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Nordic co-operation
Nordic co-operation, one of the oldest and most wide-ranging regional partnerships in the world, involves Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, the Faroe Islands, Greenland and Åland. Co-operation reinforces the sense of Nordic community while respecting national differences and similarities, makes it possible to uphold Nordic interests in the world at large and promotes positive relations between neighbouring peoples.

Co-operation was formalised in 1952 when the Nordic Council was set up as a forum for parliamentarians and governments. The Helsinki Treaty of 1962 has formed the framework for Nordic partnership ever since. The Nordic Council of Ministers was set up in 1971 as the formal forum for co-operation between the governments of the Nordic countries and the political leadership of the autonomous areas, i.e. the Faroe Islands, Greenland and Åland.
The Nordic countries have, in European comparison, retained a relatively high fertility rate and simultaneously a high labour force rate among women. This means that the Nordic countries have succeeded in creating structures that give possibilities to reconcile work and family life.

It is important to note, that reconciliation concerns men as well as women. In fact, the reconciliation of work and family life is one of the most important themes with the relationship of men and gender equality. In gender equality policy, it is also the theme, where focus on men has been strongest. This can be seen, for example, with the many initiatives taking place in all of the Nordic countries, as well as in other European countries.

Improving men’s rights for taking family leaves has been a central tool to enhance men’s possibilities to take part in child caring. However, it is not enough. Also more flexibility needs to be developed in workplaces and innovative services that support men as fathers and carers need to be developed. One thing to consider in this work is to remember diversity in men’s situations: this diversity can include relatively static differences among men (for example ethnicity or sexual orientation), as well as relatively dynamic differences (for example marital status, working in shift work arrangements). The diversity of men’s and women’s life situations needs to be taken into account when developing structures and practices that improve reconciliation of work and family life.

The conference “Possibilities and Challenges – Men’s Reconciliation of Work and Family Life” gathered experts in this field in Finland and other Nordic countries. The conference was funded by Nordic Council of Ministers and was executed by the Gender Equality Unit of the Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs and Health. It was part of the program of the Working group on men and gender equality, under Nordic Council of Ministers.

Rigmor Duun Grande
Head of Department
Culture, Legal Affairs and Gender Equality
Summary

The conference *Possibilities and Challenges – Men’s Reconciliation of Work and Family Life* was held in Helsinki on 21 – 22 November 2005. It gathered together experts in reconciliation of work and family life from Finland and the other Nordic countries. The conference was a part of the programme of the Nordic Council of Ministers’ working group on men and gender equality, and its practical organisation was the responsibility of the Gender Equality Unit in the Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs and Health. A general objective regarding gender equality is to build forums and boost men’s chances of participation in the discussion on gender equality promotion.

The presentations given at the conference dealt with fatherhood from a number of perspectives. One of them was that fatherhood is at same time ‘getting thinner’ and strengthening. Some men are more active as fathers than fathers used to, while others are more passive. A greater proportion of men than before remain childless.

One component of the conference programme was the panel discussion on fathers’ groups, which were presented by three panellists – from Finland, Sweden and Norway. Fathers’ groups are meant for new fathers and they aim to support men in becoming fathers and in parenting. The purpose is to relieve the various pressures and conflicts related to fatherhood. Based on the experiences of several years the panellists considered that the groups have been successful in this task.

The conference had three working groups that discussed men and reconciliation of work and family life from various angles. Working group 1 discussed the father’s quota in the parental leave system in the Nordic countries, which has undergone many changes in the last few years. Particular attention was – naturally – paid to the Icelandic model that is radical not only from the Nordic but also from the global point of view; it was stated that its objectives have been realised well. Working group 2 concentrated on working life. One of the challenges for the reconciliation of work and family life is to find convincing arguments for why focusing on it is a situation ‘that overcomes everything’. The employers, men and their families all benefit from it. The third working group considered the multifaceted character of fatherhood. It debated the question whether the variety of men’s situations is taken into account sufficiently. And what could be done that it would, to a greater extent than at present?

The report contains all the presentations given at the conference. Furthermore, it encompasses the proposals produced by the working groups and as a result of the panel discussions. The proposals of the working groups are incorporated in their respective reports.
Dear conference participants,
I wish to welcome you all to this conference arranged together by the Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs and Health and the Nordic Council of Ministers with focus on men’s balancing between the conflicting interests of family and work.

It is necessary to seek and realise better and more flexible solutions to reconciling work and family for many reasons. It is question of gender equality, children’s well being and of how we can secure the access to labour force as growing numbers of employees will be retiring in the next few years due to the demographic change. There is a great deal of discussion about this theme at the European level, too, most recently in Birmingham, at the meeting of the EU ministers responsible for equality affairs. The emphasis in the discussion is still on women’s position in working life.

I find it important that we Nordic people raise on the agenda the gender equality aspect, which has been traditionally important to us. In the Nordic countries women’s status in society has in many respects long been different from the gender and family patterns prevalent elsewhere in Europe. Here the starting point is men’s and women’s equal opportunities for taking part in the labour market and thereby achieving an independent economic position. Simultaneously, we should look at the other side of the coin: men and women have an equal right and responsibility to be involved in the growth of their children and to share the obligations for maintaining the everyday life of their families.

This conference will focus on discussing the gender equality aspect starting from the situation of men. Are we in the Nordic countries, after all, much more advanced in the reconciliation of work and family life from the men’s point of view compared with other European countries? Or could one ask, from a somewhat different viewpoint: is there room in our society for men’s fatherhood or is competition more important at workplaces? Is there room for care by fathers amongst the various pressures of families today?

As a central objective of social policy has been seen, quite unanimously, to support the setting up of a family and having and bringing up children. The uppermost objective of social policy is to secure the future
of society, production, and transfer of cultural heritage with children’s birth and safe growth. Thus families should be motivated to have children.

Maintaining the welfare society presupposes an optimal participation of the population in the labour market, a high education level and a strong commitment to work. Then an adequate output of the national economy makes it possible to retain social welfare, including securing families’ welfare for instance by means of services and social income transfers.

In regard to individual families this setting of objectives at different levels or defining different target situations can be very contradictory. For young people planning to set up a family, in particular for women, it can prove difficult to achieve the objectives of having a family and at the same time getting a good education and a permanent job.

According to questionnaire surveys young men appreciate and want to spend more time with their family. According to studies, young fathers however work most overtime.

So, what was it all about? What is the key to reconciliation of work and family life? This issue should be approached from several angles and seeking various methods.

Families’ choices are affected by many factors, such as the parents’ labour market status, the family’s economic situation and parents’ values and attitudes.

It is surely true that the choices of the majority of young families with children are guided by economic necessity. As regards reconciliation of work and family life they choose the option that they think will be least negative in view of the family’s economic situation. When asked about the reasons for why fathers do not take longer parental leaves, the reply is that the most important reason is economic considerations.

Despite economic considerations, families’ decisions are affected simultaneously by parents’ values and images. Choices are made based on facts but also based on assumptions. Also ideas about the objectives in life, gender equality and, for instance, good parenting guide their actions in practice.

As regards my own family, the decision about sharing the parental leave when our children were born was not quite self-evident to implement in practice. We had decided to take both half of the leave. When it was my turn and I was supposed to return to work and leave my baby of six months ‘in the loveliest baby age’ to be cared by father, that really was not so easy for me as I had imagined. My husband, however, declared that there is no talk about anything else, he’ll stay at home with children for his turn. And I had to give up half of my domain, where I used to use my power to care. It was my turn to accept that I’ll get instructions for childcare, cleaning and cooking from my husband.

Indeed, more and more young men find it self-evident that they take part in family training, are present at the birth of their children and want
to see themselves as ‘full’ fathers. Fatherhood is seen as an issue that brings content to life. In his relation to family a man is no more ready to be his ‘wife’s little helper’, but fatherhood is seen as a right to be involved in the growth of children from the very beginning as equal to mother. Full paternity has become an indicator for men’s quality of life. This change in attitudes also enables a more equal sharing of responsibilities between the spouses.

We in Finland have carried out an information campaign about fatherhood, in which the value choices of the family were a special object of study. The aim of the campaign was to encourage fathers to use their entitlement to parental leave. The campaign included social advertising of various types in the media and dissemination of information through the service system for families with children.

The newest idea is to add an information package telling about fathers’ entitlement to parental leaves to the ‘maternity pack’ given to all families in Finland at the birth of a child.

An effective service system is essential to facilitating the reconciliation of family life and work. A comprehensive and quality child day care system is the most important service. The child’s subjective right to day care provided by the local authorities has proved a sustainable way of providing day care that is in the interests of the child, and we want to stick to it in the future as well. Families with children have also expressed their strong support for these services. The most recent service reform in Finland was making the pre- and after-school activities for young school-children statutory services. Both are services that enable parents’ gainful employment while feeling safe that their children are in good care. Day care also plays an important role in securing a quality early childhood education and care before starting school.

The family leave system is another important factor affecting the reconciliation of family life and work. Family leaves are often linked with various societal objectives that partly appear to be gender-related, such as maternity leave. Mostly it is however question of structures created in support of an equal parenthood that are, for miscellaneous reasons, often gender-related so that they render benefits used by women.

In recent years, the structure of family leaves has in many countries been adjusted to support to a greater extent fathers’ opportunities for taking part in both running the everyday life of family and being closely involved in their children’s growth. Different patterns of paternity leave have been taken into use, as well as incentives for fathers to take parental leave that is meant to be shared by the parents. In Finland, the latest reforms are introduction of fathers’ bonus leave system and sharing the parental leave more flexibly between the mother and father based on the part-time principle. Among these, in particular the demand for developing fathers’ own separate paternity leave is the next objective in reforming the family leave system. It will be really interesting to hear and compare
comments that you will contribute with about the usability of quotas in strengthening the fathers’ position.

Ladies and Gentlemen, You are going to discuss here today the reconciliation of family life and work from the point of view of men, fatherhood. Then it is unavoidable to touch upon, not only parents’ and fathers’ individual choices but also the gender equality point of view in society and the impact of working life – structures that distort gender equality. In this issue, we return to some extent to where we started, as fatherhood and motherhood are, from the employer’s point of view, put in opposite scales. A balance can be reached only if potential fatherhood appears to employers as a similar economic risk as maternity.

