possible interpretations into the spatiality of love in everyday fathering geographies, although I believe that the underlying arguments of this thesis are transferable to a wider population (ibid.).

¹⁰ For discussion of father involvement and shift work, see Linnenberg (2012).

¹¹ A social trend which Schwiter and Baumgarten (2017) refer to as 'Daddy Days' (as dubbed by the popular press).

3.6. Research Process and Sequence of Data Collection

The fieldwork process involved three methods of data collection, informed by differing, though complementary methodological approaches. These included a semi-structured interview; a participant-solicited diary (potentially complemented with photos) and a go-along. As noted, the research design was necessarily flexible, not least due to the personal nature of the phenomenon under study (Jupp and Gallagher, 2013), but also because ethically it was important that participants could adapt the research design if necessary, opting out of stages if they did not wish to participate in them (for example taking photographs), or flexing the methodology to suit them, though most did participate in the research as designed. However, 'Jasper' opt-outed of keeping a diary as his wife had just given birth to their second child! but was happy to take photographs so we substituted with a photo-interview (Gabb, 2010); 'Vince' was only able to participate in an interview.

3.6.1. Initial Meeting

All fathers were offered an opportunity to meet with me outside of the parent-groups from where they had (in)directly been recruited, providing a good opportunity for the fathers- particularly those who had been recruited via snowballing- to discuss the research, ask any questions they had and to clarify anything they were unsure about, ultimately ensuring they were able to give informed consent to participate. Consequently, I met with all participants at least once (often twice) in a 'public' space before the beginning of data collection. On a number of occasions, these initial meetings involved meeting a father's child(ren).¹² Although this stage did not involve active data collection, it was, I felt, an important part of the research process in terms of ethical (feminist) praxis, enabling the building of rapport between myself and participants, offering a time to informally chat in a comfortable setting which, I hope, enabled participants to feel more relaxed in subsequent meetings (ibid.).

¹² On two occasions this also involved meeting the mother (further meeting another during the go-along). Thus, at least some of the mothers of children were aware of fathers' participation (one even engaging in taking photographs), though this was not a requirement and was wholly the choice of the participant.

3.6.2. Interview

The first method of data collection involved an in-depth interview, conducted face-to-face on a one-to-one basis. Before the start of the interview, participants signed a consent form and were given a further opportunity to ask questions. Interviews were designed to gain insight into participants' general perceptions/experiences of relationships as a father, adopting a narrative approach (where participants tell stories about their everyday lives, reflecting on everyday habits- see Phoenix and Brannen, 2014; Gabb, 2010:20). Interviews covered topics such as the 'Meanings of Fathering', 'Childhood Parental Relationships'¹³ and 'Doing Fathering' (see Appendix C). They were semi-structured, allowing for the interview to progress in a conversation-like manner, as well as providing me with space to ask improvised questions to further probe emergent themes in participants' responses, especially elements which had not been anticipated (Longhurst, 2010; Valentine, 2005).

Interviews typically lasted approximately an hour (the shortest being 45 minutes, the longest over 2 hours) taking place in various locations chosen by the participants to ensure they were conducted in places that were practical and comfortable for them (ibid.). Two were conducted in a café/restaurant, one in a workplace office, and three took place in the participants' homes¹⁴ (consequent to their care circumstances). Interviews were audio-recorded, with permission and transcribed verbatim using DragonNaturally Speaking voice recognition software (see Dunn, 2016:171), a process which enabled the beginning of my immersion in the data (Cope, 2010). To ensure that transcripts accurately reflected the opinions of fathers, all were given the opportunity to review their transcript and make any amendments they wished, though no significant changes were requested.

¹³ This was included for how it is argued to shape men's fathering aspirations (Jessee and Adamsons, 2018). However, at the beginning of the interview it was stressed to participants they did not have to answer any questions or discuss topics if they did not want to, all participants were explicitly asked if they were happy to discuss their childhood (Question 12 in bold) before further questions, due to ethical concerns this could potentially upset interviewees.

¹⁴ Geographers have long highlighted the importance of interview location to offering further depth of analysis (Longhurst, 2010; Sin, 2003; Elwood and Martin, 2000). Indeed, conducting interviews in participants' homes enabled me to see these rather intimate everyday spaces of fathering, see family photographs and even some interactions between father-and-child.

3.6.3. Participant Diary

The next stage of data collection sought data which captured more everyday experiences of fathering relationships/interactions, furthering narratives described in interviews on more general experiences. Participants completed a solicited-diary (Morrison, 2012b)- a method which incorporates a melding of narrative and ethnographic approaches (Gabb, 2010) - which they kept for a period of approximately two-weeks. This was deemed long enough to capture a diversity of fathering activities/interactions but also not too long to be inconvenient/intrusive.¹⁵ It was also suggested that participants take photographs in order to complement their diary narratives, though it was stressed that any photos shared were *not* intended for use in the thesis.

Diaries took the physical form of an A5 spiral-bound notebook, typically given to participants at the end of the interview, providing an opportunity for questions. Within the diaries, I enclosed some brief guidance notes to help focus fathers' narratives (see Appendix D) although I did not wish to provide too much guidance so as to constrain them. Having fathers complete the solicited-diary themselves, with relatively limited guidance, not only facilitated greater depth and richness to the data but also provided a space for fathers to identify and highlight elements which *they* deemed to be important (Morrison, 2012b; Latham, 2010).¹⁶

3.6.4. Catch-up

Following its completion, I met up with each father to collect the diary. Although again not a key stage of collecting data, this provided an opportunity for fathers to informally talk me through their diaries (and photographs), useful when I sat down to read and code them. Although Latham (2010) describes how many researchers conduct post-diary interviews in order to clarify diary content, as the diaries were the key piece of data desired at this stage, these conversations were not recorded/transcribed, instead

¹⁵ In feedback questionnaires, participants were reasonably happy with this period, with several suggesting a week would have been too short (cf. Morrison, 2012b), especially as some only had one day 'with' their children, and a month too long.

¹⁶ Indeed, some have argued that diaries can enable participants to become ethnographers of their own lives, claiming that they can be quite an empowering method (Gabb, 2010), although, in the context of this research I am unsure of the extent to which this made fathers feel empowered.

notes were made in my research journal at the earliest opportunity to refer back to if necessary. However, the photo-interview which acted as a substitute for Jasper was audio-recorded and transcribed (following the same procedure of sharing the transcript for review as in the interview) in order to capture his narratives of his photographs.

3.6.5. Go-along

Given the focus of this research project on the *spaces* of fathering relationships/interactions, the third and final stage of data collection involved *going to* these spaces, employing a 'go-along' method. This technique hybridises interviews and participant observation (Winchester and Rofe, 2016) and is advocated especially by Kusenbach (2016; 2003) for its ability to provide insight into the significance of space/place in everyday experiences. Go-alongs are largely informed by an ethnographic methodological approach but are more active than 'hanging out', enabling researchers "to observe their informants' spatial practices in situ whilst accessing their experiences and interpretations at the same time" (Kusenbach, 2016:154, also 2003:463). This allowed me to ask participants about what was happening, providing greater richness of observations, though many offered narratives without prompting.

This stage involved going to a particular space that the fathers themselves deemed important for their relationships/interactions, encompassing a variety of places/activities, from the morning walk to school; trips to public parks/gardens or playgroup (Appendix B).¹⁷ These typically lasted 1-2 hours, though one involved a whole Sunday morning including a church service, followed by a trip to the park. This was intentionally the last stage of data collection, by which time I had not only gained insight and understanding of these men as fathers through their interviews, diaries and informal chats- and thus what the go-along spaces/activities might mean to them- but also, I hoped, made fathers comfortable around me (and more importantly, comfortable with me potentially being around their children).¹⁸

¹⁷ Whilst several go-alongs entailed an outing of sorts, children demonstrated great familiarity and comfort in these places, leading me to believe they were not places selected for my benefit.

¹⁸ It was no way imperative that go-alongs included the presence of fathers' children, though (perhaps unsurprisingly given the purpose of the method) they always did.

Each go-along was implicitly mobile, often involving walking to/through these places- even running around a playgroup! This, and their rather lengthy nature meant that audio/visual recording was highly impractical, as were written notes. Visual recording in particular seemed inappropriate and potentially ethically problematic since *other* people's children were always present in these spaces. Therefore, rather than making notes in-situ, at the earliest opportunity as many notes as possible were made to act as prompts for writing-up observations. Subsequently, verbal quotes from go-alongs are paraphrased (as accurately as possible) with observations being conveyed through vignettes, differentiated through italicisation.

3.7. Data Analysis

Ultimately, this research draws upon data from six interviews (along with Jasper's additional photo-interview), four diaries and five go-alongs. Together, these produced an extremely rich set of data; yielding approximately 200 pages of text, revealing many aspects which, at its early stages, this research project did not have the foresight to cover and have much shaped the content of the discussion chapters and the overall thesis. In order to construct such discussions, the data was first analysed through coding, organised to make sense of interpretations, highlighting important/recurring themes through data triangulation. Indeed, during this process of data analysis, further themes emerged, which have been incorporated into the discussion as they relate to the research objectives.

As Cope (2010) notes, data analysis and coding are often complex, lengthy endeavours, especially as "codes do not stand alone but are part of a web of interconnected themes and categories" (p.442). Indeed, when coding began, I initially felt a little overwhelmed; I was pretty confident about some of the key themes which had emerged and wanted to include- but were they the *right* themes? I reconciled that, given the (feminist) interpretivist epistemology of this research, there *were* no right/wrong codes, but the codes were a reflection of *my interpretation* of the data (Thomas, 2017).

Having become rather immersed in interview/go-along data through the transcription/write-up process (Cope, 2010), coding began by re-reading participants solicited-diaries, the piece of data which I had not been directly involved in producing and was thus the least familiar. By beginning with the diaries, I was able to draw effective links across the methods, beginning data-triangulation. This also enabled my immersion within (many of) the *fathers'* narratives, noting themes *they* were raising. Throughout coding, notes/memos on what words/actions meant were made, focusing especially on ideas of 'relationships' and 'love', which, unsurprisingly formed the 'meta-codes' of my analysis in which there were various (interconnected) sub-codes.

3.8. Ethics

Before the commencement of this research, ethical approval was gained, and every effort was made to ensure I conducted myself ethically, for example presenting myself in a professional, yet casual and friendly manner throughout. To ensure participants were able to give informed consent, they were provided with a detailed information sheet and opportunities to discuss/clarify elements of the research or request further information. Participants were assured that their data would always be handled with the upmost confidentiality and kept securely on password-protected devices in an anonymised format and that their identity would not be revealed to anyone by myself. Participants' names (and those of their children) have been replaced with pseudonyms. Throughout, it was emphasised that participants had the right to withdraw from the research at any time, without giving a reason. Conscious of the researchers' gaze (as part of my feminist praxis), I emphasised that this research was not evaluative of participants' fathering and I intend to provide each with a summary of research findings, along with a full-copy of this thesis, if desired.

3.9. Positionality

As an interpretivist study (from a feminist position) it is important to highlight and critically reflect on how who I am as a researcher has affected the findings of this thesis (Thomas, 2017; Hiemstra and Billo, 2017). Some scholars have noted that there are limits to this reflexive practice, with Rose (1997) arguing that we can never fully, transparently 'know' ourselves and our difference/sameness to participants before

(sometimes even in) the moment, as knowledge is always partial (Hiemstra and Billo, 2017). Therefore, in this final sub-section I discuss my positionality within the *context* of *this* research.

My positionality as a young, female researcher (with no children) positioned me as something of an outsider as I have not 'lived' and experienced parenthood, meaning that, at times, my capacity to fully understand fathers' narratives/experiences was limited, particularly on an emotional level as I perhaps might have been able, had I been a parent/father (see Aitken, 2009; Williams, 2009:60). However, through emphasis on rapport-building throughout the research process I felt able to construct 'spaces of betweenness' with participants (Katz, 1992) based on my positionality as a *daughter*, sharing stories of my own family and child-father experiences. This, I felt, enabled me to make sense of fathers' narratives, especially in terms of their relationships with their children.

My positionality as a woman may have arguably placed me in a position of trust (Hall, 2014). Indeed, throughout the research process I often wondered how different my experiences might have been, had I been a man for example, whether participants would have been (seemingly) so comfortable with my being around and interacting with their children (Horton, 2001). Moreover, given my positionality, researching fathering instigated a myriad of emotional experiences, reflecting the inherent emotional landscapes of research (Hall, 2014; Tarrant, 2014b).

Generally, I felt that participants' children warmed to me quite readily, however, my identity as a non-mother also raised ethical issues for me, wrapped up with notions of power between researcher/researched. For example, throughout much of the research process, I found myself experiencing an unanticipated sense of affection towards the children, wanting to play/interact with them, raising ethical questions of how much I should/*could* interact with them. When introduced to a participant's child(ren) I would greet them with a little wave and try to appear friendly, but, aware that I was practically a stranger and not wanting to upset children, nor the parents, I never tried to physically interact with them of my own accord- feeling momentarily

stunned when one father passed me his toddler to hold! Often, I let my level of interaction be dictated by the parent(s) and the children themselves, taking the way they interacted with me as a guide to how much interaction was deemed appropriate. Throughout I realised, that not only was there an element of power in the 'researchers' gaze' in that I was aware of how the fathers in this study seemingly wanted me to perceive and believe them to be 'good' parents but also how the *participants themselves* had a considerable level of power *over me* as a researcher through the 'gaze' in terms of judging *my* competence to conduct research (ethically) where young children were implicitly involved.

3.10. Summary and Discussion Outline

This chapter has provided the research rationale of how data was collected and analysed for this thesis. It has explained the philosophical/epistemological groundings of my research design, the recruitment of research participants, methods of data collection and described how such data were analysed. Throughout I have given consideration of ethical praxis, also engaging in critical self-reflection of how my positionality has shaped the research process and ultimate findings of this thesis of how these men, as fathers, perform, experience and instil love through their everyday geographies, which I now explore in the following discussion chapters.

As the Literature Review has shown, there exists little engagement, both with fathering and explicitly with love within geography (with some notable exceptions), resulting in a dearth of understandings of the significance of space/place to contemporary fathering and to experiences of love, much less appreciation of the spatialities *of love in everyday fathering*, as in this thesis. With my aims in mind, the discussion chapters explore how the fathers in this study cared for, (emotionally) supported, nurtured and bonded with their children, building/maintaining relationships with them through particular everyday intimate care interactions which took places in particular spaces/place; interactions which I argue *constitute* love. Throughout I critically argue how these everyday acts of care and intimacy (and emotional support), not only occur in particular places (and are thus spatial), but also themselves produce *spaces of love*, as well as particular kinds of (loving, caring) masculine subjectivities.

As developed in the Literature Review, I regard love as being a complex, multifaceted affective/affectionate bond, encompassing elements of trust, intimacy and the commitment/responsibility to providing emotional/practical care and support (building upon Morrison et al., 2012; Thien, 2011; Valentine, 2008; hooks, 2004) which I theorise is performed through everyday geographies, particularly those of care and intimacy. I am, however, wary of this being read as a prescriptive list of practices which constitute *being* a 'good' or 'loving' father (or indeed mother), or, since this research focused in the main on fathers with young children, this being read as a manual or linearly deterministic set of practices for father-child relationship building. Rather, these practices should be regarded as illustrative *examples* of spatial enactments of love performed by the fathers in this study.

Chapter 4

Intimate Geographies of Care in Everyday Fathering

4.1. Introduction

Whilst many scholars continue to cite and discuss historical stereotypes of breadwinning and providing financially as fundamentally significant to the contemporary roles and identities of fathering (Shirani et al., 2012; Yarwood, 2011; Aitken, 2009), many of these fathers contested this.

It's different to how it was traditionally, I certainly don't see myself as the breadwinner...(Corey, Interview)

Probably growing up I would have always assumed I would be the provider, but I don't think that's true anymore- I am at the moment, but I think that's because practically that's best. (Adam, Interview)

Instead, much greater emphasis was placed on being actively engaged and spending time with their children and having relationships with them, largely reflecting contemporary discourse of involved fathering and the importance of 'being there (for)' and 'spending time with' their children (Marsiglio and Roy, 2012; Kay, 2009b; Dermott, 2008), a discourse which has very clearly implied metaphors of spatiality in being 'there' emotionally/physically.

I think the first thing is about time, the importance of spending time, because that can't be replaced...the other thing is when we do spend time together, it's important that I'm engaged because it's very easy just to go through the motions. (Vince, Interview)

Some fathers also referred to particular qualities which they believed were important to fathering, with care being especially central, also conveying the contemporary desire for fathers to be emotionally available, in-tune with and responsive to their children's needs (Gillies, 2009; Wall and Arnold, 2007).

I think you've got to be caring. I want to say *understanding*- I don't know why that's just popped into my head- but understanding, I think you've got to be really understanding, I see a lot of people get frustrated with children- they're children, they're not adults. (Shane, Interview, his emphasis)

...so kind of caring and listens, takes time to listen, taking time to play and spend time with children...(Jasper, Interview)

In fact, some fathers even referred to their role explicitly *in terms of* love.

I suppose my initial thought is...a book called The Five Love Languages¹⁹ and I think actually to be there for you child in lots of different ways, to show them love in lots of different ways. (Adam, Interview)

There's 100 things I think you should be for being a good dad, but I think you've just got to be- you've just got to love them, that's it at the end of the day, you know, that's it. (Shane, Interview)

Clearly, like in Macht (2017) for many of these fathers, spending time and doing things *with* their children were understood as ways of bonding with them, relationships of love being built through shared experiences, Corey even explaining how this is crucial to the development of any relationship.

It's that shared experience thing...I think that's no different to being an adult, you go out and do stuff, you go out on adventures and it brings you closer. (Corey, Interview)

This arguably suggests that one of the most significant elements of the everyday geographies of fathering and the spatialities of love are the everyday spaces of being (and/or feeling) together with their children. This emphasis on being together and building a sense of 'togetherness'- or 'we-ness' to use Marsiglio and Roy's (2012) term- highlights the importance of the geographies of intimacy to the enactment and creation of relationships of love (Valentine, 2008) in everyday fathering with this (shared) sense of 'togetherness' being built through everyday caring practices/interactions in and across particular spaces.

4.2. Intimate Care, Trust, Familiarity and Belonging: Creating a Loving Home

Several scholars have noted that the home is often a key, though certainly not uncontested (see Brickell, 2012; Blunt and Dowling, 2006) space of family and intimacy (Valentine and Hughes, 2012; Gabb, 2010; Valentine, 2008). More specifically, it is an everyday space of 'doing' (familial) *togetherness* (Dowling and Power, 2012). This was

¹⁹ A book by Gary Chapman (1995) outlining five ways of expressing and experiencing love including 'Words of Affirmation', 'Acts of Service', 'Receiving Gifts', 'Quality Time' and 'Physical Touch', all of which Adam described. See <http://www.5lovelanguages.com/> [Accessed: 07/07/2018]

undoubtedly the case for these fathers, some describing the importance of *getting home* (from work) in their everyday fathering geographies.

Get home from nights and Charlotte is up straight away to greet me. It's one of the best bits of the day when you open the front door and the kids run up to you. (Corey, Diary)

Corey's narrative evokes a strong image of love and warmth (Rose, 2004), a joyous embrace between father and child, demonstrating their close bond through the great excitement of being (back) together, articulating the deeply emotional geographies of home in everyday fathering interactions (Meah and Jackson, 2016; Aitken, 2009). The Literature Review argues that such everyday haptic geographies of embodied touch are significant ways of expressing love and affection (Morrison, 2012a; see also Debrot et al., 2013), as well as a process of feeling at home; also producing subjectivities of 'domestic masculinity' such as fathering (Gorman-Murray, 2013). Here, Corey's loving embrace with Charlotte demonstrates how he is entering this space explicitly as a *father*, embodying a particular emotionally intimate and caring subjectivity of (domestic) masculinity in this space (Brandth and Kvande, 2018; Meah and Jackson, 2016). This clearly situates the home as an important everyday emotional carescape of fathering and as a space for doing/expressing bonds of love (Morrison, 2012a).

I can't think of any other kinds of physical spaces really that have the same [emotive value than the school-run], other than the house itself. (Leo, Interview)

However, integral to a sense of togetherness and intimate bond of love is the establishment and maintenance of familiarity and trust (Valentine and Hughes, 2012; hooks, 2004), which are intertwined with spatiality in rather complex ways; constructed in (and across) particular spaces, such as those within the home (Valentine, 2008; Jamieson, 1998), but can entail exclusion from particular spaces at certain times if the level of familiarity and trust between father-and-child is wanting (Gabb, 2012). This was explained by Leo as we sat together on the stairs of his home,²⁰ looking at and talking about photographs; one photograph showing Logan (the eldest) as a baby, lying on his

²⁰ My go-along with Leo, a stay-at-home dad for the morning walk to school also involved a house tour.

back, arms outstretched towards his dad's face, provoking Leo to explain how, at one point:

Logan wouldn't let me put him to bed because he didn't know who I was since I was leaving early in the morning [for work] and then only returning not long before he went to bed. That's one of the reasons why I packed up my job. (Leo, Go-along)

Leo's rather emotive story makes especially evident how crucial a sense of trust and familiarity is to the spatialities of 'doing' father-child interactions and relationships of love. He explains how, because Logan 'didn't know who' Leo was- lacking a sense of familiarity and a bond with him- he would not permit Leo's involvement in performing the intimate care of putting him to bed, a spatio-temporal moment when children feeling secure is imperative as they "transition from the wide-awake reality of the day to the more vulnerable sleep state of the night" (Marsiglio and Roy, 2012:67). This also highlights the complex emotional geographies of (being barred from doing) love in everyday fathering.

Moreover, the spatiality of love (and the significance of trust/security) was further demonstrated by one father, who described the importance of creating a positive home space of security for his daughter, a space in which she felt happy and comfortable, expressing this in his interview,

I suppose just the most important thing is that Amy feels comfortable at home and that this is a relaxing space, it's not just a space where she watches T.V., or a place where she eats. Like actually it's a place where she plays and has a lot of fun and will play hide and seek, or she'll read. (Adam, Interview)

And further in his diary.

Home in the afternoon and lovely to see how immediately happy she was playing and finding her toys. Lovely to know she feels at home where we live. (Adam, Diary)

Again, the home is clearly an important everyday space of love for these fathers, especially Adam, wanting to ensure it is a space where Amy feels 'in-place'. Although arguably a moral responsibility of fathering, being committed to creating a positive home space where children feel happy and safe may also be understood as a spatial act

of love for, as argued by Thien (2011), “love makes intimate knowledge of particular places...and attaches one to another” (p.316), suggestive of how love constructs feelings of belongingness, with both beings *and* spaces.

In especially for young children, care practices involved in everyday bath/bedtime routines have been argued to help instil a sense of belonging and security within the space of home, as Marsiglio and Roy (2012) suggest through discussion of the significance of (fathers’) reassurance and emotional support in these moments, which typically take place in intimate spaces within the home that are symbolically significant, such as bedrooms and bathrooms. These intimate spaces are also often important for doing (gendered) identity work (Morrison, 2013:241), Gorman-Murray (2013) examining these as spaces for the production of homebodies of domestic masculinity through performances of emotional care.

Nurturing, supportive interactions involved in these routines, for example cuddles and reading stories at bedtime, enable fathers to *create* space where children feel safe and secure, building trust between father-and-child (Marsiglio and Roy, 2012). This situates how intimate spaces of care within the home are also important spaces for *establishing* trust and familiarity, reciprocity and relationship-building with children, foregrounding one’s identity as a father (Gabb, 2012; 2010). By habitually engaging in these practices with their children, fathers were able to not only foster children’s sense of belonging at home, but also a sense of belonging *with their father* (Ball et al, 2000). As such, these intimate spaces, and the practices of care which take place within them facilitate the production and performance of ‘we-ness’ (Marsiglio and Roy, 2012), further highlighting the intertwinings of love and spatiality in the everyday geographies of fathering.

4.3. Intimate Spaces, Emotional Give-and-Take, Caring Masculine Subjectivities

Indeed, for many of these fathers, home was often situated around the everyday significance of fathers being able to spend time and interact with their (young) children through engagement in everyday spaces of intimate care- which have both practical and emotional dimensions (Milligan and Wiles, 2010)- such as sharing meals with children, bathing them and putting them to bed, often involving cuddles and the reading of bedtime stories (for similar, see Meah, 2017; Liu, 2017; Gorman-Murray, 2013; Marsiglio and Roy, 2012). These were especially important intimate geographies of care in everyday fathering for creating and experiencing a sense of 'togetherness' with one another; building reciprocity, belonging and ultimately relationships of love.

I always try to get home for around six o'clock and then have dinner with Vanessa, do the bath, do the bedtime routine and she is in bed by seven, so there is like an hour in the evenings. (Vince, Interview)

Home from work. Got to play with Shaun before tea and bath! (Shane, Diary)

In the evening I make sure I'm home so Amy and I can have half an hour...to sit and watch something or play. And then I would generally take a lead on bathtime and sort of like reading her a story and that's a very important time for me. (Adam, Interview)

Sometimes, however, these were highlighted through the geographies of 'absence' (Wylie, 2009), where the significance of these moments was emphasised especially when fathers could not participate, as Jasper, who often works late on Friday evenings, explains.

Fridays is very much up and down for me, because obviously we spend time in the morning but by the evening I'll come home, and it will be 7:30 and he will be in bed so therefore I won't see Joseph...I've got this play-off between not having Friday evening and obviously not having bathtime and bedtime, and night-time things...so we don't get the praying together before we go to bed. (Jasper, Interview)

This again illustrates the complex (emotional) geographies of intimate care (Milligan et al., 2007) in everyday fathering, reflecting a poignant sense of sadness and regret- almost loss- over missing out on the everyday intimacies of bonding with his children

and 'doing' love at home (emotionally, physically and even spiritually) due to (physically) being elsewhere.

Such intimate care practices may be also understood as spatial acts of love, for these intimate spaces enable reciprocal relationship-building through emotional give-and-take (Macht, 2017), where fathers can verbally and physically interact with their children (Marsiglio and Roy, 2012) through chatting, laughing and cuddling.

Good time spent with Amy at bathtime and bedtime...stories and cuddles with Amy are a highlight even when they are draining. (Adam, Diary)

Usual bedtime routine but now we have started reading 'Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets'. Charlotte is very excited about this after we finished the first book. From my point of view it's a lot easier to read this sort of book as it keeps me engaged also. Some of Cassie's early reads are a bit of a chore to get through. (Corey, Diary).

However, these narratives are also suggestive of how these intimate interactions can be largely emotionally taking, perhaps linked to the constant need to ensure children feel secure in this spatio-temporal moment and that their emotional/practical needs are met.

When I put the kids to bed, my daughter, she is always kind of mucking about, always trying to keep it going, you know "I'm scared" or "I need a drink" all that kind of stuff at the last minute to keep it going. (Leo, Interview)

This highlights the complexity of love, showing how the immediate emotional geographies of these intimate spatial interactions of love/care are not always positive (Bowlby, 2011; Milligan et al., 2007)- being a 'highlight' for Adam as well as being draining- although in the long run intimate, loving fathering was regarded as emotionally rewarding (Brandth and Kvande, 2018).

I think for me personally, I'm just really at a great advantage with Shaun to be able to do this, it's a privilege, yeah...he's a great boy...I couldn't ask for more. I think we're proper blessed, he's a fun little chap. (Shane, Interview)

Moreover, intimate interactions and performances/expressions of love are also not always positive when caring for poorly children, as Adam describes.

Amy has a stomach bug...cuddly hour with her feeling poorly, want her to feel loved...Largely stayed in. Enjoyed watching films and having a cuddle, but didn't like her being in pain. (Adam, Diary).

Here Adam demonstrates the affectual flow of love between himself and Amy, articulating the haptic geographies of love, as did Corey at the beginning of this chapter (Debrot et al., 2013; Morrison, 2012a), expressing his deep desire to comfort Amy, 'wanting her to feel loved'; reflecting their close bond through the negative feelings *he* experiences about her 'being in pain'. This is also indicative of the "strange spatiality [of love] that might be described as an intertwining of self and other" (Maclaren, 2014:56), where, in this moment, in this space, holding Amy, Adam is very clearly a *father loving* his daughter, deeply in-tuned with her emotionally, embodying an emotionally/caring masculine subjectivity (of domesticity) openly expressing this love (Brandth and Kvande, 2018; Gorman-Murray, 2013; 2008).

In a similar way, one father even reflected on how becoming a father had somewhat *changed* him in terms of his personality and emotional identity (Gambles, 2013:188), describing his shift from embodying a rather emotionally stoic masculine identity to a more open (arguably more vulnerable) one, a change he had not anticipated, illustrating the complex interplays between fathering, emotion, love and masculinity (Macht, 2017).

I'd been [in the emergency services] for over 20 years when Charlotte was born, I'd seen a lot of stuff, a lot of pretty nasty stuff and it was always kind of like 'Oh, that's pretty shit' you know...I considered myself a bit of a steely-eyed bastard I think. Having kids, I was ready for the late nights...I was ready for having no money, not being able to go anywhere, all that kind of thing. What I just *wasn't* ready for was the fact that *anything* can bring you to tears and that's what's changed me most as a person, about being a father. (Corey, Interview, his emphasis)

Similarly, another father discussed the supposed contradictions between fathering masculinities and those of hegemonic.

My partner and I always sort of joke that if I go out with all the other dads it's like the 'beta males', you know, we are not the alpha males who are beating their chests, bringing home money and being ineffectual at changing nappies (laughs). (Leo, Interview)

This reflects arguments of how fathering offers spaces for men to embody what Mann et al. (2016) claim to be a 'softer' (rather than more 'feminine') discourse of masculinity, constructing new subjectivities of masculinity through emotional/practical childcare (Brandth and Kvande, 2018; Miller, 2011b; Brannen and Nilsen, 2006; hooks, 2004). However, the incorporation of 'caring' masculine subjectivities does not necessarily displace, nor render unimportant other aspects of masculinity, including those more aligned with hegemonic ideals such as breadwinning (Hunter et al., 2017).