This issue is very topical in Finland. At present the costs of parenthood are higher for the employers of mothers than for the employers of fathers. Most family leaves are taken by women, which burdens the employers of female-dominated branches. Female-dominated branches thus bear a greater financial responsibility for the future of society.

Ways to develop the compensation of costs of family leaves were studied a while ago in Finland. Rapporteur ad int. Janne Metsämäki put forward several proposals for developing family leaves so as to promote gender equality, in other words to enable an equal status for fathers in this area. He proposes, i.e., an increased equalisation of the employer costs between the employers, establishing a specific parental insurance, raising the compensation rate in parents’ allowances, compensating employers for the costs of caring for sick children and extending the paid maternity leaves to all collective bargaining sectors. Furthermore, the Rapporteur would like to improve the position of fathers by separate measures, such as by allowing them to choose the time for paternity leave more flexibly, improving the right of ‘distant’ i.e. non-resident fathers (joint custody) and by active information targeted to families.

Based on the Rapporteur’s proposal I have appointed a tripartite working group at our ministry to draw up drafts for new legislation. The drafts are due in January 2006. It is indeed high time to proceed in this issue since we have enough information for the basis of decision-making. What we need now is political will to make decisions that will benefit the different parties in working life and strengthen families’ opportunities for a balanced work and family life.

The working group on family leaves under the lead of the Ministry of Labour has also pondered the need to amend the relevant legislation. It proposed extending the entitlement to partial care leave for parents of children with disabilities or sick children up to the age when the child reaches majority. Adoptive parents are proposed to be entitled to a special care leave. The working group also discussed why distant parents (in practice mainly men) couldn’t take family leave: paternity/parental leave, partial care leave, and temporary care leave for caring for a sick child. In divorce situations the objective is joint custody, but family leave legisla-
tion puts distant parents in a different position compared with parents living with the child, for instance when a child falls ill.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish that you’ll have a rewarding conference discussing these fatherhood issues integrally linked with promoting men’s equality. I hope that your discussions will raise new approaches to solving conflicts between work and family life. We all probably have the same mission in this issue: every child is entitled to father’s involvement in supporting its growth, which work may not hinder.
2. Negotiations of Gender and Employment – Men’s Work and Men’s Family

Johanna Lammi-Taskula

How do men negotiate their gender, that is, being a man, particularly in relation to work and family life? The concept of negotiation conjures up an image of negotiators sitting on the opposite sides of a table discussing and justifying their arguments and demands in order to reach a decision. The result may satisfy all parties or perhaps one party draws the short straw and has to yield or give up their demands. My assumption is that very few of us are involved in this type of negotiation with regard to being a man or woman.

I here use the notion of negotiation to refer not only to decisions reached between people through discussion but also more broadly to the possibilities that people have to fulfil their needs and aspirations in the wider context of a community and society.

Our actions are directed and limited by the expectations, classifications and rules that we are subject to in our everyday life in families, workplaces and residential communities. Our everyday life is also affected by the rules and cultural conceptions present in Finland or those prevailing more widely in the Nordic countries, the EU or the globalised world. Some of the rules have been democratically negotiated and established as formal rights and obligations. Some have gradually taken shape over decades and centuries and become self-evident ways of thought and action.

In relation to these social rules established between people we are in a way constantly negotiating what we can be and what we cannot be, what we can do and what we cannot do. Gender is one of the classifications that we apply to other people and also to ourselves, and it affects our possibilities from our very birth.

Babies are not aware of having a gender classification. Therefore neither are they aware of the gendered expectations that life will put in front of them. When children grow up, they constantly negotiate between what they find attractive and what is possible within the framework of the rules set up in the community around them—in a particular time, place and culture.

If children have certain external characteristics, they are treated as boys and, as a consequence, they start to look for their own way of being
a man in an acceptable way. The first thing they notice is that unlike themselves, certain kinds of people are regarded as girls and that certain things and actions are seen to belong to girls and women. They may then feel that it is advisable to try to avoid such things and actions in order to convince themselves and others of their masculinity.

Let’s take an example and call him Taavi. Taavi is a purely fictitious person who helps us gain some insights into the life of an ordinary man. It is preferable, though today not absolutely necessary, for Taavi to do certain things at certain ages as part of a man’s life: to study preferably for certain occupations, to go out with persons preferably of the opposite sex, to be in gainful, preferably full-time employment at the latest after completing studies, and to become a father, that is, to show that he is capable of reproduction.

Figure 1. Men’s families in Finland

Maybe Taavi’s life will not proceed as clearly from one life stage to another as his father’s life did—his grandfather’s life course, in turn, was disturbed by the war. In the light of statistics, though, it is very likely that Taavi lives alone at 20, and only thinks over the possibility of getting a family. At thirty, however, he is likely to live with a partner just like three in four men of the same age. A survey we conducted at fifteen Finnish workplaces showed that more men (82%) than women (75%) lived with a spouse or in a cohabiting relationship. More than half of the men lived
with a spouse and children. Accordingly, a heterosexual man with a family is not a rarity at Finnish workplaces.

Similarly as many other couples, Taavi and his spouse – let’s call her Tiina – are likely to put off having their first child for a few years due to their studies, particularly Tiina’s studies as Tiina is likely to be more educated than Taavi. Nevertheless, they will eventually have the two children – that is the common number of children – before Taavi is 40 years of age, whether these children be conceived conventionally or through fertilisation or maybe obtained through adoption.

At this stage, when the first half of a man’s life is very much past, some of Taavi’s age group still live alone, some have divorced and live in an address different from that of their child. Some are single parents and live with their child. Although official statistics fail to show it for the time being, some live in a heterosexual restructured family or with a same-sex partner, possibly with “my, your and our” children.

**Figure 2. Men’s Occupational position in Finland** (Of male population aged 16–64)

![Figure 2. Men’s Occupational position in Finland](image)

*Source: Statistics Finland*

We might assume that when Taavi was a child in the 1970s, his father worked as an engine fitter in a paper mill. At that time, many of the fathers of Taavi’s mates were blue-collar workers, as was nearly half of the male workforce. A man’s work was often physical. Taavi’s father worked in shifts, and before leaving for the night shift he had time to warm some sausage soup left over from the dinner Taavi’s mother had prepared the preceding night, so that the boy had some kind of snack when he came from school.

Taavi may also work in a factory, but he is more likely working in the factory office. He has an 8 to 5 job and so can spend the nights with his
family unless he does overtime or is away on a business trip, which is not so uncommon among fathers of small children today.

**Figure 3. Men’s branches of employment in Finland (Thousands)**

![Graph showing men's branches of employment in Finland from 1990 to 2004.](image)

Source: Statistics Finland

Working in an industrial workplace, Taavi’s work mates are mostly men. Industry is still a male fortress where male action is determined by male traditions. Such male-dominated workplaces engaged in the planning, construction and sale of goods, machines, equipment and buildings may even occasionally be regarded as those of “real men”, as distinct from the more female-dominated areas of care, education and personal services. In any case, none of Taavi’s friends, neighbours or relatives was at all surprised when Taavi, after receiving an average matriculation examination certificate, started studies at a technical college. In a way, the matter had already been negotiated for him although he made the choice himself.

The strong gender segregation of the labour market in Finland and the other Nordic countries maintains separate social spheres for men and women. Separate spheres reproduce patterns of interaction referred to as homosociality. Homosociality means that the company of people of the same gender as oneself – men or women – seems more natural than that of people of the other gender. Men seek the company of men, choose male-dominated areas of study, and male managers hire male workers in male-dominated workplaces. The same applies to women.

People who differ in their gender from the majority of workers at a workplace, such as male nurses or female engineers, may feel uncomfortable although they were not subject to direct discrimination or bad treatment. For anyone who is classified in a category other than the majority
one, it is more difficult to feel “one of us”, no matter whether the classification be based on gender, age, sexual orientation, skin colour or ethnic background.

As Taavi is a white heterosexual man like most workers at his workplace, it should not be difficult for him to negotiate himself the status of a "decent bloke" in the work community. The family is of advantage to him in this regard, as a decent man is expected to have a family. Having a family shows – particularly considering today’s demographic and welfare policy concerns – that he is doing his bit in producing future tax payers, in addition to which some take it as a proof of his sexual ability and biological fitness.

So it is advisable for a man to have a family. However, the family should not be seen or heard too much at the workplace. Although legislation and collective agreements on terms of employment support the work-family balance in the Nordic countries, everyday workplace practices play a role in determining to what extent work and family life can actually be reconciled. Taavi knows some men who work in the female-dominated social and health and education sectors (they are not many, though); unlike them, he feels that he cannot be absent from work for too long for family reasons.

Let’s assume that a kindergarten teacher Tero, Taavi’s friend since childhood, has told Taavi that it was quite easy for him to go and discuss with his superior about a couple of months’ child care leave. Over the previous years, many employees at his workplace had taken child care leave. Although Tero’s superior knew that getting a substitute teacher would cause some trouble due to cuts made in the resources, she encouraged Tero to realise these plans and stay at home to take care of his child.

![Figure 4. Attitudes at workplaces](image)

Of course, it is possible for Taavi to take a couple of weeks’ paternity leave; almost every father does so in today’s Finland. There is really no
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need for negotiations on paternity leave, maybe with the exception of some of the most dynamic workplaces, where even a temporary, short-term preference given to family life instead of work is interpreted as a negative phenomenon with regard to work progress and career development.

Paternity leave has become normalised although only a few believed in the 1970s that this would happen. It is also increasingly possible for the father to stay at home to take care of his sick child; it is a matter of a few days or perhaps only half a day if the parents take turns.

Figure 5. Caring for an ill child

The right to stay at home to care for a sick child, that is, the right to a temporary care leave, has been agreed on in negotiations between the social partners and is enshrined in legislation in Finland. In other words, the right has been confirmed by both employers’ and employees’ confederations, as well as the state. An individual father therefore has no need to negotiate at his workplace for the right to take family leave. For most employees, a short absence involves no loss of pay, and there are no negative comments, at least not to your face. In recent years, it has become possible to get a carer supplied by the employer to take care of one’s sick child at home as a job-related benefit. In a survey among parents of young children in Finland (Family Leave Survey), however, only a few of the respondents knew about this kind of benefit at their workplace.
If these carer benefit arrangements become more common, new kinds of negotiations will take place. Today parents negotiate at home as to which one of them may, can or must stay away from work today or tomorrow, or in which ways they will take turns during the day to care for a sick child. The new negotiations at workplaces are about whether the employees can actually use their statutory right to take leave themselves, or whether a carer should be sent to take care of their child.

Negotiations at home could also include discussions on how parental leave is shared between the mother and father. In Finland, the father can take family leave only after the period of maternity leave, which is intended for mothers only. The baby is then some four months of age. We know that few fathers use this possibility.

In order for Taavi to be able to take parental leave, he should at least know that such a possibility exists. There have been a few information campaigns on the right to paternity leave; one of them is obviously currently on-going. The campaigns have to do with the fact that various government programmes on family and gender equality policies have had as their explicit goal to encourage fathers to take family leave.

The campaigns seem to have been effective since a majority of the fathers of small children who responded to the Family Leave Survey reported having been aware of the possibilities available for fathers when the parents were considering which one of them would take parental leave. Three in four fathers who chose not to take parental leave did so while they were aware of their rights.

Although fathers were aware of their right, nowhere near all of them had discussed the matter with their spouse. So the unspoken negotiations took place between the lines, resulting in a wordless agreement. Maybe it
was taken for granted that the mother stays at home and the father works overtime. Maybe they thought that the family finances would not allow the father to leave his well-paid job to take a one-month parental leave. As for Taavi, the salary he receives from the factory office with his college-level education may well be higher than that paid to Tiina for her work as a librarian, despite her university degree.

Assumptions affect choices, but our survey revealed that the validity of such assumptions is rather seldom checked by, for instance, calculating what the actual financial impact of the father’s parental leave would have been on the family finances. Such calculations were more common in families where the father had taken parental leave. This may suggest that the calculations had shown the same results as those made by the Employers’ Confederation of Service Industries a few years ago: compared to the economic impact of the mother’s parental leave, sharing parental leave between mothers and fathers with average male and female income was a matter of rather small sums after taxation had been taken into account.

Parenthood not only involves rational negotiation but also provides an arena for the arousal and expression of various emotions. Emotions also play a part in negotiations on the division of paid and unpaid work between parents. We made an attempt in the Family Leave Survey to find emotional dimensions that are associated with the division of parental leave between mothers and fathers.

At least one thing became clear: many fathers who had taken parental leave thought that it was fine to be able to get off the treadmill of work for some time. However, fathers had not always mentioned this reason aloud when discussing with their spouses: mothers much more infrequently than fathers reported that this reason had affected the division of parental leave in families where the father had taken leave. It seems that mothers’ wishes to return to work coincided with fathers’ wishes to stay at home without any need for fathers to express their emotional needs in the family negotiations. This might tell us something about the construction of gender, that is, what kind of wishes men feel it is acceptable and appropriate for them to express. A different thing is how mothers would actually have reacted if fathers had told them about their dream of having a break after several years of work. I believe that the reaction would have been very positive.

Finally, I will return to Taavi and his father. Taavi’s widowed father has had some health problems recently. He lives in his house, which has a big yard. In the wintertime the father is no longer able to clear the snow himself, so Taavi sometimes clears the snow from the path after a snow storm before he goes to work.
The survey we conducted at fifteen Finnish workplaces suggests that not only women but men as well engage in care work to help their own parents. Middle-aged economically active men reported as frequently as women that they supported their own parents mentally (regular contacts by phone, for instance), did shopping for them, took care of their banking and other errands and also did domestic work if the parents were too frail to cope alone.

An increasing number of older people live in their own homes in Finland. Professional care provided by public services is far from sufficient to cover the need, and not all can afford private home-help services. Therefore negotiations on arrangements enabling the care of older people as part of everyday life are likely to increase in families and workplaces.

Hardly has Taavi helped his children make their way through the teenage years with their eventual upheavals, when he needs to go and discuss his need for further flexibility in working hours so as to be able to help his father at any time during the working day. Maybe Taavi would like to take job alternation leave during his fathers last months of life, but there is a severe shortage of workers at the workplace and work pressures are high. Now that is something to negotiate!

However, it has maybe already been realised at Taavi’s workplace that adequate arrangements for the reconciliation of work and family life are in the interests of both employees and their families and the employer. The tacit knowledge and skills obtained through the social relationships of family life are of vital importance at workplaces: communication and argumentation skills, situational leadership, ability to constantly face new challenges, self-confidence, responsibility, persistence, making and revising plans, etc. In addition, spending time with the family can help employees recharge batteries that get run down at work. From this point of view, negotiations on the reconciliation of work and family life can be conducted in mutual understanding instead of confrontation – not only among women but among men as well.
3. New Directions and Diversity of Fatherhood

Jouko Huttunen

The recent change, fragmenting or even crisis of fatherhood is very well documented in various books and articles within social sciences (e.g. Susan Faludi 1999; Robert Griswold 1993), but the potential directions or trends of future fathering are not so easily in full view of scholars and experts. Looking at the issue broadly we might speak about two opposite tides, the diminishing and intensifying cultures/discourses of fatherhood (Alan J. Hawkins & David C. Dollahite 1997; David Blankenhorn 1995), which both are already prevailing in our public debate. The diminishing culture of fatherhood may be seen in that kind of a public discourse which considers solely mothers and, on the other hand, in the factual decreasing presence of fathers in many families. Correspondingly, the intensifying or strengthening culture of fatherhood is generated by the discourse focusing on committed fathering and shared parenting, as well as by the growing number of involved fathers, who already try to live that kind of life as true.

Moreover, I try to clarify the concepts of “father”, “fathering” and “fatherhood”, much in compliance with David Morgan’s recent writings. Also I am going to reflect, how the modernization processes in the family context have influenced the everyday fathering by Finnish men, and how the concept of fatherhood can be divided into various segments according to the man’s position in relation to the child. In this respect we may identify genetic/biological, juridical, social and psychological “fatherhoods”. Respectively, in relation to society – and in relation to the mother – many kinds of categorisations of fatherhood types have been documented, but one of the latest (Loren Marks & Rob Palkovitz 2004) is somehow interesting: “the good”, “the bad”, and “the uninterested”. Particularly, the discourse on bad fatherhood and “deadbeat dads” is worth of reviewing.

Finally, the question about fatherless society is rising along the late demographic trends, which reveal that in several countries men have and want fewer children than women, and especially in the near future, more men than women will live the whole of their life without any kind of personal parenthood (David Eggebeen 2002). If this is a sort of threatening scenario, a part of the diminishing culture of fatherhood, or a demographic fact among many others that has no explicit impact on our future everyday fathering, we don’t know yet.
The terms father, fatherhood, and fathering

The term “father” is not any more unambiguous, neither the concept of fatherhood. In the case of the term “father” we are concerned with processes by which this term becomes attached to a particular individual. We reveal the distinctions between biological, juridical and social fathers and analyse the ways in which societies privilege the biological fathers (Barbara Hobson & David Morgan 2002). We may get information about the fathers by listening to the experiences of men called fathers. In this meaning the term “father” refers to the mode “being”.

If fathers are seen in relational terms to mothers and children and as elements of social structure, fatherhood can be seen as the cultural coding of men as fathers (norms, sanctions etc.). Here, we are dealing with the rights, duties, responsibilities and statuses that are attached to men called fathers, as well as the discursive terrain around good and bad fathers. The tensions within fatherhood discourses are interesting by revealing something essential in our understanding about fatherhood.

As Barbara Hobson and David Morgan (2002) argue that, the words “father” and “fatherhood” are well established in the English language and readily translatable into other languages, but the same cannot be said for the term “fathering”. The parallel terms are “mothering” and “parenting”. In formal terms, the distinction might seem to signify one between being and doing, between a status or identity and a set of practices. The matter in question is the part of a man’s “doings” which are closely connected to the well being of a child. However, all the fathering practices do not always require the actual co-presence of a child when, for example, a father puts in a request for parental leave.

The different meanings of “father” may be specified as follows:

- **Genetic or biological father** refers to the biological origin of a child: a man whose sperm has fertilized the ovum. In some cases the man may be characterized sooner as a “sperm donator”, because of the artificial or unaware nature of the conception.

- **Juridical father** is the lawful father in a child’s life. He is a man who has established the legal paternity, which always means certain statutory rights and responsibilities given to him. For example, in many post-divorce circumstances a father’s legal position is carefully evaluated and, possibly, re-evaluated.

- **Social father** is a man who is sharing his everyday life with a child, living together with him or her, and responding to the daily needs of the child. A common post-modern family situation, in which a man is not a biological but definitely a social father, is a “new” family, a stepfamily where a mother is the biological mother for every child, but the man is not the biological neither juridical father for any of the children.
• Psychological father is a man who has established a close, reciprocal relationship with a child, living or not with the child, but, at all events, he or she regards the man as his/her father. The term “psychological” refers to a kind of an attachment or a bond between a child and a man, and therefore this kind of a father or fatherhood may be assessed as the most meaningful form of the term “father”.

In modern societies like the Nordic countries, the concept of father is fragmented, not only at the conceptual level but also in practice, so that many children actually have two fathers in their everyday lives: the juridical non-residential father and the social stepfather living with the child and his/her mother. However, it seems that the biological roots of the term “father” are still prevalent and so tenacious that we need more public debates on this issue. Fatherhood – as well as motherhood – are so largely socially constructed and reproduced that it has to be possible to change the miserable conventions into better practices for the benefit of children and all parents.

Fathers in different family types

Fathers and fathering styles differ from each other also according to the family environment or context in which a man is “doing” his fatherhood. In this respect we may specify four different types.