4.4. Stretching Love: Loving, Intimate Fathering Spaces Beyond Home

Recognising how fathers increasingly "participate in emotionally attuned hands-on caring in the spaces around paid work" (Miller, 2011b:1103), scholars have interrogated the home as a significant space where fathers 'do' intimacy/care, especially through engagement in debates on (domestic) masculinities (Meah, 2017; Meah and Jackson, 2016; Gorman-Murray, 2013). However, this implies a differentiation between the spaces of work and home, when these are in fact, under (post-structural) feminist thinking, increasingly intertwined (Blunt and Dowling, 2006:18-19). Indeed, although some fathers suggested how work can, at times, constrain their everyday interactions with their children, several also described the value of media technologies as spaces for facilitating their engagement in everyday practices of intimate care (similarly see Macht, 2017:117) especially when they could not be physically present, typically due to work (blurring the assumed geographies of 'absence' and 'presence' (Moran and Disney, 2017; Wylie, 2009, see also Baldassar et al., 2016; Baldassar, 2008). This arguably emphasises the importance placed on these everyday practices of care for 'doing' love as fathers.

I do quite a lot of travelling with my job....and Vanessa will notice it increasingly if I'm not there, so she will say "dada is *missing*", "where is dada?". And of course I'm at work, so then I try and call her and we have a Skype call- and it's not ideal. I do feel that...if I miss a number of days of being there in the evening she'll notice and that will unsettle her. (Vince, Interview, his emphasis)

Didn't really see Amy, out from 7am till 10pm. Nice to see videos of her enjoying time with family on Whatsapp and FaceTiming before bed. (Adam, Diary)

Whilst the workplace may be regarded as a socially-recognised space of 'doing' fathering- and part of its assumed 'moral geographies' (Lilius, 2016; Holloway, 1998)- in terms of providing financially, it is not often recognised as a space of actively 'doing' love, nor for doing/maintaining father-child relationships. However, through the use of media technologies, fathers 'stretch' the assumed carescapes of love (cf. Longhurst, 2016), creating explicitly *fathering* spaces of *love*, with these interactions, in and across media spaces, foregrounding these men's identities as explicitly intimate, caring *fathers*, deeply involved and committed to the everyday emotional practices of care, even in spaces where these might typically not be emphasised. This well articulates the complex spatiality (and scalarity) of love (Kraftl, 2015:177-178; Valentine, 2008), as these intimate spatial interactions are not limited to the space of home and do not always necessitate physical togetherness (Marsiglio and Roy, 2012; Valentine, 2008; Marsiglio et al., 2005).

4.5. Conclusion

This chapter has begun to empirically demonstrate the implicit spatialities of how love is 'done' (Morrison et al., 2012; Thien, 2011, 2004) within everyday fathering geographies (Meah, 2017). It has discussed the everyday intimate (emotional) geographies of care performed by the fathers in this research, exploring how these constitute and facilitate enactments of love in various ways (ibid.; Macht, 2017; Marsiglio and Roy, 2012), particularly through interactions of establishing trust, familiarity (Jamieson and Milne, 2012; hooks, 2004, 2000; Jamieson, 1998), togetherness and building reciprocal bonds/relationships between father-and-child (Macht, 2017; Marsiglio and Roy, 2012). Of importance methodologically, is that these

are fathers of mainly young children, shaping the spatial practices of intimate care and bonding discussed, particularly intimate care interactions of bedtime routines (Marsiglio and Roy, 2012), accounting for this chapter's predominant focus on the home as space of 'doing' love (Conradson, 2003). Although, critical consideration of the complex spatialities of love has demonstrated how fathers' engagement in such intimate care practices are not confined to the space of home but may be 'tracked' into spaces well beyond (Meah, 2017; Baldassar et al., 2016; Baldassar, 2008; Valentine, 2008).

Ultimately, this chapter has begun to reveal how interactions/practices of 'doing' love take place in and across everyday spaces and are thus inherently spatial (Morrison et al., 2012). Yet it has also shown that interactions of love (re)creates spaces/places (Thien, 2004, cf. Lilius, 2016), constructing, for example, a home of love and security, and reworking the workplace into an intimate fathering space. Through exploration of these, this chapter has further begun to demonstrate how love, as a geographical process, brings to the fore emotional, caring (domestic) masculine subjectivities of intimate fathers (Meah and Jackson, 2016; Gorman-Murray, 2013; Aitken, 2009), but more importantly, how spatial interactions of care and relationship-building explicitly produce masculine subjectivities of *love* (Macht, 2017).

Chapter 5

Playful Geographies: Love, Fun and Support

5.1. Introduction

As discussed in the Literature Review, several have argued that fun/leisure activities are of great significance for fathers in terms of spending time and bonding with their children (Creighton et al., 2017, 2015; Brandth, 2016; Newland et al., 2013; Kay, 2009a). Yet there is little-to-no consideration of how these enable fathers to 'do' love. Some have attributed the importance of such activities (particularly sport, but also play) to how they enable men to incorporate care and intimacy into 'acceptable', socially-recognised performances of masculinity (ibid.; Harrington, 2009)- although I would certainly argue that this does not mean play/playfulness are unimportant interactions in mothers' everyday geographies (see Clement and Waitt, 2017; Talbot, 2013 to some extent). Indeed, a number of fathers described how playfulness was often interwoven within their everyday *family* geographies.

The kids really enjoy playing this computer game- Grisly Manor. It's a puzzle-solving thing and it's great to play together. Yesterday we were all snuggled up on the sofa with a blanket over us...and I felt a really sense of warmth- it's so nice when we're all focused on the same thing, really connected. (Leo, Diary)

I think going out to the playground, we go quite often...that's actually quite a good time because it gives Joseph time to run around, and it gives us time to do things together. (Jasper, Interview)

This is indicative of how playful interactions can be sites of 'doing' family togetherness in and across everyday spaces from the home to playgrounds/parks (Gabb, 2010:156; Hallman and Benbow, 2010, 2007). Thus, in addition to the everyday geographies of intimate care, spaces of play and playfulness were also important to many of these fathers' everyday geographies in terms of bonding with their children, further constructing a sense of 'togetherness' and, more specifically, as spaces for 'doing' love in various ways.

5.2. Positive Experiences, Emotional Engagement and Playful Spatial Interactions

Fathers often described a strong desire to provide their children with the best possible experiences, some conveying this through expression of the importance they placed on their children's lives being filled with good, positive memories.

I don't know when your first memory was, mine's about two-ish, three-ish I think...but I don't know when *his* first memory is going to be (gesturing to Shaun)...I just want it to be a good one at least. (Shane, Interview, his emphasis)

For many, ensuring their children had good everyday experiences was often centred around them having opportunities for interactions of fun/play.

On a Thursday, Vanessa goes to a parent-toddler group...she really enjoys it- again, lots of opportunity for interaction and she's got little friends of hers that will come around to the house. (Vince, Interview)

I just want her to be her and have fun. (Adam, Interview)

More specifically in terms of fathers' everyday geographies, the significance of experiences and spaces of play were especially described through fathers wanting to be actively involved in and to share these everyday experiences with their children.

Whilst it's just going to the park for us, for them, it's an adventure. Going to the park, and the games they play down there with their imaginations, I think it's a very different experience for them. What they've come back from- I've just gone to the park- they'll have gone out to the park, playing on a pirate island, you know, a mediaeval castle. And they've shared that experience with me, which helps bring them closer to me, but also brings me closer to them, and gives me something to remember for later (chuckles). (Corey, Interview)

This aptly demonstrates the spatialities of love in play/playfulness, revealing how play takes place in everyday spaces (Woodyer, 2012)²¹ through which fathers described 'doing' togetherness and forming intimate bonds by sharing these experiences, which as Corey explains, contributes to bringing him 'closer' to his children, describing this with great fondness.

²¹ Also of interest here is how play also *creates* space, where seemingly banal spaces, such as parks, become more extraordinary, almost magical spaces, affected into being through imaginative play (Pyyry, 2015; Canning, 2013), understood as such by Corey through his involvement in this experience.

However, of importance- though frequently somewhat overlooked by scholars who are critical of fathers' predominant engagement in play- is the centring of wanting their *children* to have fun, rather than the father himself to necessarily do so.

Just have fun, that's my main one...if you're not having fun and your child's not having fun (pause)- if the child's having fun and *you're not*, then yeah, you can let that one go, but why wouldn't you have fun?
(Shane, Interview, his emphasis)

Rather, play and fun provided spaces for fathers to engage in processes of emotional give-and-take (Macht, 2017; Miller, 2011a; Dermott, 2008), interactions which took place in everyday spaces, for example the home, much like the activities of intimate care discussed above, the value of which were again somewhat highlighted by fathers due to work.

I think that's probably a common thing with a lot of families...when the dad's been out at work all day and comes in...and just has that playtime before bed...I guess it's a different experience for the dad where like, I've only seen my child for like two hours in the evening- which is not a nice feeling! (Jasper, Interview)

In fact, intimate care and playfulness were often referred to simultaneously.

Enjoyed playing with Amy after work and watching part of a film. Nice cuddles and fun to do bathtime and enjoy laughing together. (Adam, Diary)

Thus, although the home has been shown to be a significant space of how fathers 'do' love, constructing intimate relationships with their children in their everyday geographies through intimate care, this shows how the home is also an important site of fathers' geographies of playfulness, with fathers incorporating playfulness into even the most banal of practical care.

Leo goes into the kitchen where Lara is, he exclaims "You've got your jumper on backwards!" She laughs, running up to him. He gently lifts her arms over her head, tugging at the bottom of the jumper. "Here we go- Suupeeergiiirrrllll!" he cheers. Lara mock-scolds him that now her jumper will be inside out. "I'll put you inside out" he jokes. Suddenly the jumper is on properly, neither inside out, nor back to front. (Leo, Go-along)

This reflects suggestions that father interactions are typically characterised by playfulness (Newland et al., 2013). However, it also demonstrates how the geographies of (practical) care and playfulness are by no means mutually exclusive but rather are intertwined (Brandth and Kvande, 2018). That is, through play/playful interactions these fathers embodied intimate care-givers (in supposedly ‘masculinised’ ways), not only providing practical aspects of care, but also emotional ones through “personal attention and communication in ways which endorse a mutual sense of identity and self-worth” (Milligan and Wiles, 2010:734) creating spaces to emotionally engage with their children (Creighton et al., 2015), ultimately ‘doing’ love in both practical and emotional ways, bonding with one another through emotional reciprocity (Macht, 2017; Marsiglio and Roy, 2012).

5.3. ‘Masculine’ Carespaces, Playful Adventures and Spaces of Love and Support

Whilst the home is clearly an everyday space for fathers to engage in play with their children, in this research (as with much other including Brandth and Kvande (2018 1998), Doucet (2006), Miller (2011a)), fathers more typically conveyed the significance of playfulness in terms of *going to* places. Indeed, during my go-along with Shane to a gymnastics playgroup, he explained its importance to him as a father because “It’s just so fun for him”, gesturing to Shaun who at that moment had climbed into a doughnut-shaped cushion, draped a hoola-hoop over himself and was slapping at the cushion excitedly, looking extremely pleased.

This arguably reflects theorisations of how fathering tends to be performed in ‘public’ spaces outside of the home- though the previous discussion chapter somewhat contests this- as more ‘masculine’ parental carespaces (Tarrant, 2014a, 2013; Barker, 2010; Gillies, 2009; Brandth and Kvande, 1998). However, the Literature Review, notes that such spaces have been re-cognised as somewhat domesticified (Lilius, 2016) or “extra-domestic spaces” (Doucet, 2006:709) situating these as socially-recognised spaces for ‘doing’ family and parenting (Lilius, 2017; Lugosi et al., 2017; Hallman and Benbow, 2010, 2007). As such, this is also indicative of how such spaces become acceptable places for the performances of assumed ‘domesticised’ subjectivities of masculinity such as through intimate fathering, and how subjectivities of domesticity

permeate outside of the home (Mann et al., 2016; Harrington, 2009; Gorman-Murray, 2008).

Reflecting supposedly 'masculine' discourses of care, some fathers even framed their playful geographies and interactions with their children as 'adventures' (Creighton et al., 2017), which entailed their children exploring and experiencing new things and places with their father, sharing these experiences.

It's pretty cool because Shaun doesn't know what he wants to do or what he likes- I don't but I'm there to encourage...I sort of see it like as a mad adventure. (Shane, Interview)

[Going on holiday abroad] Vanessa loves the whole process of you know, checking in, going through security...she just loved the adventure of it all I think. (Vince, Interview).

In her analysis of the incorporation of a young child into homespace, Luzia (2011) discusses how (mothers') everyday geographies become almost re-shifted towards floorspaces, where infants/toddlers play and crawl. In a similar way, my research also revealed the significance of *how* children (don't) move *through* space and their changing mobile geographies to how and where fathers interacted, played and ultimately bonded with them.

[These photos capture] the journey, in the sense of early photos to the now photos. So it's interesting that some of the early ones...they're kind of the 'I'm not moving very far' or 'I'm learning these bits', but the later ones, actually now trying to capture photos of Joseph is really hard because he's on the move...it's actually interesting comparing because obviously photos with both of them, he's moving and she's very still. (Jasper, Photo Interview)

Indeed, for one father in particular, his everyday 'adventures' as a father were explicitly described through going for walks with his daughter, which were 'only just' becoming possible with her developing mobility.

Amy and I are only just getting to the point where we can go on adventures now, because we're only really getting to the point where she can walk around. Once she's very active and mobile and wants to go off- she's an explorer, she has no fear, she'll run off all over the place!...So I can't wait until she's mobile enough to do that outside. (Adam, Interview).

For Adam, everyday walks with Amy were of high significance for him as a spatial practice for building a close, intimate relationship and 'doing' togetherness with her, featuring heavily in his diary.

A short 40-minute walk on the streets near where we live. Amy enjoyed walking in the snow and being carried. She was very excited to see footprints, especially of animals, when we would recite the Gruffalo's child. ("Aho, oho, footprints in the snow, whose are these tracks and where do they go..."). (Adam, Diary)

Adam's narrative well articulates how walking facilitates moments of playful interactions between father-and-child, making evident how emotional engagement is manifest within these as they share this enchanting experience (Pyyry, 2016, 2015), Adam also demonstrating his commitment and responsiveness to Amy's practical/emotional needs by carrying her when she needed him to. Additionally, everyday walks also created spaces for emotional reciprocity/intimacy, facilitated especially due to Amy's limited (embodied) mobile geographies. This was witnessed during our go-along, where Amy grew tired after a while, requiring Adam to carry her, bringing them eye-to-eye, enabling her to touch and affectionately caress his face, running her hands over it, laughing and grabbing his nose, provoking him to respond by smothering her face with kisses, making her giggle. These intimate, affectionate, *reciprocated* haptic geographies of touch represent deep expressions of their loving bond (Doucet, 2013; Morrison, 2012a).

Moreover, as several scholars have argued, walking frequently intersects with, and at times even *constitutes* play (Clement and Waitt, 2017; Horton et al., 2014). Indeed, much of my go-along with Adam involved Amy playing by wandering around and exploring the public garden space as we followed her, Adam mostly only physically intervening in her playful adventure when necessary, for example cleaning her hands with a wipe after she had dipped her fingers into 'dirty' pond water. He commented:

I like to let her go and explore on her own- does mean you don't tend to get very far! (Adam, Go-along)

Some may even contend that in doing this Adam enacts a rather masculine style of caring- contrasting somewhat with the kisses above (Brady et al., 2017:73)- promoting and encouraging Amy's (partial) independence through playful geographies of mobility (Creighton et al., 2015; Brandth and Kvande, 1998). Indeed, whilst playfulness in public space (particularly through walking) has been noted to be just as significant in everyday mothering geographies (Clement and Waitt, 2017), some of these fathers highlighted how their playfulness often differed from (their perception of) mothers' play/care.