• Fathers who are living in an intact two-parent family with at least one child under 18 years old. In these cases the father is supposed to be both biological and juridical father for the child/children, and the man is living in his first couple relationship. Even though exact statistics are not available, it might be estimated that in Finland over 70% of all fathers are living in intact two-parent families.

• Fathers who are living mostly as a social or stepfather in a “new” family or stepfamily, some of them also with a child/children of their own. Circa 15% of Finnish fathers live in this kind of circumstances, actually being social fathers, because generally the child/children has/have their biological-juridical father somewhere as a non-residential father.

• Fathers who are not living together with their children, mostly due to the post-divorce arrangements. These non-residential or “remote” fathers are juridical fathers who may have a joint custody or duty of maintenance, and they have the right to meet and live together at times with their children according to agreement. In Finland the proportion of this kind of fathers might be estimated to be as high as 15–20%.

• Fathers who are living as a sole parent with their child/children, while the mother of the child/children has the role of a remote parent. The
legal paternity may be a single or joint custody. As estimated, ca. 3 – 5% of the Finnish fathers are in this situation.

Table 1. The manifestations of the different meanings of “father” in diverse family types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father’s position in family context</th>
<th>Form of the manifestation of fatherhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genetic/biological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent family</td>
<td>Nearly always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepfather in a “new” family</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residential, “remote” father</td>
<td>Nearly always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single father</td>
<td>Nearly always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table above indicates, diverse family types constitute a varying terrain for the manifestation of a man’s fatherhood. It should be noted that the armour of a man’s fatherhood is vulnerable even in the nuclear family, especially on the part of the psychological fatherhood. On the other hand, even though the role of a single father is not considered as enviable, in most cases he is living the life of a “full” father.

**Diminishing and intensifying cultures of fatherhood**

Alan Hawkins and David Dollahite (1997, 4–5) have launched the term “diminishing culture of fatherhood”, by which they mean above all the decreasing presence of fathers in families and its destructive consequences for children, communities and society. They refer to David Blankenhorn’s well-known book “Fatherless America”, and his statements on the biological origin of the nature of men’s fathering behaviour. Blankenhorn (1995, 3) asserts boldly what others quietly assume that fatherhood is a problem, because men are not biologically suited to responsible fathering:

Men are inclined to sexual promiscuity and paternal waywardness …unwilling or unable to make that vital investment.

Therefore he suggests authoritative cultural coaxing and guiding into responsible fatherhood through a set of legal and extralegal pressures that require men to maintain a close alliance with their children’s mother and to invest in their children.

Even if I question Blankenhorn’s analysis about the cracking down on fathers’ paternal waywardness, it is easy to agree with him that there is a diminishing tendency in the contemporary culture of fatherhood, and the danger of that is real. Also John Gillis (2000) refers almost to the same
phenomenon by the term “marginalization of fatherhood”, by which he means the discourses that downplay the meaningfulness of fatherhood in men’s lives, as well as the actual inappropriate behaviour of some fathers.

This diminishing tendency of post-modern fatherhood can be identified in three different fields of modern life: in discourses, social conventions and family practices. The value or meaning of fatherhood and fathering may be decreased, first of all, by such public discourses that stress for example “the male freedom and optional fatherhood”, as well as by discourses on “bad fathers”, “mother’s superior care” or “men as sperm donators”. Even if a certain public debate, like above-mentioned, is not malevolent or demolishing the value of fatherhood as it is, nevertheless it turns the general interest away from the importance of fatherhood. Similarly, some social conventions, like post-divorce settlements that disfavour male care, or growing demands of work life that pass over the needs of fathers, are ruining little by little the importance of fatherhood. Actually, it means that a given father is gradually drawn away from sharing the everyday life of his child without the father’s own intention. As generalized this kind of conventions are creating the diminishing culture of fatherhood. And finally, some family practices, like the growing numbers of absent fathers, who are not present physically or psychologically in their children’s everyday life, are producing the diminishing culture of fatherhood. Fathers whose relationship to the child is only biological and/or juridical, busy fathers or uninvolved fathers as well are contributing to the diminishing tendencies of fatherhood.

On the other hand, there can be identified an intensifying or strengthening culture of fatherhood in many western societies. This new culture is produced and maintained by the very similar mechanisms as the culture of diminishing fatherhood: by discourses, conventions and practices. Firstly, discourses on “new” fatherhood and shared parenting stress involved fathering. In contemporary social discourse, the term “new fatherhood” has been introduced in many ways each encompassing various aspects of new fathering; for example, “hands-on fathering” (Daniels & Weingarten 1988), “generative fathering” (Hawkins & Dollahite 1997), “nurturant fathering” (Pruett 1987), “positively involved fathering” (Pleck 1997), and “responsible fathering” (Doherty, Kouneski, & Erikson 1998).

Secondly, social conventions like welfare state’s family policies, family-friendly work place arrangements, and positively stressing public opinion towards more involved fathering are such factors that have a great impact on the intensifying culture of fatherhood. For instance, fathers’ right to an increasing portion of parental leaves has been documented as one of the most successful way to reinforce men’s involvement in their fatherhood. And thirdly, certain family practices, like fathers’ growing proportional engagement (relative to mothers) in child care and housework, or in prenatal classes, childbirth and father-child groups, are
practices which serve as good examples or encouraging models for other men and all community. At the moment, there is a remarkable lack of survey research concerning the (true) family practices around fathering. Actually we do not know the extent or proportions of these two different cultures of fatherhood from the viewpoint of family practices.

The good, the bad, and the uninterested: contemporary types of fathering and fatherhood

As we know, generalized and typologized discussions of fathers or any particular groups of human beings discount both inter-individual and intra-individual variability. However, there is a degree of legitimacy to carefully generalized discussions of fatherhood, be it contemporary or historical, because most fathers share some universal characteristics. Further, descriptions of different styles of types of fathers can serve as helpful ideal types that are of great utilitarian and heuristic value in assessing the social reality of the “typical” father.

Loren Marks and Rob Palkovitz (2004) have identified four contemporary types of fathering, especially from the American point of view: the new, involved father, the good provider, the deadbeat dad, and the paternity-free man. The first two, the new, involved father and the good provider, can be classified as “the good”, the third one as “the bad”, and the fourth one, the paternity-free man, as “the uninterested”. Actually, typologizing fathers along the moral dimension good vs. bad is nothing new (e.g. Furstenberg 1988), but perhaps Marks and Palkovitz have caught something crucial and representative in the post-modern family life.

As already mentioned above, the "new, involved" father is one prevalent portrayal of modern fatherhood, which suggests that we are witnessing an increased level of father involvement, a rising number of men who have given more time and commitment to their hands-on fathering while at the same time trying to be providers, too (Wilcox 2002). Specifically, although the greater responsibility might be in the hands of the mother, these new fathers are much more likely to change diapers, care for, and nurture their children and engage in domestic tasks than previous generations, or the other current father types. In other words, in accordance with David Morgan’s “fatherhood triangle”, this type could be defined as a “package” in which the father is biological or/ and social, fathering consists of nurturing and caring, and the fatherhood of the man could be characterized as generative or hands-on.

The other of the “good” father types, the good provider, is somewhat controversial by nature: their fathering consists of bread-winning as well as of playing with children, and the main feature in their fatherhood is the economic responsibility. Although a father’s ability to provide may have many positive intergenerational effects on children through observational
learning, educational opportunities, and other aspects of developing human capital and needed skills, the crucial question will be directed to the nurturing role of the father. Is he balancing satisfactorily the economic provision with close-at-hand father involvement? Loren Marks and Rob Palkovitz (2004) put the question as follows:

How 'good' does a good provider have to be?

Parents are consistently pressured to provide their children with the latest entertainment, technology, and fashion in a society where consumerism and status are hegemonic. These pressures toward provision of status can be juxtaposed with the ideal that parents should create a home that is emotionally and relationally stable.

Furthermore, there have always been “bad fathers” with varying interpretations and emphases, but currently divorces, mother-headed households, and defaults on court-ordered alimony and child support payments have reached near all-time highs (Palkovitz, 2002). These and other similar negative indicators have been interpreted to suggest that contemporary patterns of fatherhood are far from reflective of a “new breed” of fathers and indicate a fathering deficiency and decline. Pleck and Pleck (1997, 48) characterize “bad fathers” as follows:

The bad dad has always been the man who failed to live up to his parental responsibilities.

Those responsibilities have always been defined in part as acknowledgement of paternity and responsibility for child support.

Even though the good dad has possessed a variety of qualities, failure as a breadwinner has always been a significant feature of the bad dad.

Conversely, some co-residential fathers may provide economically but miserably fail to adopt the social and emotional roles of fathering. Such men are physically present but psychologically absent fathers.

**Paternity-free men and fatherless society**

As An-Magritt Jensen proved by demographic data in her presentation at this conference, the declining tendency in the importance of marriage and parenting has been greater in the lives of Norwegian men than in the lives of Norwegian women. This declining tendency has been documented also elsewhere in Western countries (e.g. Forste 2002). David J. Eggebeen (2002) contrasts elements of the good father type with that of paternity-free manhood by stating,

it is ironic that, at the very time that the changes in the practice of fatherhood are being praised, fatherhood is becoming a less common activity.
Why is this? Renata Forste (2002) argues that present answers are “vague at best”. Certainly, some childless men desire to have children but do not become fathers due to infertility, mental disorders, lack of a partner, economic circumstances, or other personal reasons.

There might be some male specific reasons like Peter Pan phenomenon, to which Griswold (1993, 228) refers with other words. With Peter Pan phenomenon I mean that kind of young men’s subculture where life is seen as groovy, individualistic and freewheeling, and in which kind of life commitments and generative thinking are not on the personal agenda. In addition, sometimes the homosocial cohesion of a male group is so tight that there is no room for personal solutions like a marriage or cohabiting. Also a profound commitment to working life or male hobbies may cause a way of life in which parenthood, or even pair relationship, has no place. Or else – if the cohabitation or marriage is regarded as convenient under these circumstances, the fatherhood (and the potential child) is seen strongly optional. These post-modern busy husbands actually will live a single man’s life with the presumption that the spouse or partner will be endlessly patient in the case of having a child. As William Marsiglio (1998, 94) argues, men may be reluctant to assert their preference [to not have a child] if they are in love with a partner who forcefully asserts her desire to give birth to their child. In this type of situation, it is often the case that men’s procreative consciousness is interwoven with their feelings toward their partner identity.