Some parents might think I'm too boisterous with Shaun...I'm really hands-on, I throw him around- you'll see this at gymnastics! (Both laugh). He's always laughing you know, but I make some of the mums look at me like 'Oh, what is he doing?!'. (Shane, Interview).

[My wife] probably doesn't let them get more than six-foot in front of her because she's worried about them getting run over, or them falling over, whereas because I walk around with them a lot, I have much more confidence in knowing that they won't go into the road, I give them a longer leash...When they're playing, I tend to have a philosophy of 'if you're going to fall over, that's how you learn not to do it again'...So I kind of let them get on with it really, as long as they don't get massively hurt you know! (Corey, Interview).

As noted in the Literature Review, foregrounding rough-and-tumble style play and encouraging children's greater risk-taking and independence have been argued to enable men to draw upon and incorporate masculinised notions of care into father-child interactions, differentiating 'fathering' from 'mothering' (Brandth and Kvande, 2018; Creighton et al., 2017; Newland et al., 2013). In particular through the philosophy Corey describes of 'learning not to do it again', some may even suggest that fathering more (stereo)typically constitutes what has been socially-dubbed 'tough love' (Macht, 2017:142). However, this 'masculine' approach actually offered fathers opportunities to perform love in tender, emotionally nurturing ways in everyday spaces of play (Creighton et al., 2017, 2015). This was made especially evident in my go-along with Corey, conveyed through the following (rather lengthy) vignette:

Cassie heads over to the adventure slide apparatus, looking up at the vertical ladder and beginning to climb, clutching at the ladder-frame, lifting her leg, setting her foot onto the next rung and hoisting herself up. She seems to be handling it okay, though becomes a little more tentative, slowing the further up she gets...Leaning over the top, legs still hanging over onto the ladder, she stops, staying like that for a moment, then making a noise of mild distress announcing, "I'm stuck!". Corey walks over- he doesn't rush- saying "Yes you can Cass, you've done it loads of times". She repeats she can't. Standing behind her, he reaches his arm up and gently taps his fingers along her bottom. Knowing he's behind her, Cassie very slowly lifts her leg up onto the next rung, until she's climbed into the tower. "Good girl!" Corey praises. She moves through the tower and onto the rope bridge, Corey paralleling her movement on the ground. Cassie puts her foot onto the rope, rethinking its positioning, moving it around a few times before retracting it onto secure ground. She again tells her dad she can't, looking down at him with a rather miserable face, eyebrows drawn together, pouting. He again says "Yes you can, darling. Just put your foot here," pointing to where the tightrope joins with the ropes running up to the handles, the most stable part. She follows his instruction, seeming pretty satisfied with his suggestion, propelling herself forward, though still with some apprehensiveness, clutching at the rope tightly. After a few steps, Corey says "You're over halfway now, it's too late to turn back darling"...She reaches the end, climbing into the second tower, Corey praising her, even giving her a little applause. He waits at the bottom of the slide and Cassie squeals gleefully as she goes down. She embraces her dad at the bottom, before running straight back to the ladder...(Corey, Go-along).

This is undoubtedly to my mind a spatial enactment of love; it is a demonstration of Corey's (emotional/physical) support for Cassie, illustrative of his commitment to her care, to being there to support her, letting her know he is (always) behind her. His gentle verbal reassurance and praise, along with light physical encouragement provides Cassie with the support she needed in a moment where she felt afraid, stuck and about to falter, creating a space for him to nurture and build self-confidence in her ability (Andreasson and Johansson, 2016:487). Through this, he embodies a loving masculine subjectivity of an emotionally in-tune, nurturing father (Eerola, 2014:319), also revealing the ongoing significance of performances of trust in father-child loving relationships, constructed here through playful interactions in everyday spaces, developing and reinforcing their intimate bond of love (Goodsell and Meldrum, 2010).

In fact, in a similar kind of way, many of the everyday spaces and interactions of playfulness described by these fathers were grounded in their involvement in nurturing their children's development, often through playful movement (Creighton et al., 2017; 2015; Brandth and Kvande, 1998).

Gymnastics...Shaun had a couple of falls and bangs but it was great. Was doing rolling on the mat and enjoyed the trampoline, getting more used to it. (Shane, Diary)

These spatial interactions were also often sources of fatherly-pride, creating intensely emotional spaces.

Had good fun following Amy around and exploring the garden centre, proud of her adventurous spirit...She's mastering small steps slowly and is much better on her feet outside now. (Adam, Diary)

This reveals the emotional geographies entangled within everyday fathering interactions, in particular through their (children's) subtle changing geographies (Meah and Jackson, 2016), with fathers looking to the future, anticipating the further shifts within their (emotional) fathering geographies, alluding to their ongoing commitment to their children's changing needs as they grow and develop and the challenges of fathering change (Palkovitz and Palm, 2009).

Practice Charlotte's Brownie Promise with her as she's making it tonight...I obviously felt proud of her, but was also aware of the passage of time as I witness her transition from Rainbows to Brownies. Just how long will she be my little girl? (Corey, Diary).

5.4. Conclusion

This chapter has explored how fathers 'do' love through various playful spatial interactions, examining how such interactions enable bonding and the construction of intimate relationships between father-and-child (Creighton et al., 2017, 2015; Newland et al., 2013), especially through shared experiences and reciprocal emotional/physical interactions (Brandth and Kvande, 2018, 1998; Macht, 2017; Dermott, 2008, 2003, cf. Morrison, 2012a) frequently conceptualised as 'masculine' ways of doing

intimacy/love.²² In addition to these being spaces of doing ‘togetherness’ and for relationship-building, this chapter has also demonstrated how playful geographies offered fathers opportunities to ‘do’ love by supporting and instilling confidence in their children in everyday spaces, nurturing their development (Creighton et al., 2017, 2015; Macht, 2017; Newland et al., 2013), alluding to the multifaceted nature of love beyond an emotional relationship.

This chapter has also highlighted academic debates on the contradictions/paradoxes of ‘masculine’ fathering carescapes and interactions (Brandth and Kvande, 2018, 2016; Brandth, 2016; Barker, 2011, 2008, also Mann et al., 2016; Tarrant, 2013) for, whilst the spaces and interactions of ‘doing’ love explored through these fathers’ everyday geographies supposedly reflect hegemonic performances of masculinity, (in terms of the style of play, and encouraging independence) this was somewhat contrasted by the nurturing, tender interactions which took place through them (Lilius, 2016). Fundamentally, this chapter builds upon the discussions and debates of the previous, further demonstrating how love is ‘done’ in everyday spaces of fathering geographies, producing intimate/caring masculine subjectivities. However, it has also begun to reveal how the very *spaces of* these interactions facilitates *further* enactments of love.

²² However, examining these as spaces for doing love does not undermine the significance of play for play’s sake, as these playful interactions clearly mattered in the moment (Woodyer, 2012).

Chapter 6

Moral Carescapes: Instilling Love in Everyday Spaces

6.1. Introduction

The Literature Review has visualised the family- however comprised- as a key institution of love (Gabb, 2010; Aitken, 2000), embodying the very benchmark of intimate/caring relationships (Wilkinson, 2014; Valentine, 2008). Yet it is also one for transmission of moral and ethical norms (Hall, 2016, 2011), processes which are interrelated (Aitken, 2000, 1998), as Valentine et al. (2012) reveal when examining the spatialities of family intimacy through moral alcohol consumption. Although some imply that it is mothers who are the main moral educators in families (Waitt and Harada, 2016)- often citing how they are the caregivers who typically spend more time with children (Hall, 2016)- others have noted the significance of moral guidance to fathering (Baxter, 2012; Palkovitz and Palm, 2009:13). Indeed, a number of fathers in this study highlighted the importance of their providing a positive role model for their children and ‘teaching’ moralities.

Just the best role model you can, that’s the way I see it. I want him to be the best he can be...I’m the only- he can only learn off me. He can learn off other people, but I’m his main- how can I put it? He has to learn everything, so someone needs to teach him, so I’m sort of a bit of teacher if that makes sense...Just how to be a good human being, that’s all it ever amounts to being. (Shane, Interview)

A father needs to be someone who leads by example in the family, in the approach of how he treats his wife in front of the children...And I think it’s that kind of hard-line between being hot on discipline and not being scary. Being able to correct- discipline where *needed*, but not feeling like you’re scared of the dad. (Jasper, Interview, his emphasis)

Like Jasper, some even highlighted this responsibility through reflection of ethical gender(ed) roles and relationships, alluding to moral reworkings of masculinities (and even gendered carescapes).

At this stage I think providing a positive role model- I know that's sort of standard but just doing as well as you can, especially having two daughters...providing for two girls what I think they should- not see in a man- but should see as a positive sort of thing in a man. (Corey, Interview)

When people ask me what my job is...I always say it's a parent, or a stay-at-home dad because I think it's important for people to see that's relevant and a legitimate role, and for the kids to see that as well. (Leo, Interview)

These narratives reveal a general desire to contest gendered stereotypes *through* everyday fathering geographies, which may, in and of itself, be understood as exemplary of how these fathers 'do' love by attempting to (re)create a better, more equitable and socially-just world for their children, foregrounding the significance of moral geographies to love in everyday fathering.

However, in this study, moral geographies were especially uncovered through how fathers not only loved their children in and across everyday spaces but also fulfilled a desire (or perhaps a moral responsibility) to *raise children who love*. That is, the everyday spaces in which fathers 'do' love, also created- even simultaneously comprised- moral fathering carescapes for *instilling* love, offering a rather novel insight into the ways and spatialities of how fathers 'do' love beyond current theorising (Macht, 2017; Meah, 2017). Building on the preceding discussions, this chapter explores how the very spatialities of intimate care and playfulness discussed above themselves facilitated further performances/enactments of love, revealing the multifaceted nature of love's spatialities.

6.2. Sharing and Caring: Fostering Moral Interactions in Everyday Spaces

A number of fathers expressed the importance they placed on imparting within their children a moral ethic of being able and willing to share with others, describing this as establishing 'appropriate' moral boundaries. This was perhaps an especially heightened concern for some of the fathers in this study as many were- at this point- fathers to only children.

I suppose that's the main thing really, for Vanessa to understand what is appropriate and what's not appropriate...and also I think because she's an only child, understanding the importance of sharing, and the importance of sharing with other children. So that's one thing we've been really conscious of, the need for her to have really good interactions with other children...basic things like sharing toys, books and things that she would regard as *hers* when friends come round. (Vince, Interview, his emphasis)

This was even used to describe the complex- even contradictory- emotional geographies experienced by fathers' in everyday carescapes of love (Aitken, 2009).

The number of emotions you go through in one day is unreal, you can be dead proud of him one minute and then the next he's there trying to take a toy off a kid and you're like (in a panicked/stressed tone) "Argh! Shaun, no!" (Shane, Interview)

By encouraging children to share, for example, toys in playspaces, fathers created moral spaces to instil love in their everyday carescapes, fostering and habitualising lovingness (Kraftl, 2015) and children's ethical sense of care and respect for others through everyday geographies of care and spatial "ethics of encounter" (Conradson, 2003:451) with other children.

This was similarly revealed in my go-along with Corey when he encouraged Cassie to invite 2-year-old Eli (a playmate) to join her in the 'spiderweb-swing'; to *share* this space, and fun experience, with him.

Corey settles the pair into the swing-basket side-by side. As he walks around the swing, Cassie gently taps Eli's knee, gesturing to her fist, curled around the ropes of the basket, "Hold on tight, Eli!" she says. Looking momentarily vacant, he copies as the swing is pushed into motion. (Corey, go-along).

Through how Cassie tells Eli- unprompted- to 'hold on tight', making sure he is secure, she indicates an ethical lovingness and care for him, recreating the 'spiderweb-swing' into a space of love *between* the two children. This, I would argue, demonstrates how love and its spatialities are multifaceted. Whilst this playspace has been shown to be a space where Corey bonds with, supports and 'does' love towards Cassie, it is also simultaneously a space for Cassie to perform and habitualise lovingness to others, encouraged/facilitated by Corey.

Another father likewise described such care interactions between his own two children through how Logan morally and care-fully (Milligan and Wiles, 2010:741) supported Lara in the intimate space of the family car (Waitt and Harada, 2016).

Drove the kids to the campsite...they argued a bit, but ultimately Logan really helped his sister, getting a bag in case she was sick and making up funny stories to distract her. The stories were genuinely funny, and I did feel a fission of pride. (Leo, Diary)

This interaction creates a deeply emotional space of pride for Leo as a father through how *Logan* embodies a- supposedly masculinised (Newland et al., 2013)- loving subjectivity through his playful interaction of care towards his sister in this intimate space. Of great importance here, however, is how the very nature of this space- mobile and in motion- facilitates this loving (moral) encounter between the siblings as Logan emotionally/practically cares for Lara in case this motion makes her sick.

The importance of fostering children's love for others, particularly their siblings was also made especially evident by Jasper, whose wife over the course of this research gave birth to their second child. He described his involvement in preparing Joseph for Jasmine's arrival through everyday intimate spaces of care, incorporating this into their bedtime reading.

We were expecting him to feel 'Oh, I've got a sister who's getting all the attention, no one's really caring' but we made a conscious effort right through the pregnancy...We were given some books to read, children's books that kind of talk about getting a new brother or sister using like a baby tiger...Yeah, it was just part of our bedtime reading...But generally he's been very good. He wants to spend time with her and cuddle her. (Jasper, Interview)

Here, everyday intimate care spaces became both spaces for Jasper to 'do' love towards Joseph, offering him reassurance of his ongoing commitment of love/care for him after the arrival of a newborn sibling, drawing upon a discourse of unconditional love (Macht, 2017:171; Valentine et al. 2015) but also creating a moral space to foster Joseph's

(anticipatory) love for his sister.²³ This was also revealed following her arrival, described by Jasper in his photo interview. He had shown me a photograph of Jasmine in cot, Joseph sitting next to her, holding a cuddly hedgehog, which I commented was very cute. He explained:

Yeah, what we decided to do when she was born was to take him while my wife was still in hospital and get him to buy a present [the hedgehog] for Jasmine...trying to give him an understanding of getting something to buy for your sister, and then we also got something for her to buy for him. (Jasper, Photo Interview)

The exchange of gifts (see Gabb, 2010) described in this narrative acted as a catalyst for Jasper to build in Joseph a *reciprocated* sense of love between him and his newborn sister, also revealing how such love between siblings is built in and across everyday spaces (Bacon, 2012). Indeed, this was witnessed in our go-along.