The paternity-free thinking might also be down to the norms and obligations of modern involved fathering. Some men may judge these cultural expectations too demanding, and they assess their potentialities insufficient for good fathering. And finally, could it be possible to speak about the paternity-free attitude in terms of “not interested in children” or even “don’t like children”? However, the fact is that there is a growing group of men, both married and unmarried, who appear to prefer paternity-free manhood over the alternative.

After all, as Marsiglio (1998) puts it, it might be realistic to assume that the paternal motivation may be related to a father’s involvement with children so that men who want to be fathers are more likely to be involved fathers. Conversely, men who do not desire to be fathers, but who biologically and juridically become fathers, are less likely to be involved financially, temporally, or relationally, especially across time. Perhaps future fathers will increase in quality while decreasing in quantity.

But if in the future there stay alive strong reverse tendencies, our communities are becoming more and more fatherless societies with an increasing number of men without any kind of personal fatherhood, with an increasing number of families without a man, and with increasing numbers of absent fathers in general. Fatherless society refers also to the diminishing culture of collective fathering, which means, for example, lack of male mentors, coaches and male workers in schools and kinder-
garts as well as in social work or in health care. Concretely, the lack of collective fathering is visible in the immediate neighbourhood by the fact that there are fewer and fewer fathers or men playing with children outdoors.

The pessimistic scenario of future fatherless lays stress on the declining value of male generative behaviour in society. It means that the egocentric, “cv-oriented” way of life has become so prevailing and self-evident for many men that they have no room for thinking about other people or being responsible for the younger generation. From this point of view, the lack of generative behaviour can be recognized also elsewhere in our society, like in political, societal and working life, in which generative activities are out of fashion or they are excluded from normal manners. Ultimately, the question is, how do we understand the collective responsibility for other people.
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4. Fatherhood – Between Ideology and Demography

An-Magritt Jensen

While public discourse celebrates the new fatherhood, the distance between men and children in everyday life is increasing. The involved fatherhood is heralded in media, politics and research at the same time as childhood is feminized. As having, rearing and caring for children are undermining status, prestige and power fewer children are produced and a ‘child line’ running through accords with the traditional gender divides in the family.

I shall raise three questions:

- Are family changes a sign of a declining significance of children to men?
- Are the public discourses and children’s access to fathers different worlds?
- Can we argue that the ageing Europe is the ultimate elimination of childhood?

Public policies over the last decade have increasingly given attention to fathers’ time with children. Fathers who give priority to work over time with children are not the heroes of the ideologically battles. But in children’s daily life fathers (and men) play a dwindling role. However, the ideology of the new fatherhood prevents us from realizing the development. The widening gap between men and children is a primary indication of a declining significance of children and childhood in society at large.

‘Patriarchy has two basic intrinsic dimensions.’ Therborn tells us, ‘the rule of the father and the rule of the husband, in that order’ (2004: 13). But with the transformation to an industrial society the basis of patriarchy was transferred from the family to the market. Mechanisms of gaining status, prestige and power moved outside the family, while new demands in the family sphere could represent a threat to achieving a position in society. Increasingly also men are expected to use their time and energy with children. Men’s fertility and family behaviour indicates a strong reluctance to this change.

The rise in extramarital births reflects the marginalization of children to the status of men, and maybe also to women. The “babyboom” of the 1990s is gone. However, in the case of Norway we also find that the total
number of children born is about the same as in 1980, while there has been a strong shift from marital to extramarital births. We may ask why fathers no longer find it important to establish a legal paternity.

Figure 8. Children born outside marriage. Scandinavia 1845–2000

I shall use Scandinavia – and Norway in particular – to illustrate the revolution in extra-marital births since the 1970s. There is an extraordinary similarity in the historical trends of these countries (Figure 8). Scandinavia is often seen as a liberal corner with long-standing support to gender equality (Therborn, 2004) and with a relatively high acceptance of extramarital births historically. The rise in births outside marriage from the 1970s was spectacular, but social scientists were not alarmed. Rather there was an inclination to emphasise that this was a change in family-formalities rather than realities (for example Trost, 1978). By contrast, I see this change as an indicator of the changing role of children to men.

Until 1970 low levels of extramarital births prevailed. Due to higher fertility the number of children born outside marriage could have been substantial, but the proportion remained in general below 10%. Strong social norms condemned ‘illegitimate’ births. Actually, in Norway, living together without being married was forbidden by law until 1972 and people could be punished to three months in jail. The law was not practised, but served a symbolic function. Having a child outside marriage has been a big agony to young women and their ‘bastard’ children throughout history. After 1970 it became a norm. In order to understand this social revo-
lution, we have to look at the significance of children to men. This is reflected in consensual unions. Through their fragility consensual unions are a major vehicle separating fathers from children in their daily life. Due to lack of public registration of their legal rights, fathers also have a weak position after break-up.

Figure 9. Extra Marital Births. European Countries 1970–2002

The rises in extramarital births are similar across European countries (Figure 9). Paradoxically, as women’s possibilities to control their fertility increased, births outside marriage started to rise. Where church and social norms until the 1970s should ensure that children were born into marriage, thirty years later there is no country without an increase in the level of extramarital births. Although there is a wide variation the trend is upward in all countries.

Why was marriage an important institution to men in one historical period, while unimportant in another? In answering this question we have
to consider the social position of fathers historically, as described by Gillis (1997) and Therborn (2004). Fatherhood was at the core of the patriarchy in the family and society. By contrast, fatherhood has no bearing on men’s social position in present-day societies. Childlessness is an indicator of this change.

Figure 10. Childlessness among women and men at age 40. NorWay

A sharp increase in both postponement of the first birth and childlessness has taken place among men over the last few years (Figure 10). In Norway in the 1940-cohort the gendered childless-gap was 5%. In the 1964-cohort the gap has increased to 9%.

Childlessness is increasing and more among men than women. In the UK the proportion of childless men is higher than among women at all ages (Burghes et al., 1997:17). In Norway 22% against 13% among women at age 40 are childless. At this age 40% of the men are not social fathers – they have never fathered a child, or do not live with a child for whom they have economic responsibility. Twenty years ago (1940-cohort) the corresponding figure was 25% (Statistics Norway, 2005; Skrede, 2003). Research from several countries confirms that men have and want fewer children than women.

A study on fertility intentions among women and men who have not yet started a family in Norway finds that while 77% of the men expect to have a child, 90% of the women do. Gender differences in fertility expectations are much stronger than social differences (Lyngstad and Noack, 2005). A similar study on young people’s attitudes on family and work from Sweden confirms the picture: Fewer men than women regard the having of children as the meaning of life, and more men give priority to work and leisure before having children. Young men vision a future life with good earnings, while women emphasise options of part time work and time with the family (Bernhardt, 2000a). A thought-provoking result emerges from the interplay of attitudes to family and gender equality.
Possibilities and Challenges – Men’s Reconciliation of Work and Family Life

Both young women and men who give priority to family favour gender equality less (Bernhardt, 2000b). Low fertility desires among men are also found in rich societies outside Europe. A recent Australian study finds that men want fewer children at the start of their reproductive life and over time their preferences for children are revised downwards. Advancing age, lack of a partner and relationship breakdown were important factors of the development (Qu and Weston, 2004/2005). A conflict between work and children is traced in the reluctance among men to have children, to care for children or to sequence their life in a ‘work-first-child-later’ approach.

Parenthood as a signifier of the changing position of children is very different when we look at motherhood and fatherhood separately. First, a declining importance of children is primarily traced through fertility and family patterns among men as illustrated above. Secondly, in countries where women are unable to have children outside marriage, such as in the case of Italy, the declining importance of children is traced through very low fertility levels both among women and men. In Scandinavia the rise in births outside marriages has coincided with a general rise in births but also in a rise in children not living with their father. One may ask whether giving birth – and becoming a parent – increasingly depends on women’s possibility to bear and rear children without a man? Are we confronted with father-escape or mother-power? The argument of father-escape meets stronger opposition in public discourses than the argument on mother-power. A common counter-argument of the father-escape-hypothesis is that modern fathers are more absorbed into fatherhood than in previous times. The fathers live with their children even if they are not married to the mother of the child. The spread of consensual unions can even be regarded as part of a modernisation of the family. Through consensual unions patriarchy is undermined and gender equality is promoted. In the public discourse an interpretation of this as father-escape has a low standing.

The argument of mother-power, by contrast, is not unusual. This argument is forwarded in particular among non-resident fathers. The rise in extra-marital births is regarded as a result of the rather generous and woman-friendly Scandinavian welfare states. Taking this position, it is argued that mothers are now in power. Fathers are marginalised, and men are selected out of fatherhood by the stronger women who are less dependent on a husband for economic support. It is pertinent to ask whether the very framing of this discourse is part of the patriarchal power structures in society.

To understand a possible father escape we need to look at the labour market. Also outside the family men are distanced from children. The Scandinavian labour market is described as one of the most gender-segregated in Europe. This is due partly to the large public sector of the welfare states, where women are occupied (Anker, 1998). We find that
mothers’ occupations are in public, child friendly, low-paid sectors with high job security. By contrast, fathers’ occupations are in private, child hostile, well-paid sectors with low job security. Mothers adjust their employment to children. By contrast, fathers remain the main economic provider of the family. Both parents give priority to fathers’ work to secure family economy. Consequently, the incompatibility between market and children hits fathers more than mothers. A challenging question is if women are willing to sacrifice more for parenthood than men are? Another challenging question is why sacrifices are needed to enter parenthood?