After the service we sat in the church hall...Jasper cradling Jasmine, Joseph having a bit of a run around...He came up behind Jasper, peering over his shoulder at the snoozing newborn; at that moment, Jasmine opened her- unseeing- eyes. Joseph began jumping up giddily exclaiming "She's waking up! She's waking up!" (Jasper, Go-along)

This again reveals the multifaceted spatialities of love in everyday fathering, with this space simultaneously being a space for Jasper to 'do' love towards his children, for example, through the haptic geographies of touch of cradling and holding Jasmine close to him, bonding with her (Morrison, 2012a; Ball et al., 2000) and for encouraging his children to love, with Joseph expressing his great excitement, lovingness and (emotional) care for his sister. Moreover, the Church was also an important moral space of love for Jasper (and an important everyday space in his family's geographies), for raising his children through faith, with this being an important space to nurture his children's love for God (Bradford-Wilcox and Bartkowski, 2005).

²³ This offers a rather fascinating insight into how *expectant* fathers 'do' love towards their existing children, through the geographies of expectancy/anticipation (Anderson, 2010) and pregnancy (cf. Longhurst, 2008), though geographical work on expectant fathering is sorely lacking.

6.3. Ethical Playful Mobilities: Stewardship and Love for the World

Additionally, everyday fathering carescapes offered moral spaces for instilling love and an ethical sense of care for the non-human, as well as the human (Lawson, 2007:6-7, see also Smith, 2000:Chapter 9 for moral geographies and environmental ethics). In the previous chapter, I discussed the playful mobile geographies of how Adam bonded with Amy, noting how he rarely physically *intervened* in her wanderings. Everyday walks were of great significance to Adam as a father as spaces to 'do' love, made evident across all of the methods of this research. Yet during our go-along he also demonstrated how these were also spaces for him to impart moral ethics of love in Amy through playful interactions.

Amy toddles a few steps ahead of us, looking around in enthrallment. She wanders near a few patches of daffodils, turning at the last moment to walk through them. Adam lurches forward, effortlessly raising Amy's arms over her head, using them to gently guide her through the scattered patch of flowers so she doesn't trample them accidentally, weaving her body in and out of them like a plane, Amy cackling in delight at the sensation. (Adam, Go-along)

This tender, rather intimate playful interaction of love- joyous and fun for Amy- enabled Adam to simultaneously create a moral space of love, guiding Amy *through* a patch of flowers rather than allowing her to accidentally trample over them. Through this, he is able to nurture a respect for, sense of lovingness and moral care towards nature, implanting within her a sense of Stewardship and love for the (natural) world (Linzmayr and Halpenny, 2014; Crowley, 2013; Lawson, 2007:748).

This observation reveals the complex, multifaceted spatiality of love, revealing how fathers 'do' love at a variety of spatial scales simultaneously in (inter)connected ways (Goodsell, 2005, cf. Luzia, 2010:361). Adam performs love through the immediate geographies of the body via the hapticity of this playful interaction (Morrison, 2012a) bonding with Amy through intimate care and playfulness, taking place in a public nature space, but simultaneously arguably (re)constructing the (imagined) space of the world into a space to 'do' love (Goodsell, 2005) through a discourse of ethical geographies of care and Stewardship (Milligan and Wiles, 2010; Lawson, 2007).

Moreover, the incredibly tender, nurturing approach through which Adam intervenes and arguably 'corrects' Amy, was similarly expressed by Corey.

The kids have behaved very well this week and I have had little cause to assert any discipline. By and large they are really good kids anyway but I often find a calmer approach works better with them anyway. (Corey, Diary)

Here, quite like Adam, Corey illustrates an intimacy between himself and his children, through his understanding of the 'best' way to approach them. This is reminiscent of the desire expressed by Jasper at the beginning of this chapter on wanting to instil discipline and impart morals without his children perceiving him as being 'scary' alluding to a possible moral reworking of historical stereotypes of fathering responsibilities through the performance of intimate masculine subjectivities of love.

6.4. Conclusion

In this final discussion chapter, I have explored the complex, multifaceted spatialities of love performed within everyday fathering geographies, specifically through consideration of moralities and ethical carescapes (Hall, 2016, 2011; Milligan and Wiles, 2010) complicating and extending current academic understandings of how fathers 'do' love in their everyday spatial interactions (Macht, 2017; Meah, 2017). In particular, it complicates Macht's (2017) conceptualisation of fathers' love as emotional give-and-take, purely reciprocated back in some kind of self-contained dialectic relationship. Instead, this chapter has explored how the everyday spaces in which fathers 'do' love and the spatial interactions which occur within them, also enabled the fathers in this research to encourage/nurture the *evocation* of love from their children, not necessarily towards themselves, but to *other* beings, human and non-human (Lawson, 2007, also Crowley, 2013; Smith, 2000), from friends, (expectant) siblings, even to the (natural) world.

Enhancing the discussions of the preceding chapters, which have demonstrated how love is spatial, performed in and across everyday spaces of fathering geographies and to how love itself creates space and subjectivities, this chapter shows quite definitively how *space* itself facilitates love. That is, each of the ethical teachings and

encounters of love discussed in this chapter came into being by the very nature of the *spaces* in which they took place, creating moments to love/care: sharing and caring for others in playspaces; comforting siblings in mobile spaces where the *motion* of this space can make them feel ill (Waitt and Harada, 2016); Stewardship in nature spaces (Linzmayer and Halpenny, 2014). Ultimately, whilst love has been largely discussed in quite ephemeral terms, performed in the moment, spatially constructed on relatively small spatial scales, this chapter fundamentally highlights how love is much more spatially complex.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

7.1. Summarising Findings

This thesis has discussed how love is ‘done’ through a myriad of fathers’ everyday geographies and spatial practices. Building upon the thesis of love’s spatialities developed in the Literature Review, the Discussion chapters have explored how, through everyday intimacy/care in and across everyday spaces, the men in this research ‘do’ love as fathers. It has argued how they build and maintain close, intimate relationships of love with their children through spatial interactions founded on trust, familiarity, togetherness and their responsibility/commitment to providing emotional/practical care (Goodsell and Meldrum, 2010) supporting hooks (2004, 2000) conceptualisation of love as a complex combination of these. Additionally, through critical consideration of everyday fathering geographies, this thesis has argued how fathers not only ‘do’ love through building relationships and caring for/about their children, but also by raising *children* who respect, care and ultimately *love* others in various ways (ibid.; Lawson, 2007; Milligan and Wiles, 2010). Thus, it extends current theorisation of love being performed by fathers in purely direct (reciprocated) relationships of emotional give-and-take (Macht, 2017; Meah, 2017).

By exploring everyday fathering geographies, throughout this thesis I have theorised- both conceptually and empirically- the complex spatialities of love, situating it is a distinctly *geographical* phenomenon (Morrison et al., 2012). I have demonstrated that love is implicitly spatial, done in and across everyday spaces, at a multitude of spatial scales, wrapped up within a myriad of father’s everyday geographies (ibid.; Meah, 2017). I have shown that (interactions of) love (re)creates spaces/places (Thien, 2011), and how *spaces themselves facilitate* love. Through the empirical focus of this research I have also argued how love’s spatialities produces particular kinds of subjectivities of masculinities, not least that of intimate, caring fathers, emotionally in-tuned with their children’s emotional/practical needs. I have shown, through the spatial interactions covered in this thesis, how men *become loving fathers* in particular spaces

(ibid.), ultimately supporting Aitken's contention that fathering is "a daily emotional practice that is negotiated, contested, reworked and resisted differently in different spaces" (Aitken, 2009:230).

7.2. Methodological Implications

Based on this research, I would make a number of methodological recommendations for future scholars (in and beyond geography) interested in researching fathering and/or love for "the adoption of new methodologies may assist the spatial turn to love"- or love's turn to the spatial!- (Morrison et al., 2012:517). Future research would benefit from adopting methodologies which incorporate both narrative and ethnographic approaches, for this enables appreciation of not only what fathers may *think* about love (Macht, 2017), but also how they *do* it in particular spaces/places, enhancing scholarly understandings (Meah, 2017). Indeed, my understanding of the complex, multifaceted spatial nature of love uncovered through this thesis was only made possible by the very mixed-methodological approach utilised. By being *in* certain spaces, *in* certain moments, going-along and observing the spatialities of fathering interactions was I able to truly appreciate how these fathers 'do' love through, for example, emotional support and instilling moralities, shaped by the very spaces they were performed in. This methodology enabled me to conceptualise love beyond Macht's (2017) emotional give-and-take which (although excellent) gives to my mind a rather one-dimensional view of fatherly love, relying predominantly on interview data.

7.3. Theoretical Implications for Future Research

Fundamentally, love is spatial and we cannot fully understand and appreciate how love is 'done' without recognising its implicit spatiality and the significance of how *where* it is performed shapes how it is *done* (Morrison et al., 2012). As I have shown through this thesis, engaging with love as a spatial concept enables us to understand how certain spatial enactments of love can facilitate further kinds of love as a very consequence of their spatiality, offering us a lens to appreciate the multifaceted nature of love, recognising it as being more than an emotional relationship, but a spatial *process*, constantly performed (ibid.; hooks, 2004). Understanding that enactments and

performances of love are spatial is of great theoretical significance to advancing scholarly work in this area, which I have begun to undertake.

However, this thesis has only the scope to *begin to explore* the spatialities of love, particularly as performed within the everyday geographies of fathering. These areas warrant future research and I hope this thesis offers a foundation from which such research may be developed. For example, incorporating a multitude of other relationships in which love is 'done', future research could consider the spatialities of how *fathers themselves* are cared for, supported and loved through, say, support groups and friendship networks, which remains a heavily neglected area²⁴ (Jupp, 2012; Barker, 2011; Smith and Winchester, 1998).

Ultimately, I have demonstrated how love, space and subjectivities of masculinities are complexly intertwined in ways which must be recognised in order to develop more holistic understandings of love, and how fathers perform, experience and instil this in and across everyday spaces. I invite and implore scholars to recognise both the spatiality of love in their analyses and to more critically consider *fathers* as givers of love (Meah, 2017; Macht, 2017; Aitken, 2009).

²⁴ Indeed, this research project also revealed how the spaces in which fathers bonded with their children were simultaneously spaces in which they constructed supportive, loving relationships, particularly with other parents through friendships (Jupp, 2012), though this particular thesis did not have the scope to incorporate such a discussion.

References

- Adamsons, K. and Palkovitz, R. (2014) 'Theorising About Fathering: An Introduction to the Special Issue.' *Journal of Family Theory and Review*. 6 279-281.
- Adamsons, K. and Pasley, K. (2016) 'Parents' Fathering Identity Standards and Later Father Involvement.' *Journal of Family Issues*. 37: 2 221-244.
- Ahmet, A. (2013) 'Home Sites: The Location(s) of 'Home' for Young Men.' *Urban Studies*. 50: 3 621-634.
- Aitken, S.C. (1998) *Family Fantasies and Community Space*. New Brunswick, New Jersey and London, Rutgers University Press.
- Aitken, S.C. (2000) 'Fathering and Faltering: 'Sorry but You Don't Have the Necessary Accoutrements.''' *Environment and Planning A*. 32 581-598.
- Aitken, S.C. (2005) 'The Awkward Spaces of Fathering.' In van Hoven, B. and Hörschelmann, K. (Eds.). *Spaces of Masculinities Critical Geographies*. London, Routledge. Pp. 222-236.
- Aitken, S.C. (2009) *The Awkward Spaces of Fathering*. Surrey, Ashgate.
- Aitken, S. and Valentine, G. (2006) 'Ways of Knowing and Ways of Doing Geographic Research.' In Aitken, S. and Valentine, G. (Eds.). *Approaches to Human Geography*. London, Sage. Pp. 1-12.
- Anderson, K. and Smith, S.J. (2001) 'Editorial: Emotional Geographies.' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*. 26 7-10.
- Anderson, B. (2010) 'Preemption, Precaution, Preparedness: Anticipatory Action and Future Geographies.' *Progress in Human Geography*. 34:6 777-798.
- Andreasson, J. and Johansson, T. (2016) 'Global Narratives of Fatherhood. Fathering and Masculinity on the Internet.' *International Review of Sociology*. 26: 3 482-496.

- Bacon, K. (2012) "Beings In Their Own Right"? Exploring Children and Young People's Sibling and Twin Relationships in the Minority World.' *Children's Geographies*. 10: 3 307-319.
- Baldassar, L. (2008) 'Missing Kin and Longing to be Together: Emotions and the Construction of Co-Presence in *Transnational* Relationships.' *Journal of Intercultural Studies*. 29: 3 247-266.
- Baldassar, L. Nedelcu, M., Merla, L. and Wilding, R. (2016) 'ICT-Based Co-Presence in Transnational Families and Communities: Challenging the Premise of Face-to-Face Proximity in Sustaining Relationships.' *Global Networks*. 16: 2 133-144.
- Ball, H.L., Hooker, E. and Kelly, P.J. (2000) 'Parent-Infant Co-Sleeping: Fathers' Roles and Perspectives.' *Infant and Child Development*. 9 67-74.
- Barker, J. (2008) 'Men and Motors? Fathers Involvement in Children's Travel.' *Early Child Development and Care*. 178: 7-8 853-866.
- Barker, J. (2011) "Manic Mums' and 'Distant Dads'? Gendered Geographies of Care and the Journey to School.' *Health and Place*. 17 413-421.
- Baxter, J. and Smart, D. (2011) 'Fathering in Australia Among Couple Families with Young Children Research Highlights.' *Family Matters*. 88 15-26.
- Baxter, J.A. (2012) 'Fathering Across Families: How Father Involvement Varied for Children When Their Father Has Children Living Elsewhere.' *Journal of Family Studies*. 18 187-201.
- Baxter, J. (2016) 'Case Studies in Qualitative Research.' In Hay, I. (Ed). *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. Ontario, Oxford University Press. Pp. 130-146.
- Beck, U. and Beck-Gernsheim, E. (1995) *The Normal Chaos of Love*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Beck, U. and Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002) *Individualisation*. London, Sage.
- Binnie, J. (2000). 'Cosmopolitanism and the sexed city.' In Bell, D. and Haddour, A. (Eds.) *City Visions*. London, Pearson. Pp. 166-178.

Blunt, A. and Willis, J. (2000) *Dissident Geographies: An Introduction to Radical Ideas and Practices*. Essex, Pearson Education Limited.

Blunt, A. and Dowling, R. (2006) *Home*. London, Routledge.

Bondi, L., Davidson, J. and Smith, M. (2005) 'Introduction: Geography's 'Emotional Turn'.' In Davidson, J., Bondi, L. and Smith, M. (Eds.). *Emotional Geographies*. Oxon, Routledge. Pp. 1-16.

Bowlby, S. (2010) 'Thoughts on 'Geographies of Care' Prompted by Reading Annemarie Mol's The Logic of Care: Health and the Problem of Patient Choice.' *Area*. 42: 1 135-136.

Bowlby, S. (2011) 'Friendship, Co-Presence and Care: Neglected Spaces.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 12: 6 605-622.

Boyer, K. and Spinney, J. (2016) 'Motherhood, Mobility and Materiality: Material Entanglements, Journey-Making and the Process of 'Becoming Mother'.' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 34: 6 1113-1131.

Boyer, K., Dermott, E., James A. and MacLeavy, J. (2017) 'Regendering Care in the Aftermath of the Recession?' *Dialogues in Human Geography*. 7: 1 56-73.

Bradford-Wilcox, W. and Bartowski, J.P. (2005) 'Devoted Dads: Religion, Class and Fatherhood.' In Marsiglio, W., Roy, L. and Fox, G.L. (Eds.). *Situated Fathering a Focus on Physical and Social Spaces*. Oxford, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers. Pp. 299-320.