Figure 11. Children living with the father among all children living with one parent

To understand the increasing gaps between men and children we also have to look more thoroughly into family changes (Figure 11). Suggesting that consensual unions undermine fatherhood, as I do, is more often than not met with hostility. Consensual unions are considered modern and egalitarian. However, consensual unions are a major vehicle in parental break-up and through this they are fortifying the traditional strong linkages between children and their mothers. The increase in family dissolutions almost invariably separate fathers from the daily life of children (Jensen, 2001). During the period of increased attention to ‘the new fatherhood’ in the 1990s, the share of children living with their father alone actually declined.
The proportion of children registered at the father’s address was 12% in 1989 and 14% in 2004. At a first sight the figure indicates that the decline in the proportion of children living with their father during the first part of the 1990s has recovered during the latter years. A closer look reveals that this is only partly the case. Supplementing official statistics, upon which Figure 5 is constructed, with survey-data we find another change during this period. Most children with two homes (shared daily care) are registered at their father’s address. Single fatherhood is often shared parenthood on a fifty-fifty basis. Only 7% of the children live with a single father who is the main residential parent – and this low proportion is surprisingly stable over time (Jensen, 2005).

We need to raise the question of clashing ideals and realities. While our ideals include parental time with children and work (through for example the so called ‘daddy quota’ in parental leaves), gender equality and ensuring children’s economic security, the realities are different. Here we find that only mothers adjust work according to children, a feminization of childhood is taking place and there are increasing gaps between men and children. Can we say that the daddy quota indicates that children are now prioritized, for example at the expense of career or labor market, among men? The researchers who have been pioneering these analyses say ‘no’. A pattern where the father works less in order to adjust to mother’s long working hours is almost non-existent (2%) (Brandth and Kvande, 2003: 174–177).
A main counter-argument to these suggestions is often referred to as fathers’ increased participation in child care. However, while 81% of the fathers with children aged 0–6 years have taken part in care, the time is limited: 1.31 hours on an average day (Figure 13). In international comparison this is probably high. Still, looking into the figure with more caution, we also find that the main changes took place in the beginning of the period. Over the last decade a standstill has evolved. We may ask if the ‘glass roof’ of father’s time with children was reached in the 1980s. The daddy quota has not resulted in more time with children among fathers. The Time Budget Survey in 2000 (Vaage, 2002) revealed that the time fathers spent with young children had come to a standstill by 1990.

A child-line runs through the society. Most men give priorities to work rather than family. Most young men have education and occupations on the other side of the ‘child-line’. Most fathers leave the main responsibility for children to the mother – whether living together or not. The income-winners are typically men. Mothers are the income losers. They have lower average salary per hours, not only compared to men but also to childless women, and the income gap increases by the number of children (controlled for the relevant socio-economic characteristics) (Hardoy and Schøne, 2004).

The discourse on the emancipated Scandinavian father has received much attention in research, public debates and policy. Why is there such a discrepancy between public discourse and everyday practices of fatherhood? My suggestion is that children have lost their symbolic power in influencing adult marital behaviour as accumulation of status, prestige and power in society is moved from the family (Jensen, 2003). Men (fathers) have won the battle in the public discourse while children have lost...
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access to men (and fathers) in real life. The veiling of the gap between men and children mirrors the continued patriarchal power structure in society. Childhood is feminized in everyday life, while fatherhood is celebrated in public discourse.

I think there is a strong need to understand fatherhood from the perspective of the interaction between children and the labour market. The squeeze between economy and care is traced in the gender differences in parenthood and traced in the ageing European population. Framing gendered parenthood as personal choices is a powerful barrier to see the declining significance of children and childhood in modern societies.
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5. Panel discussion: Directors of fathers’ groups tell about men’s experiences of reconciliation of work and family time

5.1 Fathers’ Groups in Stockholm

*Mats Berggren*

The project “Dad for Real” was launched on 1 May 2003. The project was initiated by Mats Berggren who is also the Project Manager and who have several years of experience in working with parental support for men in the County of Stockholm. The project is financed by Stockholm County Council and it is implemented in cooperation with ABF Söderstörn Educational Association. The goal of the Project is to:

With focus on children, offer men the opportunity to prepare themselves for active parenthood as well as an equal relationship with their partners.

Future goals and desired effects are:

- To increase the number of men who utilise parental insurance
- To reduce the number of divorces
- To increase breast-feeding frequency
- To improve women’s position in working life
- To reduce violence committed by men against women and children

The Project is to last three years and it comprises five municipalities. 28 tutors have been recruited and they work independently with their fathers’ groups in the evenings.

The tutors have received basic training within the Project and have common training material, which has been checked by the County Council.

*Gender Mentor*

For six months a Gender Mentor has been attached to the Project. The Mentor’s task is to examine from a gender perspective the training mate-
rial, the Project’s home page, etc. The Mentor has also observed personnel meetings and group activities. The final report was completed in June 2005 and it gave the Project its approval.

**Evaluation**

Since the launch of the Project in 2003, around 200 groups have been formed with about 1,000 men participating. The Press, the TV and the Radio have all taken note of the Project.

The participants were recruited during ordinary parental training organised at maternity centres. The groups are meant to complement the ordinary training and not to replace it.

An examination of questionnaire responses shows that fathers, mothers and midwives appreciated the group activities.

Questionnaires to fathers show for example that of all the respondents:

- 78% attended at least five meetings
- 98% were content with the tutors
- 76% were content with the number of meetings
- 90% viewed that the activities corresponded to their expectations
- 86% were content with the number of topics
- 89% said that as a father the groups meant a lot
- 65% were encouraged to take more fathers’ leave
- 100% viewed that the groups are a good form of parental training

**The meetings**

The tutors organised six meetings with their groups. The participants were most often first-time fathers. One meeting was arranged before childbirth and five after. The meetings are meant to function as a discussion forum and the tutor should be more of a discussion initiator than a teacher.

Themes of the meetings:

- Childbirth
- The new life
- Parenthood
- Couples
- Work – family – free time
- Family meetings

The themes are experienced as important when both the tutor and the participants can get prepared for each meeting.
**Fathers’ Group Tutors**

The tutor should try to communicate in a positive way how important it is that men as fathers are involved from the very beginning. Fathers should take a great responsibility early on in the child’s life. It is not, however, something that just happens. It is we, the men, who decide how much and in what ways we get involved.

While the tutor must respect everyone’s economic situation, he should nevertheless stress that father’s leave is worth every penny and second. The tutor must have courage to ask uncomfortable questions. He should encourage the group to look at things from other, unusual perspectives.

In addition to basic training, the tutors receive further training two to three times per year. The further training can be for example a lecture from a guest speaker or internal group guidance. Examples of further training since the onset of the projects are:

- Behavioural science
- Violence against children
- Feminism

**Management Group**

The Project has a management group consisting of the project management, four fathers’ group tutors, the educational association as well as a representative of the Country Council. The Management Groups meets four to five times per year and its tasks include guiding the project towards the best possible direction.

**Statistics and Status**

The Swedish society today signals that men should get more involved in the child’s life during the first year. The Swedish parental insurance has been reformed precisely in that direction. In 1994 the first “father’s month” was introduced, i.e. a one month’s leave solely for the father with no possibility to transfer the leave to the mother. Even the mother received such a month. In consequence, the number of days fathers took as parental leave doubled in a couple of years. In 2002 another month was introduced and the number of days fathers took as leave increased again. In 2005 there were discussions about more individualised system of parental insurance but at present no new reforms are impending.

**Parental insurance in Sweden at present:**

480 days (16 months), 90 days are so-called guarantee days with SEK 60 per day. For the remaining 390 days (13 months), the compensation is 80% of the salary, however not more than SEK 24,625. Of the 390 days,
60 are reserved for the father and 60 for the mother. The remaining days can be divided between the father and the mother.

The possibility to take father’s leave has existed in Sweden since 1974.

Days taken as leave:

- Mother 100%  Father 0%
- 1985 Mother 96%  Father 4%
- Mother 90%  Father 10%
- Mother 81%  Father 19%

The figures are rounded. 19% corresponds to 74 days.

The above figures are the average of all Swedish men. If examined more closely:

- Men living in big cities take more days as father’s leave than men living in the regions
- Men with higher salaries take more leave than men with lower salaries
- Men with higher education take more leave than men with lower education

Conclusions

The Project has lasted now two and a half years and during that time, the activities have always been met positively. Men and future fathers are content with us and they view that we fulfil their need for information and preparation. Women and future mothers are thankful that their men become more interested and more motivated after having been in touch with us. Also midwives have a positive view on our activities and they think that our groups complement the support the midwives provide for families and for women in particular and that we “help” them with something they were not really happy about before.

Our conclusions are that men in fact have no specific worries or questions regarding childbirth just because they are men. Their questions deal a lot with:

- “How do I organise the daily life so that everyone gets their fair share?”
- “Work, family and free time.”
- “What do I do so that everyone is satisfied?”
- “What does one do?”
- “My father didn’t do it like this.”

These are questions that all parents ask themselves irrespective of gender.
5.2 Work to Support Fathers

Ilmo Saneri

‘Miessakit’ – Fellowship of Men’s Associations is a non-governmental expert organisation of men that aims to support men’s mental, psychological and social growth, to promote interfamilial interaction and family life, to strengthen the foundation for gender equality among men, and to develop the structures for solidarity and mutual help between men furthering these aims.

The most important activities of the association are the Men’s Group, Surviving a divorce – help in divorce crises, ‘Lyömätön Linja’ – an organisation helping men to find an alternative to intimate partner violence, Societal influence from the male point of view, and training. The association has gathered as its important support structure a nation-wide contact person network operating at present in about 15 localities in Finland. The main financier of the activities is the Finnish Slot Machine Association.

The establishment of ‘Miessakit’ was a result of group activity for men’s mutual growth started by Senior Trainer Antti-Veikko Perheentupa at the start of the 1990s in the Greater Helsinki area.

The men who attended the groups experienced the group process so important a support for their life that they decided to establish an association under the lead of Perheentupa. The purpose was to build up by and by a mutual support network for men throughout the country. The network helps in starting various activities that support men in meeting the new and old challenges in present society.

In recent decades the status of men has radically changed when compared to the earlier situation. Men are supposed to manage, besides the traditional men’s tasks, also interesting new things and things causing amazement. Women do not only put these challenges forth, but also men demand them of each other and of themselves. One of the most significant matters that have changed for men is the increased possibilities to realise their fatherhood role.

Fatherhood has always been, and still is, a very important element in the lives of men who have become fathers. Feelings aroused by one’s own child affect men extremely deeply and these feelings are dealt with all through one’s life. The improved opportunities to take part in the everyday life of children bring new challenges in view of men’s personal needs, the relationship between the couple, working life and all those things that are built around these basic things. Work to support men in meeting these positive challenges is part of the basic activities of ‘Miessakit’.
Work to support fathers

The purpose of the work to support fathers carried out by ‘Miessakit’ is to develop specific training and structures for this work. These activities provide men opportunities to take part in fathers’ peer groups in connection with municipal prenatal classes or self-motivated activities, and on the other hand municipal or service providers’ officials can specialise themselves in supporting fatherhood. Modern prenatal classes should also take into account fathers’ special characteristics as an important element in a family. The types of activities are training of leaders for daddies groups, job supervision, regional level consultation for starting such groups, and organisation of daddies groups.

Training for leaders of daddies groups is provided at three levels:

- Special characteristics of daddies groups
- Group guidance and special characteristics of daddies groups, and
- How to gather a daddies group.

The training under first point comprises one day dealing with activities of daddies groups based on the experiences from the so called Hollola model; second is a little more extensive than the first one, including the fundamentals of group training and group dynamics (duration 2–4 days); and in the third focus is, in particular, on gathering self-motivated daddies groups.

The leaders of daddies groups are provided with training in social case work and group work. The duration and number of meetings are agreed as needed. The purpose of regional initiation consultation is to go through the matters related to the gathering of a group and regional special issues. The organisation of daddies groups is an entirety supporting in particular the planning of activities offered to local authorities. This entirety can also include training, job supervision and regional initiation consultations. At the practical level the training is provided by the field workers of ‘Miessakit’, and at the agreement level it is administered by administrative workers of ‘Miessakit’.

Experiences of the work with fathers (as related by field worker Ilmo Saneri)

At the moment I am working in ‘Miessakit’. My job description consists of leading daddies groups at municipal child health clinics, training of their staff, working as expert in fatherhood issues on various forums and replying to inquiries of the media, whose interest in these issues has increased recently. I have worked with fatherhood issues since the end of the 1980s.

At the moment we are living through an interesting phase in the work to support fathers. The traditional ideas about the Finnish father are
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Finnish fathers have always been considered taciturn, hard working men. The father’s involvement when their children are babies has not been regarded as very important. But I have met hundreds of Finnish men and know how fathers today can surprise me again and again. I meet in my work fathers that are very much aware of their fatherhood, discuss and are ready to face the challenges of today. I am especially surprised at their talkativeness and openness. But even modern fathers are not talkative in any situation but an appropriate situation and place is needed for that.

About ten years ago we developed with the child health clinic at Hollola the so-called Hollola model. According to this model fathers meet with their own group two times before the birth of the child and three times after the birth. The result of this trial exceeded all expectations. Supported by their own peer group fathers could deal with their fatherhood very broadly. The feedback from mothers was exclusively positive. The group had also increased their ‘preparedness’ for discussions in the group at home. The model has already been used elsewhere: e.g. the well being project at the health clinics in Espoo observed the Hollola model. Judging from the experiences from it the leader of the group must be a trained person, a man.

The experiences from the daddies groups have been encouraging. They have produced a really lot of material for fatherhood purposes. The most important contribution has been that fathers have heard what their peers think about issues. The birth of a child is an event in a man’s life that loosens his tongue. We have had to limit the time reserved for listening to men’s stories about their children’s birth because of lack of time. The group meetings have been characterised by joy, pride and positive feelings. In my opinion a man is at the start of his fatherhood so fragile that he cannot bear any threats or moralising – therefore such things are not dealt with at the meetings. Instead, an atmosphere of a tremendous and happy event has been created. The attraction of fatherhood is so intense that I believe that even those who have an uncertain attitude towards fatherhood will be involved and get a better start for their own fatherhood than they would otherwise. For Finnish men it is indeed important to do as other men do.

Work is still a significant component in Finnish men’s lives. It is my experience that in particular the birth of the first child increases men’s need to make money. They have to prepare themselves for the future life as a family man. It includes improving the home in view of the new child, changing the car into a bigger one etc. A majority of families have loans to pay back. When the mother stays home from work that also increases the need for men to work harder. Fathers’ willingness to stay at home to care for their babies has however increased drastically. Approximately 70% of fathers are dreaming about staying at home. The majority of them however say that it is impossible financially. I have learned that fathers
should obtain 80% of their earnings until that would be possible in terms of money. Despite that some fathers realise their dream (about 5–10%). In that case the family has to compromise over everything else, and that is not enough either. In many cases e.g. the grandparents help these families financially.

The situation is however distressing for fathers. Feelings of guiltiness and unhappiness that absence from work involves are bothering many fathers in such a situation. Fathers feel that they are left out of something important. A greater and greater number of men would however like to see and experience how their children are growing while staying at home. Small entrepreneurs are a group that feel especially unhappy. They cannot reduce their business or discontinue it because of the birth of a child. It is difficult to balance between a prosperous enterprise and family. In particular mothers commonly criticize small entrepreneur fathers. The well being of an entrepreneur family depends on the attitude of the mother. The attitude towards fathers who stay at home has changed among men. It is considered worth attaining and respectful to stay at home to care for a baby in the life of modern men.

What should be done then? In my opinion, municipal prenatal training should include expert work to support fathers all over the country. It is a real wonder that such a resource in terms of family policy is left unused. I wish to cite one father:

I cannot understand how one can become a father without such a daddies group.

As I already stated, mothers have given flattering feedback: there is more discussion between the parents, father’s role in the family has been reinforced and clarified, the joy about the child has increased, the relationship between the couple improved. All in all, it is no point asking if daddies’ groups are needed. The strengthened relationship between parents will surely be reflected in a reduced number of divorces. Many mothers are worried about whether their partners are suitable as fathers if men are not involved during the pregnancy in the way mothers would hope. When they have been told how difficult and fragile fatherhood is before the birth of the child, that piece of information alone has saved many marriages. This is indicative of how poor the staff’s knowledge about fathers is at child health clinics. That should absolutely be improved. Reconciliation of work and family life is indeed faced with difficult challenges. The knowledge that fathers today want to stay at home to take care of children however facilitates solving the problem. In my opinion fatherhood is today in a better shape than ever and it brings pressures to society to respond to it.
5.3 Reform – Resource Centre for Men

_Ulf Rikter-Svendsen_

Reform started out as a project in 2002, with yearly support of € 250,000 from the Ministry of Family and Children Affairs. The project was initiated by KFM, a voluntary organization running a helpline for men since 1981. Reform is organized as an NGO with two full time employees. Reform was evaluated in 2004 and is now running as a national centre based in Oslo.

Reform’s basic values are:

- Gender equality
- Knowledge based
- Innovation
- Diversity
- Against violence
- Responsibility

And our vision is:

A society built on diversity and equality where power and care are shared independent of gender.

_Activities_

Reform participates in the national debate on gender equality, with a specific responsibility to voice men’s issues. The centre is working to prevent men’s use of violence and it is initiating different activities related to men, such as fathers groups, anger management courses etc. The centre also offers counselling, legal advice and seminars regarding men.

_Statistics_

Since 2002 Reform has received 1160 contacts, 88% of which are men and 12% women. The figures for 2004 (from the annual report of Reform, 2004) are:

- 365 new contacts
- 45 contacts with immigrant or ethnic minority background
- 109 legal advise
- 219 consultations with 83 men
- 43 men in anger management groups
- Over 90% fathers
The most common problems men are presenting:

- Divorce or separation 21%
- Relationship 16%
- Domestic violence perpetrator 15%
- Visiting arrangements with children 11%
- Mental health and lifestyle 10%
- Other 27%

*Experiences from six fathers groups in Oslo*

These groups were initiated and run by Per Are Løkke, psychologist and the author of the book “Farsrevolusjonen” (Pax forlag, Oslo 2002). The project was supported by the Ministry of Family and Children Affairs and initiated as a part of the ordinary parental training at two different public health centres in Oslo.

The fathers were focused on

- And motivated to prevent problems in partnership and divorce
- On “typical traps”
- The birth, what happens, how to deal with it, what is their place etc
- Emotional reactions
- The time after birth, how to deal with the strong mother–child relation, positioning
- How to become involved as a father from day one
- Fatherhood as an important project

*Experiences and challenges*

There were no problems in recruiting fathers to these groups. Løkke considered it important that group leaders are men. Also the group members viewed this as an important issue. This is a challenge since very few men are working at the public health centres.

*Group for fathers whose partner suffers from postnatal depression/mood disorder*

This is a project involving Reform and Aline poliklinikk (a mother/child centre) in Oslo. The project is supported by the foundation Helse og Rehabilitering in Norway as a project targeting average men/fathers in extremely challenging situations in order to support their ability to cope. Research shows that if the partner is supported, then the mother’s depression is easier to heal.
The group:

- 7 meeting over 14 weeks
- 9 fathers
- 2 male group-leaders (Espen Arnevik, psychologist and Ulf Rikter-Svendsen, family therapist)
- Focus on support and empowerment

The fathers focused on

- Their role as double caretakers
- Walking on the edge
- Anger and frustration
- The balance between work and family life
- How to do right
- Exchange of experiences
- Themselves

Experiences

There was no problem at all in recruiting men to this kind of a group. Out of 16 men invited to join the group, nine participated. There was a great diversity in the group, from minor to very serious problems. Some of the group members were fathers and some were becoming fathers during the time of the project. All of the participant were Norwegian and in relationship with the mothers. The project has not yet been evaluated, as it will end in December 2005.

Some challenges:

- The importance of male group-leaders
- The balance between support and challenge
- How to reach fathers with minority background
- How to measure the effects
5.4 Panel Report

**Maria Forslund**

The conference included a panel discussion about support groups for fathers (so called fathers’ groups). The panel participants have been actively involved in creating or directing organized fathers’ groups in Sweden, Norway and Finland. Their presentations about their activities can be found in this report. What follows is a summary of the panel discussion that followed their presentations.