Brady, M., Stevens, E., Coles, L., Zadoronzyj, M. and Martin, B. (2017). "You Can Spend Time...But Not Necessarily be Bonding with Them': Australian Fathers' Constructions and Enactments of Infant Bonding.' *Journal of Social Policy*. 46: 1 69-90.

Brandth, B. (2016) 'Rural Masculinities and Fathering Practices.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. 23: 3 435-450.

Brandth, B. and Kvande, E. (1998) 'Masculinity and Child Care: The Reconstruction of Fathering.' *The Sociological Review*. 46: 2 293-313.

- Brandth, B. and Kvande, E. (2018) 'Masculinity and Fathering Alone During Parental Leave.' *Men and Masculinities*. 21: 1 72-90.
- Brannen, J. and Nilsen, A. (2006) 'From Fatherhood to Fathering: Transmission of Change among British Fathers in Four-generation Families.' *Sociology*. 40: 2 335-352.
- Brickell, K. (2012) "'Mapping" and "Doing" Critical Geographies of Home.' *Progress in Human Geography*. 36: 2 225-244.
- Bryan, D.M. (2013) 'To Parent or to Provide? The Effect of the Provider Role on Low-Income Men's Decisions About Fatherhood and Paternal Engagement.' *Fathering*. 11: 1 71-89.
- Bunnell, T., Yea, S., Peake, L., Skelton, T. and Smith, M. (2012) 'Geographies of Friendships.' *Progress in Human Geography*. 36: 4 490-507.
- Canning, N. (2013) "'Where's the Bear? Over There!'- Creative Thinking and Imagination in Den Making.' *Early Child Development and Care*. 183: 8 1042-1053.
- Clement, S. and Waitt, G. (2017) 'Walking, Mothering and Care: A Sensory Ethnography of Journeying On-Foot with Children in Wollongong, Australia.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. 24: 8 1185-1203.
- Clement, S. and Waitt, G. (2018) 'Pram Mobilities: Affordances and Atmospheres that Assemble Childhood and Motherhood On-The-Move.' *Children's Geographies*. 16: 3 252-265.
- Clifford, N.J., Holloway, S.L., Rice, S.P. and Valentine, G. (2009) *Key Concepts in Geography*. (eds.). 2nd Edition. London, Sage.
- Clifford, N., French, S. and Valentine, G. (2010) 'Getting Started in Geographical Research: How This Book Can Help.' In Clifford, N., French, S. and Valentine, G. (Eds.) *Key Methods in Geography*. 2nd Edition. London, Sage. Pp. 3-15.
- Connell, R. (1995) *Masculinities*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

- Connors, D.E. (2011) 'Feminists Researching Fathering: What Do We See Through a Reconciliation Lens?' *Peace Research*. 43: 1 51-79.
- Conradson, D. (2003) 'Geographies of Care: Spaces, Practices, Experiences.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 4: 4 451-454.
- Cope, M. (2010) 'Coding Transcripts and Diaries.' In Clifford, N., French, S. and Valentine, G. (Eds.) *Key Methods in Geography*. 2nd Edition. London, Sage. Pp. 440-452.
- Cox, R. (2014) 'Working on Masculinity at Home.' In Gorman-Murray, A. and Hopkins, P. (Eds.) *Masculinities and Place*. Surrey, Ashgate. Pp. 227-238.
- Craig, L. (2006) 'Does Fathers Care Mean Fathers Share?: A Comparison of How Mothers and Fathers in Intact Families Spend Time With Children.' *Gender and Society*. 20: 2 259-281.
- Creighton, G., Brussoni, M., Oliffe, J. and Olsen, L. (2015) 'Fathers on Child's Play: Urban and Rural Canadian Perspectives.' *Men and Masculinities*. 18: 5 559-580.
- Creighton, G., Brussoni, M., Oliffe, J. and Olsen, L. (2017) "'It's Good for the Kids": Fathers Consider Risk and Protection in Their Own and Their Children's Lives.' *Journal of Family Issues*. 38: 8 1043-1065.
- Crowley, T. (2013) 'Climbing Mountains, Hugging Trees: A Cross-Cultural Examination of Love for Nature.' *Emotion, Space and Society*. 6 44-53.
- Davidson, J. and Milligan, C. (2004) 'Embodying Emotion Sensing Space: Introducing Emotional Geographies.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 5: 4 523-532.
- Dayton, C.J., Buczkowski, R., Muzik, M., Goletz, J., Hicks, L., Walsh, T.B. and Bocknek, E.L. (2016) 'Expectant Fathers' Beliefs and Expectations about Fathering as They Prepare to Parent a New Infant.' *Social Work Journal*. 40: 4 225-236.
- Debrot, A., Schoebi, D., Perrez, M. and Horn, A.B. (2013) 'Touch as an Interpersonal Emotion Regulation Process in Couples' Daily Lives: The Mediating Role of Psychological Intimacy.' *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 39: 10 1373-1385.

- Dermott, E. (2003) 'The 'Intimate Father': Defining Paternal Involvement.' *Sociological Research Online*. 8: 4 Available at: <<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/8/4/dermott.html>> [Accessed: 14/04/2018]
- Dermott, E. (2008) *Intimate Fatherhood: A Sociological Analysis*. Oxon, Routledge.
- Dixon, D. and Jones, J.P. (2006) 'Feminist Geographies of Difference, Relation and Construction.' In Aitken, S. and Valentine, G. (Eds.) *Approaches to Human Geography*. London, Sage. Pp. 42-56.
- Domosh, M. (1998) 'Geography and Gender: Home, Again?' *Progress in Human Geography*. 22: 2 276-282.
- Doucet, A. (2006) "'Estrogen-Filled Worlds': Fathers as Primary Caregivers and Embodiment.' *The Sociological Review*. 54: 4 696-716.
- Doucet, A. (2013) 'A "Choreography of Becoming": Fathering, Embodied Care, and New Materialisms.' *Canadian Review of Sociology*. 50: 3 284-305.
- Doucet, A. and Lee, R. (2014) 'Fathering, Feminism(s), Gender and Sexualities: Connections, Tensions and New Pathways.' *Journal of Family Theory and Review*. 6 355-373.
- Doucet, A. and Mauthner, N. (2008) Qualitative Interviewing and Feminist Research in Alasuutari, P., Bickman, L. and Brannen, J. (Eds). *The Sage Handbook of Social Research Methods*. London, Sage. Pp. 328-342.
- Dowling, R. and Power, E. (2012) 'Sizing Home, Doing Family in Sydney, Australia.' *Housing Studies*. 27: 5 605-619.
- Dunn, K. (2016) 'Interviewing.' In Hay, I. (Ed). *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. Ontario, Oxford University Press. Pp.149-188.
- Dyck, I. (1990) 'Space, Time and Renegotiating Motherhood: An Exploration of the Domestic Workplace.' *Environment and Planning D*. 8: 4 459-483.

- Dyer, S., McDowell, L. and Batnitzky, A. (2008) 'Emotional Labour/Body Work: The Caring Labours of Migrants in the UK's National Health Service.' *Geoforum*. 39 2030-2038.
- Eerola, P. (2014) 'Nurturing, Breadwinning and Upbringing: Paternal Responsibilities by Finnish Men in Early Fatherhood.' *Community, Work and Family*. 17: 3 308-324.
- Elwood, S.A. and Martin, D.G. (2000) "'Placing' Interviews: Locations and Scales of Power in Qualitative Research.' *Professional Geographer*. 52: 4 649-657.
- England, K. (1996) *Who Will Mind the Baby? Geographies of Childcare and Working Mothers*. (Ed.). London, Routledge.
- England, K. (2010) 'Home, Work and the Shifting Geographies of Care.' *Ethics, Place and Environment*. 13: 2 131-150.
- Evans, R. (2012) 'Sibling Caringscapes: Time-Space Practices of Caring Within Youth-Headed Households in Tanzania and Uganda.' *Geoforum*. 43 824-835.
- Featherstone, B. (2009) *Contemporary Fathering: Theory, Policy and Practice*. Bristol, Polity Press.
- Felton, E. (2014) 'A/Effective Connections: Mobility, Technology and Well-Being.' *Emotion, Space and Society*. 13 9-15.
- Gabb, J. (2004) "'I Could Eat My Baby to Bits': Passion and Desire in Lesbian Mother-Children Love.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. 11: 3 399-415.
- Gabb, J. (2010) *Researching Intimacy in Families*. 2nd Edition. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gabb, J. (2012) 'Embodying Risk: Managing Father-Child Intimacy and the Display of Nudity in Families.' *Sociology*. 47: 4 639-654.
- Gambles, R. (2013) 'Managing the Gendered Dynamics of Parenting During the UK New Labour Government Years.' *Children's Geographies*. 11: 2 188-201.

- Giddens, A. (1992) *The Transformation of Intimacy Sexuality, Love and Eroticisms in Modern Societies*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Gillies, V. (2003) 'Family and Intimate Relationships: A Review of the Sociological Research.' Families and Social Capital ESRC Research Group Working Paper No. 2. South Bank University, London.
- Gillies, V. (2009) 'Understandings and Experiences of Involved Fathering in the United Kingdom: Exploring Classed Dimensions.' *The Annals of the American Academy*. 624 49-60.
- Gillis, J.R. (2000) 'Marginalisation of Fatherhood in Western Countries.' *Childhood*. 7: 2 225-238.
- Goodsell, T.L. (2005) 'Fatherhood and the Social Organisation of Space: An Essay of Subjective Geography.' In Marsiglio, W., Roy, L. and Fox, G.L. (Eds.). *Situated Fathering a Focus on Physical and Social Spaces*. Oxford, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers. Pp. 27-47.
- Goodsell, T.L. and Meldrum, J.T. (2010) 'Nurturing Fathers: A Qualitative Examination of Child-Father Attachment.' *Early Child Development and Care*. 180: 1-2 249-262.
- Gorman-Murray, A. (2008) 'Masculinity and the Home: A Critical Review and Conceptual Framework.' *Australian Geographer*. 39: 3 367-379.
- Gorman-Murray, A. (2013) 'Urban Homebodies: Embodiment, Masculinity and Domesticity in Inner Sydney.' *Geographical Research*. 51: 2 137-144.
- Gorman-Murray, A. and Hopkins, P. (2014) 'Introduction: Masculinities and Place.' In Gorman-Murray, A. and Hopkins, P. (Eds.) *Masculinities and Place*. Surrey, Ashgate. Pp. 1-24.
- Gover, M.R. (1992) 'Men as Primary Love Objects: On Mahler, Separateness, and Father Roles.' *Journal of Men's Studies*. 1: 2 105-116.

- Graham, E. (2005) 'Philosophies Underlying Human Geography Research.' In Flowerdew, M. and Martin, D. (Eds.). *Methods in Human Geography: A Guide for Students Doing a Research Project*. 2nd Edition. Essex, Longman. Pp. 8-33.
- Hall, S-M. (2011) 'Exploring the 'Ethical Everyday': An Ethnography of the Ethics of Family Consumption.' *Geoforum*. 42 627-637.
- Hall, S-M. (2014) 'Ethics of Ethnography with Families: A Geographical Perspective.' *Environment and Planning A*. 46 2175-2194.
- Hall, S-M. (2016) 'Moral Geographies of Family: Articulating, Forming and Transmitting Moralities in Everyday Life.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 17: 8 1017-1039.
- Hall, S-M. and Holdsworth, C. (2014) 'Family Practices, Holiday and the Everyday.' *Mobilities*. 11: 2 284-302.
- Hallman, B.C. (2010) 'Placing Families, Placing this Book.' In Hallman, B.C. (Ed.). *Family Geographies The Spatiality of Families and Family Life*. Ontario, Oxford University Press. Pp. 1-9.
- Hallman, B.C. and Benbow, M.P. (2007) 'Family Leisure, Family Photography and Zoos: Exploring the Emotional Geographies of Families.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 8: 6 871-888.
- Hallman, B.C. and Benbow, M.P. (2010) "Seeing if You Can Catch the One Picture That Just Makes it': Placing Family Life Through Family Zoo Photography.' In Hallman, B.C. (Ed.). *Family Geographies The Spatialities of Families and Family Life*. Ontario, Oxford University Press. Pp. 10-30.
- Haraway, D. (2003) *Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness*. Chicago, Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Harker, C. (2010) 'On (Not) Forgetting Families: Family Spaces and Spacings in Birzeit, Palestine.' *Environment and Planning A*. 42 2624-2639.
- Harker, C. and Martin, L.L. (2012) 'Familial Relations: Spaces, Subjects and Politics.' *Environment and Planning A*. 44 768-775.

- Harrington, M. (2009) 'Sport Mad, Good Dads Australian Fathering through Leisure and Sport Practices.' In Kay, T. (Ed.). *Fathering through Sport and Leisure*. Oxon, Routledge. Pp. 51-72.
- Hiemstra, N. and Billo, E. (2017) 'Introduction to Focus Section: Feminist Research and Knowledge Production in Geography.' *The Professional Geographer*. 69: 2 284-290.
- Holdsworth, C. (2013) *Family and Intimate Mobilities*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holloway, S.L. (1998) 'Local Childcare Cultures: Moral Geographies of Mothering and the Social Organisation of Pre-School Education.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. 5: 1 29-53.
- hooks, b. (2000) *All About Love: New Visions*. New York, William Morrow.
- hooks, b. (2004) *The Will to Change: Men, Masculinity and Love*. New York, Atria.
- Hopkins, P. and Noble, G. (2009) 'Masculinities in Place: Situated Identities, Relations and Intersectionality.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 10: 8 811-819.
- Horton, J. (2001) 'Do You Get Some Funny Looks When You Tell People What You Do?' Muddling Through Some Angsts and Ethics of (Being A Male) Researching With Children.' *Ethics, Place and Environment: A Journal of Philosophy and Geography*. 4: 2 159-166.
- Horton, J., Christensen, P., Kraftl, P. and Hadfield-Hill, S. (2014) 'Walking...Just Walking': How Children and Young People's Everyday Pedestrian Practice Matter.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 15: 1 94-115.
- Hunter, S.C., Riggs, D.W. and Augoustinos, M. (2017) 'Hegemonic Masculinity vs. a Caring Masculinity: Implications for Understanding Primary Caregiving Fathers.' *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*. 11: 3 1-9. DOI: [10.1111/spc3.12307](https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12307).
- Irigaray, L. (1996) *I Love to You: Sketch of a Possible Felicity in History*. New York and London, Routledge.
- Jacobson, K. (2014) 'The Temporality of Intimacy: Promise, World and Death.' *Emotion, Space and Society*. 13 103-110.

Jamieson, L. (1998) *Intimacy: Personal Relationships in Modern Societies*. Cambridge, UK Polity Press.

Jamieson, L. and Milne, S. (2012) 'Children and Young People's Relationships, Relational Processes and Social Change: Reading Across Worlds.' *Children's Geographies*. 10: 3 265-278.

Jessee, V. and Adamsons, K. (2018) 'Father Involvement and Father-Child Relationship Quality: An Intergenerational Perspective.' *Parenting*. 18: 1 28-44.

Jupp, E. (2012) 'Parenting Policy and the Geographies of Friendship: Encounters in an English Sure Start Children's Centre.' In Kraftl, P., Horton, J. and Tucker, F. (Eds.). *Critical Geographies of Childhood and Youth: Contemporary Policy and Practice*. Bristol, Polity Press. Pp. 215-229.

Jupp, E. and Gallagher, A. (2013) 'New Geographies of Parenting, Policy and Place.' *Children's Geographies*. 11: 2 155-159.

Katz, C. (1992) 'All the World is Staged: Intellectuals and the Projects of Ethnography.' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 10 495-510.

Kay, T. (2009a) 'Introduction Fathering through Sport and Leisure.' In Kay, T. (Ed.). *Fathering through Sport and Leisure*. Oxon, Routledge. Pp. 1-6.

Kay, T. (2009b) 'The Landscape of Fathering.' In Kay, T. (Ed.). *Fathering through Sport and Leisure*. Oxon, Routledge. Pp. 7-22.

King, G. Keohane, R.O. and Verba, S. (1994) *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. New Jersey, Princeton University Press.

Kraftl, P. (2015) *Geographies of Alternative Education: Diverse Learning Spaces for Children and Young People*. Bristol, Polity Press.

Kusenbach, M. (2003) 'Street Phenomenology The Go-Along as Ethnographic Research Tool.' *Ethnography*. 4: 3 455-485.

- Kusenbach, M. (2016) 'The Go-Along Method.' In Schwanhäußer, A. (Ed.). *Sensing the City: A Companion to Urban Anthropology*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter GmbH. Pp. 154-158.
- Laqueur, T.W. (1992) 'The Facts of Fatherhood.' In Thorne, B. and Yalom, M. (Eds.). *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*. Boston, Northeastern University Press. Pp. 155-175.
- LaRossa, R. (1992) 'Fatherhood and Social Change.' In Kimmel, M. and Messner, M. (Eds.). *Men's Lives*. New York, Macmillan. Pp. 521-535.
- Latham, A. (2010) 'Diaries as a Research Method.' In Clifford, N., French, S. and Valentine, G. (Eds.) *Key Methods in Geography*. 2nd Edition. London, Sage. Pp. 189-201.
- Lawson, V. (2007) 'Geographies of Care and Responsibility.' *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 97: 1 1-11.
- Lilius, J. (2016) 'Domesticfication of Urban Space? Mothering and Fathering While on Family Life in the Inner City of Helsinki.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. 23: 12 1763-1773.
- Lilius, J. (2017) 'Urban Space in the Everyday Lives of Mothers and Fathers on Family Leave in Helsinki.' *European Urban and Regional Studies*. 24: 1 104-118.
- Linnenberg, K.D. (2012) 'CinderFella" and First-Shift Fathers: The Effect of Work Schedule on Father Involvement.' *Sociological Focus*. 45: 3 203-220.
- Linzmayr, C.D. and Halpenny, E.A. (2014) "'I Might Know When I'm an Adult.': Making Sense of Children's Relationships with Nature.' *Children's Geographies*. 12: 4 412-428.
- Liu, C. (2017) 'Food Practices, Gendered Intimacy and Family Life in Contemporary Guangzhou.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. 24: 1 97-107.
- Longhurst, R. (2008) *Maternities Gender, Bodies and Space*. Oxon, Routledge.
- Longhurst, R. (2010) 'Semi-structured Interviews and Focus Groups.' In Clifford, N., French, S. and Valentine, G. (Eds.) *Key Methods in Geography*. 2nd Edition. London, Sage. Pp. 103-115.

- Longhurst, R. (2013) 'Stretching Mothering: Gender, Space and Information Communication Technologies.' *Hagar*. 11: 1 121-138.
- Longhurst, R. (2016) 'Mothering, Digital Media and Emotional Geographies in Hamilton, Aotearoa New Zealand.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 17: 1 120-139.
- Lugosi, P., Robinson, R.N.S., Golubovskaya, M., Foley, L. and Harwell, J. (2016) 'Experiencing Parenthood, Care and Spaces of Hospitality.' *The Sociological Review*. 64 274-293.
- Luzia, K. (2010) 'Travelling in Your Backyard: The Unfamiliar Places of Parenting.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 11: 4 359-375.
- Luzia, K. (2011) 'Growing Home.' *Home Cultures*. 8: 3 297-316.
- Luzia, K. (2013) "'Beautiful but Tough Terrain': The Uneasy Geographies of Same-Sex Parenting.' *Children's Geographies*. 11: 2 243-255.
- Macht, A.G. (2017) '*Between Stoicism and Intimacy: The Social Construction of Paternal Love*.' PhD Thesis. University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh.
- Maclaren, K. (2014) 'Intimacy and Embodiment: An Introduction.' *Emotion, Space and Society*. 13 55-64.
- Malone, K. (2016) 'Theorising a Child-Dog Encounter in the Slums of La Paz Using Post-Humanistic Approaches in Order to Disrupt Universalisms in Current 'Child in Nature' Debates.' *Children's Geographies*. 14: 4 390-407.
- Mann, R. Tarrant, A and Leeson, G.W. (2016) 'Grandfatherhood: Shifting Masculinities in Later Life.' *Sociology*. 50: 3 594-610.
- Marsiglio, W., Roy, K., and Fox, G.L. (2005) 'Situated Fathering: A Spatially Sensitive and Social Approach.' In Marsiglio, W., Roy, L. and Fox, G.L. (Eds.). *Situated Fathering a Focus on Physical and Social Spaces*. Oxford, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers. Pp. 3-26.
- Marsiglio, W. and Roy, K. (2012) *Nurturing Dads: Social Initiatives for Contemporary Fatherhood*. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

- Matthews, B. and Ross, L. (2010) *Research Methods A Practical Guide for the Social Sciences*. Harlow, Pearson.
- McDowell, L. (1997) 'Women/Gender/Feminisms: Doing Feminist Geography.' *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*. 21: 3 381-400.
- McDowell, L. (1999) *Gender, Identity and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies*. Cambridge, Policy Press.
- McLaren, A.T. and Parusel, S. (2015) 'Watching Like a Hawk': Gendered Parenting in Automobiled Urban Spaces.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. 22: 10 1426-1444.
- Meah, A. (2017) 'Fathers, Food Practices and Circuits of Intimacy in Families in Northern England.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. DOI: [10.1080/0966369X.2017.1372387](https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2017.1372387).
- Meah, A. and Jackson, P. (2016) 'The Complex Landscape of Contemporary Fathering in the UK.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 17: 4 491-510.
- Miller, T. (2011a) *Making Sense of Fatherhood Gender, Caring and Work*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, T. (2011b) 'Falling Back into Gender? Men's Narratives and Practices Around First-Time Fatherhood.' *Sociology*. 45: 6 1094-1109.
- Milligan, C. (2014) 'Geographies of Care and Care-Giving.' In, Cockerham, W.C., Dingwall, R. and Quah, S.R. (Eds.). *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Health, Illness, Behaviour and Society*. Oxford, Wiley Blackwell. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118410868.wbehibs053> [Accessed: 27/06/2018]
- Milligan, C., Atkinson, S., Skinner, M. and Wiles, J. (2007) 'Geographies of Care: A Commentary.' *New Zealand Geographer*. 63 135-140.
- Milligan, C. and Wiles, J. (2010) 'Landscapes of Care.' *Progress in Human Geography*. 34: 6 736-754.

Moran, D. and Disney, T. (2017) 'It's a Horrible, Horrible Feeling': Ghosting and the Layered Geographies of Absent-Presence in the Prison Visiting Room.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. DOI: [10.1080/14649365.2017.1373303](https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2017.1373303).

Moran, D. Hutton, M.A., Dixon, L. and Disney, T. (2017) 'Daddy is a Difficult Word for me to Hear': Carceral Geographies of Parenting and the Prison Visiting Room as a Contested Space of Situated Fathering.' *Children's Geographies*, 15: 1 107-121.

Morgan, D. (1996) *Family Connections: An Introduction to Family Studies*. Cambridge, UK Polity Press.

Morgan, D. (2011) *Rethinking Family Practices*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

Morrison, C.A. (2012a) 'Heterosexuality and Home: Intimacies of Space and Spaces of Touch.' *Emotion, Space and Society*. 5 10-18.

Morrison, C.A. (2012b) 'Solicited Diaries and the Everyday Geographies of Heterosexual Love and Home: Reflections on Methodological Process and Practice.' *Area*. 44: 1 68-75.

Morrison, C.A. (2013) 'Homemaking in New Zealand: Thinking through the Mutually Constitutive Relationship Between Domestic Material Objects, Heterosexuality and Home.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. 20: 4 413-431.

Morrison, C.A., Johnston, L. and Longhurst, R. (2012) 'Critical Geographies of Love as Spatial, Relational and Political.' *Progress in Human Geography*. 37: 4 505-521.

Newland, L.A., Coyl-Shepherd, D.D. and Paquette, D. (2013) 'Implications of Mothering and Fathering for Children's Development.' *Early Child Development and Care*. 183: 3-4 337-342.

Oakley, A. (1998) 'Gender, Methodology and People's Ways of Knowing: Some Problems with Feminism and The Paradigm Debate in Social Science.' *Sociology*. 32: 4 707-731.

Palkovitz, R. and Palm, G. (2009) 'Transitions Within Fathering.' *Fathering*. 7: 1 3-22.

- Palkovitz, R., Trask, B.S. and Adamsons, K. (2014) 'Essential Differences in the Meaning and Processes of Mothering and Fathering: Family Systems, Feminist and Qualitative Perspectives.' *Journal of Family Theory and Review*. 6 406-420.
- Parsons, T. and Knight, P.G. (2005) *How to Do Your Dissertation in Geography and Related Disciplines*. 2nd Edition. London, Routledge.
- Philip, G. (2013) "Extending the Analytical Lens": A Consideration of the Concepts of 'Care' and 'Intimacy' in Relation to Fathering After Separation or Divorce.' *Sociological Research Online*. 18: 1 15 Available at: <<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/18/1/15.html>> [Accessed: 14/04/2018]
- Phoenix, A. and Brannen, J. (2014) 'Researching Family Practices in Everyday Life: Methodological Reflections from Two Studies.' *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 17: 1 11-26.
- Pospěch, P. (2017) 'Urban or Family-Friendly? The Presentation of Czech Shopping Centres as Family-Friendly Spaces.' *Space and Culture*. 20: 1 68-80.
- Pyry, N. (2015) 'Geographies of Hanging Out: Connecting Everyday Experiences with Formal Education' In Blazek, M. and Kraftl, P. (Eds.). *Children's Emotions in Policy and Practice Mapping and Making Spaces of Childhood*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan. Pp. 107-121.
- Pyry, N. (2016) 'Learning with the City via Enchantment: Photo-Walks as Creative Encounters.' *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. 37: 1 102-115.
- Rau, H. and Sattlegger, L. (2018) 'Shared Journeys, Linked Lives: A Relational-Biographical Approach to Mobility Practices.' *Mobilities*. 13: 1 45-63.
- Richardson, M. (2014) 'Intergenerational Relations and Irish Masculinities: Reflections from the Tyneside Irish, in the North-East of England.' In Gorman-Murray, A. and Hopkins, P. (Eds.) *Masculinities and Place*. Surrey, Ashgate. Pp. 255-267.
- Robson, C. and McCartan, K. (2016) *Real World Research A Resource for Users of Social Research Methods in Applied Settings*. 4th Edition. Sussex, John Wiley and Sons.

- Rose, G. (1993) *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Rose, G. (1997) 'Situating Knowledges: Positionality, Reflexivity and Other Tactics.' *Progress in Human Geography*. 21 305-320.
- Rose, G. (2004) "'Everyone's Cuddled Up and it Just Looks Really Nice': An Emotional Geography of Some Mums and their Family Photos.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 5: 4 549-564.
- Ruddick, S. (1992) 'Thinking About Fathers.' In Thorne, B. and Yalom, M. (Eds.). *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*. Boston, Northeastern University Press. Pp.176-190.
- Schwiter, K. and Baumgarten, D. (2017) 'Stay-at-Home Fathers on the Wane- In Comes Daddy Day! Changing Practices of Fathering in German-Speaking Countries.' *Dialogues in Human Geography*. 7: 1 83-87.
- Shannon, J.D., Tamis-LeMonda, C.S. and Cabrera, N.J. (2006) 'Fathering in Infancy: Mutuality and Stability Between 8 and 16 Months.' *Parenting*. 6: 2-3 167-188.
- Sheller, M., and Urry, J. (2006) 'The New Mobilities Paradigm.' *Environment and Planning A*. 38: 2 207-226.
- Shirani, F., Henwood, K. and Coltart, C. (2012) "'Why Aren't You at Work?": Negotiating Economic Models of Fathering Identity.' *Fathering*. 10: 3 274-290.
- Sin, C.H. (2003) 'Interviewing in 'Place': The Socio-Spatial Construction of Interview Data.' *Area*. 35: 3 305-312.
- Smith, D.M. (2000) *Moral Geographies Ethics in a World of Difference*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Smith, F.M., Jamison, J. and Dwyer, C. (2008) 'Work and Wonder at the Weekend: On Emotions in Feminist Geographical Praxis.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. 15: 5 533-545.

- Smith, G.D. and Winchester, H.P.M. (1998) 'Negotiating Space: Alternative Masculinities at the Work/Home Boundary.' *The Australian Geographer*. 29: 3 327-339.
- Strange, J-M. (2015) *Fatherhood and the British Working Class 1865-1914*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Soja, E.W. (1980) 'The Socio-Spatial Dialectic.' *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 70: 2 207-225.
- Talbot, D. (2013) 'Early Parenting and the Urban Experience: Risk, Community, Play and Embodiment in an East London Neighbourhood.' *Children's Geographies*. 11: 2 230-242.
- Tanfer, K. and Mott, F. (1997) 'The Meaning of Fatherhood for Men.' *Report to the NICHD Workshop on Improving Data on Male Fertility and Family Formation*. The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C
- Tarrant, A. (2013) 'Grandfathering as Spatio-Temporal Practice: Conceptualising Performances of Ageing Masculinities in Contemporary Familial Carescapes.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 14: 2 192-210.
- Tarrant, A. (2014a) 'Domestic Ageing Masculinities and Grandfathering.' In Gorman-Murray, A. and Hopkins, P. (Eds.) *Masculinities and Place*. Surrey, Ashgate. Pp. 241-254.
- Tarrant, A. (2014b) 'Negotiating Multiple Positionalities in the Interview Setting: Researching Across Gender and Generational Boundaries.' *The Professional Geographer*. 66: 3 493-500.
- Tarrant, A. (2016) 'The Spatial and Gendered Politics of Displaying Family: Exploring Material Cultures in Grandfathers' Homes.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. 23: 7 969-982.
- Thien, D. (2004) 'Love's Travels and Traces: The 'Impossible' Politics of Luce Irigaray.' In Sharp, J., Browne, K. and Thien, D. (Eds.). *Women and Geography Study Group: Gender and Geography Reconsidered*. Pp. 43-48.
- Thien, D. (2011) 'Emotional Life.' In Del Casino, V., Thomas, M.E., Cloke, P. and Panelli, R. (Eds.). *A Companion to Social Geography*. Chichester, Blackwell. Pp. 309-325.

- Thomas, G. (2011) 'A Typology for the Case Study in Social Science Following a Review of Definition, Discourse and Structure.' *Qualitative Inquiry*. 17: 6 511-521.
- Thomas, G. (2017) *How To Do Your Research Project A Guide for Students*. 3rd Edition. London, Sage.
- Tomlie, P. (2010) *Everyday Intimacy: Recognising Intimacy in Everyday Life*. Saarbrücken: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Trell, E. and van Hoven, B. (2014) 'It's a Place Where All Friends Meet': Shared Places, Youth Friendships and the Negotiation of Masculine Identities in Rural Estonia.' In Gorman-Murray, A. and Hopkins, P. (Eds.) *Masculinities and Place*. Surrey, Ashgate. Pp. 317-333.
- Twigg, J. (2000) *Bathing: The Body and Community Care*. London, Routledge.
- Valentine, G. (1997) 'My Son's a Bit Dizzy.', 'My Wife's a Bit Soft': Gender, Children and the Cultures of Parenting.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. 4: 1 37-62.
- Valentine, G. (2005) 'Tell Me About... Using Interviews as a Research Methodology.' In Flowerdew, R. and Martin, D. (Eds.). *Methods in Human Geography: A Guide for Students Doing a Research Project*. Second Edition. Essex, Longman. Pp. 110-127.
- Valentine, G. (2006) 'Globalising intimacy: the role and information and communication technologies in maintaining and creating relationships.' *Women's Studies Quarterly*. 34 365-393.
- Valentine, G. (2008) 'The Ties that Bind: Towards Geographies of Intimacy.' *Geography Compass*. 2: 6 2097-2110.
- Valentine, G. and Hughes, K. (2012) 'Shared Space, Distant Lives? Understanding Family and Intimacy at Home through the Lens of Internet Gambling.' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*. 37 242-255.
- Valentine, G., Jayne, M. and Gould, M. (2012) 'Do As I Say, Not As I Do: The Affect Space of Family Life and the Generational Transmission of Drinking Cultures.' *Environment and Planning A*. 44 776-792.

- Valentine, G., Piekut, A. and Harris, C. (2015) 'Intimate Encounters: the Negotiation of Difference within the Family and its Implications for Social Relations in Public Space.' *The Geographical Journal*. 181: 3 280-294.
- van Hoven, B. and Hörschelmann, K. (2005). 'Introduction from Geographies of Men to Geographies of Women and Back Again?' In van Hoven, B. and Hörschelmann, K. (Eds.) *Spaces of Masculinities Critical Geographies*. London, Routledge. Pp. 1-16.
- Varanka, D. (2010) 'Ontology.' In Warf, B. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Geography*. Thousand Oaks, Sage. Pp.2081-2083.
- Waitt, G. (2015) 'I Do? On Geography, Marriage and Love in Australia.' *Australian Geographer*. 46: 4 429-436.
- Waitt, G. and Harada, T. (2016) 'Parenting, Care and the Family Car.' *Social and Cultural Geography*. 17: 8 1079-1100.
- Wall, G. and Arnold, S. (2007) 'How Involved is Involved Fathering? An Exploration of the Contemporary Culture of Fatherhood.' *Gender and Society*. 21: 4 508-527.
- Wilkinson, E. (2014) 'Single People's Geographies of Home: Intimacy and Friendship Beyond 'the Family'.' *Environment and Planning A*. 46: 2452-2468.
- Williams, R.A. (2009) 'Masculinities and Fathering.' *Community, Work and Family*. 12: 1 57-73.
- Winchester, H.P.M. and Rofe, M.W. (2016) 'Qualitative Research and Its Place in Human Geography.' In Hay, I. (Ed). *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. Ontario, Oxford University Press. Pp.3-28.
- Women and Geography Study Group [WGSG] (1997) *Feminist Geographies Explorations in Diversity and Difference*. Essex, Parson Education.
- Woodyer, T. (2012) 'Ludic Geographies: Not Merely Child's Play.' *Geography Compass*. 6: 6 313-326.

Wylie, J. (2009) 'Landscape, Absence and the Geographies of Love.' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*. 34: 3 275-289.

Yarwood, G.A. (2011) 'The Pick and Mix of Fathering Identities.' *Fathering*. 9: 2 150-168.

Appendices

Appendix A: Participant Information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

Introduction

I am a postgraduate student from the School of Geography at the University of Birmingham, looking to recruit between 5-10 fathers to participate in research for my Master's dissertation. Having identified your interest in this research, this information sheet provides more specific details to help you understand what participating in this research will mean for you. *Please take the time to read the following information carefully.*

What is the purpose of this study?

This research is focused on the meanings and individual experiences of fathering. It aims to explore fathering relationships, specifically in terms of *how* and *where* fathers build and maintain relationships with their children and fathers' *perceptions* about such experiences. It will explore how these inform the ways in which men practice fathering.

How will this study be conducted?

This study will ideally commence in mid-late February or early March and will primarily take the form of 2 interviews, specifically:

1. An initial interview to gain base insight into your experiences and understandings of fathering;
2. 1 place-based interviews in a location that is significant to your fathering (decided by yourself).

Throughout each of these, the focus will be on exploring experiences of fathering relationships. Each interview will likely last between 30 minutes to an hour. With your permission, it is preferable that interviews be audio-recorded to allow the creation of detailed transcripts. However, alternatives arrangements can be made, if necessary.

It is also requested- but not imperative- that, in order to help inform interview discussions, participants keep a diary, preferably complemented by self-directed photography for a 2-3 week period to capture experiences of fathering, with the possibility of further follow-up interview for exploration and co-analysis. However, you are welcome to adopt alternative methods to facilitate your self-expression and to ensure your comfort.

Please note that the photography is primarily intended for interview discussion only, photographs will remain within your ownership at all times. Should a photograph produced during the research be particularly useful for illustrative/analytical purposes, your specific permission will be sought to share this for the purpose of my research. You reserve the right to decline, without giving a reason.

If you are interested in participating, an initial meeting will be arranged with you (including date, time and location, at your convenience) to discuss the research process in greater depth. Ideally this meeting should include other relevant family members, though this is at your discretion.

What are the possible disadvantages or risks of taking part?

There are no identified risks of participating in this project, though it is acknowledged that the content of this research may be sensitive. I would like to assure you that this research is not concerned with evaluating father-child relationships. Your participation will be kept strictly confidential and pseudonyms will be used to protect your identity. Every measure will be taken to ensure any information you provide will be kept private. If you agree to participate in this research, to ensure that you are not misrepresented, you will be given the opportunity to review your interview transcripts and make any necessary amendments.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?

There is much research on parenting relationships from the perspective of mothers. However, little research has been conducted considering the experiences and perceptions of fathers, particularly in geography. In participating in this research, you will help to provide insight into the meanings and experiences of parental relationships from the perspective of fathers and help me write my Masters' dissertation, which it is hoped will encourage future research on fathering within geography and other related research areas. Through your participation you will also be able to reflect on your understandings and experiences of fathering.

What happens when the research study stops?

The findings of this research will be used to inform my Masters' dissertation which will later be stored in the University library which may be accessed by students/staff. The information you give during this research will be completely anonymised and will be used for analytical and illustrative purposes. You will be provided with a summary of the research findings.

Do I have to take part in this research?

You are under no obligation to take part in this research project. You are entitled to withdraw from the project without giving a reason at any time, though over time it will become increasingly more difficult to remove all of the information you provide as it may already have helped to form some of the themes in the discussion section of my dissertation; the provisional date of data amalgamation is 1st June 2018. If you do decide to withdraw your contact details and information will be removed and from the research project.

What if there is a problem?

If you have any complaints or concerns about the way you have been treated during this project, contact either the researcher or the dissertation supervisor, Professor Peter Kraftl and your concerns will be dealt with expediently.

Will my taking part in this study be kept confidential?

Yes. All information provided by participants will be anonymised to prevent them from being identified at any stage of the research by anyone other than the researcher.

Nobody other than the researcher will therefore have access to information provided by participants. Both audio recordings (or equivalent other, if necessary) and transcripts will be saved securely on password-protected devices. All data will be stored securely for no longer than necessary in accordance with the Data Protection Act (1988).

Contact details of the researcher:

Alice Menzel – Primary Researcher (Postgraduate):

Email: [REDACTED]

Mobile number: [REDACTED]

(Dissertation supervisor: Prof. Peter Kraftl – [REDACTED] – Chair in Human Geography)

Please note that confidentiality may only be breached in the unlikely event there are significant concerns regarding wellbeing (of participants or others), which the researcher is obliged to report.

Thank you for taking time to read this information sheet.

Appendix B: Summary of Participants

<u>Participant (Pseudonym)</u>	<u>Children (and Ages at Time of Interview)</u>	<u>Notable Comments</u>	<u>Go-Along Locations</u>
Adam	Amy, 1 ½ Years	Typically works 4 days a week, having Fridays off with Amy.	Birmingham Botanical Gardens
Corey	Charlotte, 7 Years and Cassie, 4 Years	Employed in the Emergency Services, working shifts throughout the week.	Birmingham Botanical Gardens
Leo	Logan, 11 Years and Lara, 7 Years	Stay-at-Home Dad	Morning Walk to (Primary) School
Jasper	Joseph, 2 ½ Years and Jasmine, 2 Weeks	Became a father for the second time over the course of the research, replacing the solicited diary with a photo interview.	Sunday Morning Church Service and trip to the Park
Shane	Shaun, 1 ½ Years	Stay-at-Home Dad, typically doing shift-work over the weekend.	Gymnastics Playgroup
Vince	Vanessa, 3 ½ Years		N/A

Appendix C: Interview Schedule and Prompting Questions

Theme	What do I want to <i>know</i>	Questions Prompts
<p>General Introduction and Background Information</p>	<p>Provide participants with an introduction and overview of the research, myself and the aim and structure of this interview.</p> <p>Cover the main interview formalities (i.e. signing of consent form; assurances of confidentiality)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce myself and give some general information about research interests; briefly the motivations for this Masters' dissertation research and outline how long the interview should last (approximately an hour). 2. Provide an overview of the intention of this initial interview: for me to get a sense of the participants as fathers and as individuals, and for them to get a sense of who I am, both as a researcher and as an individual with my own family experiences. 3. Explain to participants that the interview is designed to be flexible (more like a conversation!), and encourage them to raise themes that they feel are important based on their experiences- emphasising that these may indeed be things I may not have considered- and that participants should feel free to ask me any questions about my own experiences. 4. Stress to interviewees that the interviews are confidential, that I will not disclose any of the interview content to others; their name will not feature in the final paper. 5. (Where appropriate) highlight that the interview is being audio-recorded, perhaps gaining secondary verbal consent, although I will be making written notes. 6. Explain to the participants that their participation is voluntary, and that they do not have to answer any questions they do not want to. Emphasise that the interview can be terminated at any time. 7. Identify the overall focus and general structure of this initial interview as gaining insight into their individual understandings, perceptions and experiences of fathering and to discuss general guidance on diaries/photos/ latter interviews? Etc.
<p>Perceptions of and Experiences of Fathering</p>	<p>To gain general background about the participant, his family and general perceptions of the meaning of 'fathering' (and its implicit spatialities).</p> <p>Also to get a sense of his perception of 'society's' ideas of what 'fathering' entails.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Could you briefly describe for me, the composition of your family: there is yourself...? What are your children's names? How old are they? 9. In your own words, could you describe what you think a 'good' father should be like? Elaborate if necessary: 'What sort of qualities would you expect them to have?' 'What do you mean by...?' 10. As a father, what do you perceive your role in the family to be? Elaborate. 11. Do you feel that 'society's' ideas of a 'good' father are the same as? Different? To your own? Elaborate if necessary: Why/How so? What sort of qualities do you think society attributes to being a 'good' father? Why do you think 'quality x' is so important (from societal/personal perspective)? Are there any particular reasons why you feel your ideas differ from 'the' ideas of society.

<p>Childhood Parental Relationships</p>	<p>Continuation of above, grounded in participant's childhood and own parental relationships, if he is happy to discuss this.</p>	<p>12. Are you happy to discuss your own childhood/parental relationships? (If no, skip to question 17).</p> <p>13. Could you briefly describe for me what your own childhood was like?</p> <p>14. What was your relationship like with your father (or mother/relevant other)?</p> <p>15. How would you describe his (or their) role in the family?</p> <p>16. How do/did you feel about this? What was that like?</p> <p>17. Do you feel your own childhood experiences/parents' role(s) have influenced your ideas of fathering/the way <i>you</i> practice fathering? Elaborate if appropriate: In what ways?</p>
<p>"Doing" Fathering and its Spatialities</p>	<p>To understand the practices of fathering which comprise the building and maintenance of fathers' relationships with his children and the spatialities of these.</p> <p>Try to uncover throughout the spatialities of their fathering (revisiting questions of 'where') and how these compare/contrast to mothering ('how do you think that might compare to your partners' experiences?')</p>	<p>18. Introduce section and link to intention of providing guidance/examples on what diaries/photographs/following interviews are intended to encompass- the <i>spatialities</i> of fathering relationships.</p> <p>19. Could you describe for me a 'typical' day with your family? Elaborate: What do you do? Where? Why (there/that)?</p> <p>20. How do you feel about those interactions? Elaborate: Are there any particular emotions which you would associate with this? How do these interactions make you <i>feel</i>? How do you express this? (Do you express this?)</p> <p>21. Are there any activities/things/places which are significant for you <i>as</i> a father (and for your relationship with your children)? For example, anything from as banal as...to as extreme as...? Elaborate: Could you describe an example? What is so significant about that activity/place for you? How does this contribute to your relationship, in your view?</p> <p>22. Or are there any particularly memorable moments for you as a father? Elaborate: Could you describe that for me? How did that make you feel?</p> <p>23. In what ways, if at all, do you think these experiences/your relationships might be shaped by being a <i>father</i>, as opposed to a mother? Elaborate: Why do you think that?</p> <p>24. How might this relate to your own childhood/parent(s)?</p>
<p>Concluding the Interview</p>	<p>Draw the interview to a close.</p> <p>Provide participants with diaries for next phase of research.</p>	<p>25. Allow the participant to make identify other points for discussion which have not been covered, or to make any final comments.</p> <p>26. Thank the participants for their time and help.</p> <p>27. Confirm with participants the details of the next phase of the research (date/location if appropriate).</p> <p>28. Remind them that they may contact the researcher at any time if they have anything they would like to add, questions they have about the research etc.</p> <p>29. Convey to participants that they will be given the opportunity to review and make amendments of the completed transcript of this interview.</p>

Appendix D: Participant Solicited Diary Guidance Notes



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

Participant Diary Guidance Notes

Name: _____

This research is concerned with exploring the geographies of fathering relationships, specifically in terms of how and where fathers build and maintain relationships with their children and father's perceptions about such experiences. These diaries are intended to capture these for a suggested period of **2 weeks**.

This page provides some guiding questions on what you might like to include in this diary, however you should not feel constrained by these- this research is interested in **your** experiences as a father!

Describe your day: **What** did you do with your children? **Where** did these interactions occur? (You may also want to capture these through photographs). What are the significance of these activities/places for you as a father? How did these interactions make you feel?

Describe any particularly memorable moments for you as a father.

Describe any ways in which these interactions and places are specifically about your **fathering** and relationships with your children.