A fathers’ group is a service that strives to enhance the father’s role within the family and his relationship with the child. The groups the panel discussants have been involved with highlight gender equality, responsibility, diversity, experiences and knowledge in promoting fatherhood. For example, Mats Berggren from Pappagrupperna i Södra Stockholm (Fathers’ groups in Southern Stockholm) said that the aim of fathers’ groups is to

Offer men the possibility to prepare themselves for an active fatherhood and an equal relationship towards their partner, with the child in focus.

Ilmo Saneri from Miessakit (Fellowship of Men’s Associations in Finland) explained that the purpose of fathers’ groups is to

Endorse the emotional, psychological and social growth of men, advance the internal interaction within families, strengthen the base of gender equality among men and develop the structures which strive to implement collective responsibility and shared support among men.

The work in fathers’ groups underlines and aims to strengthen men’s capabilities for a fulfilled fatherhood and thus to see beyond their biological restrictions and limitations. Fathers’ groups try to convey the role of the father irrespective of their life situation and by doing so manifest the rewarding aspects of fatherhood.

Parenthood is often feminized and the caring nature of women is believed to have a biological ground and to develop as such throughout childhood. Do fathers in contrast find themselves suddenly in a situation which they were not mentally prepared for, and are thus disadvantaged compared to their partners? This relates to empowerment of boys from an earlier stage and enhancing their relative competence. Some of the main concerns regard the way fatherhood is presented to young men. Rather than promoting a gender battle at home the focal point ought to be a cooperative approach towards the relationship between work and wife. Thus
the focus should be directed at the relationship between father and mother and not purely maintain a father focus. Fathers’ groups could in this way also function as a male forum where men can share their thoughts on both relationships and fatherhood.

Fathers’ groups primarily run as help networks for men and try to prevent problems in partnership and divorce or separation. Main functions also include helping men to recognize their place in the family and relationship once a child enters the picture and apprehend the emotion attached to this.

The panel discussion revealed two important basic tensions that are included in directing a fathers’ group. The first concerns talking about violence or stressing the joyful aspects of fatherhood. The birth of a child is emotionally stressing and can sometimes trigger violent episodes. Thus, talking about violence or potential violence or aggressive emotions can help to reduce the actual incidences of violence in a relationship. On the other hand, bringing up the topic of violence can be seen negatively by the father, as preaching. Talking about violence in fathers’ groups can reduce the father’s overall involvement in the group.

The second tension concerns the gender of the group’s leader. Can a female leader lead the forum? Will men be able to express themselves openly in the company of a non-male leader? Experiences are varied as some consider that there is no difference in sex as long as the leader isn’t the “all-knowing” wife or partner. This also reflects the current situation where male leaders are difficult to find. Other experiences indicate that men tend to be more reserved in the company of women and aren’t able to show their innermost feelings as openly as in an all male group. The contradictory perspectives show that there is not one right approach to developing fathers’ groups and in the functioning of those.

Some of the panellists expressed that one of the common concerns regarding fatherhood is the feminized approach to the institution of parenthood. The maternity discourse is still pervasive and thus leaves fathers easily outside the contest. Maternity leave and maternity packages are examples of the still existing and frequently used parenthood vocabulary. The choice of words inevitably affects fatherhood on a psychological level and consequently outstands them. The psychological effects of a feminized parenthood enforce the need to strengthen fatherhood from the inside. Experiences from fathers’ groups also reveal that wives have benefited greatly from men acknowledging their position and feelings in the new families.

A main concern still facing father’s groups is how to engage all fathers and fathers to become? The institutions and support networks of fatherhood don’t reach at all, and great regional differences are a fact in at least some Nordic countries.

Problem solution suggestions to the problematic of fathers’ groups
1. Information and education

- In order to assess the need for increasing fathers’ group activities, evaluation research about the positive and negative effects and cost effectiveness of fathers’ groups needs to be carried out.
- Fathers and fathers to become should be better informed of fathers’ groups and the available support networks.
- Fathers should be informed of the positive effects enhanced father roles have on both fatherhood and partnership.
- Empowerment of boys from an earlier age and enhancement of their relationship competence.

2. Processes and practices

- Questioning the way fatherhood is presented to young men. Rather than promoting a gender battle at home the focal point ought to be a cooperative approach towards the relationship between work and partnership.
- The focus should be directed at the relationship between partners and not purely maintain a father focus. In this way fathers’ groups could also function as a male forum where men can share their thoughts on both relationships and fatherhood.
- The most essential thing about fathers’ groups is that they provide men with their own space where they can discuss fatherhood without their partner being present.

3. General recommendations

- Information on fathers’ groups in general is needed.
- Fathers should be included in the parenthood vocabulary.
6. Workshop Group 1: Are Father’s Quotas in Parental Leave Effective?

Chair:
Senior Researcher Johanna Lammi-Taskula, National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health, Finland

Speakers:
Pentti Takala, Senior Researcher, Research Department, The Social Insurance Institution (KELA), Finland
Ingólfur Gíslason, Sociologist, Head of Department for Research and Information, Centre for Gender Equality, Iceland.
Friða Rós Valdimarsdóttir, BA in anthropology and gender studies. Founding member of Briet, an Icelandic feminist NGO in 1997.

6.1 Men’s Take Up of the New Finnish Paternity Leave

Pentti Takala

Use of family leaves by Finnish fathers has increased steadily: while in 1980, some 13% of fathers took family leaves, in 1991, the proportion was 45% and last year as high as 69%. However, the percentage of fathers taking family leaves exaggerates the positive development. If we consider fathers’ share of the total use of family leaves, their role seems less significant. Finnish fathers’ share of all family leave days is only 5.3%, while the respective figures for fathers in Iceland and Sweden are 27.6% and 18.3%. On average, Finnish fathers take rather short leaves.

The problem was addressed by a recent reform. Since the start of 2003, fathers have been able to take a new kind of paternity leave, which is also called the bonus leave. The purpose was to encourage fathers to participate more in childcare, and especially to take longer parental leaves. The reform was modelled after Nordic examples, with similar ‘father’s quotas’ having been introduced in Norway, Sweden and Iceland – and earlier in Denmark as well. They have been seen as promoting fathercare “by gentle force”, as Norwegian researchers have put it.

Until the reform, the Finnish system was comprised of three parts. A maternity allowance was paid to mothers during the first 105 weekdays of
pregnancy (maternity leave). During the next 158 weekdays (parental leave) allowance was payable to either the mother or the father, who could agree on how to share the leave. Thirdly, father could receive paternity allowance (for up to 18 weekdays) at any time the mother was on maternity or parental leave.

A fourth component was added in the 2003 reform. If the father has taken the last two weeks of the parental leave, he is entitled to two extra weeks of paternity allowance. The father has to take the extra weeks right after the end of the parental leave. Together, these four weeks have also been referred to as the ‘father’s month’. Strictly speaking, the month is not a quota in the Nordic sense because it is not an individual right of the father. The father can take the last two weeks of the parental leave only if he and the mother have agreed so.

Until now, the bonus leave has been only a moderate success. The Government’s proposal estimated that “some 20% of fathers would take advantage of the new additional days of paternity leave”. In actuality, though, only a fraction of the predicted number has done so. In 2003, only 3.7% of fathers took extra paternity leave. In the following year, the percentage nearly doubled to 7.1%, but is expected to remain about the same this year.

The Social Insurance Institution of Finland carried out a study about the use of the new bonus leave. We were mainly interested in identifying which fathers took advantage of the new benefit and how they differed from the other family leave users, and why did some fathers not use the new leave. The study focused on fathers who received paternity, parental or bonus allowance during a parental allowance period that ended in 2003. All were entitled to the new benefit.

The data were obtained from both a postal survey and a register extract. The register data covered 37,400 fathers. Data on age, occupation, income, types of benefit and duration of benefits were obtained from the benefit registers of the Social Insurance Institution. In the postal survey, we received answers from over 1,000 fathers. In addition to background data, we asked about how family leave-taking by fathers was viewed at the workplace, why fathers did not choose to go on parental or bonus leave, the division of labour within families, and attitudes related to gender roles.

Three mutually exclusive groups of fathers were used:

- Paternity leave fathers (n=34,300): men who had received only paternity allowance while the mother was on maternity or parental leave
- Parental leave fathers (n=1,100): men who had shared at least part of the parental leave with the mother (and might have been on paternity leave themselves)
• Bonus leave fathers (n=2,020): men who had shared the last two
weeks of parental leave and who were entitled to two extra bonus
weeks (and might have been on paternity leave themselves)

One of the most striking results from the study was how much educational attainment varied between the three groups of fathers. Bonus leave fathers were more highly educated than the other fathers, with 15% of paternity leave fathers having completed a university degree. The corresponding figures for parental leave fathers and bonus leave fathers were 25% and 30% respectively. Differences in their spouses’ educational attainment were equally clear.

Figure 14. Family leave taken by the father according to the father’s income (%).

Family leave use also varied according to the father’s income. In Figure 14, fathers are divided into income quintiles on the basis of the income of those fathers who took paternity leave, to produce an equal number of such fathers in each quintile (20%). Hence, there were somewhat fewer parental leave fathers in the lower quintiles (those with a lower income), but a little more than 20% in the two upper quintiles. In other words, parental leave fathers had slightly higher incomes than paternity leave fathers. In contrast, bonus leave fathers had substantially higher incomes than paternity leave fathers. Only 8% of the bonus leave fathers belonged to the lowest quintile and as many as 33% to the upper quintile.

Self-employed men – who generally speaking take much fewer family leaves than wage earners – seldom used the bonus leave option. Among wage earners, fathers doing technical work or working in health-care occupations were much more likely to take a family leave than would be expected on the basis of their age in the working population as a whole, favouring bonus leaves and parental leaves in particular. In contrast, men
employed in industry took bonus and parental leaves less often than would be expected on the basis of their representation in the working population. However, this group did include many users of the paternity leave. The same was true to some extent also of men employed in commerce.

Figure 15. Bonus and paternal leave use and the % age of the male employed workforce in certain occupations (%).

A similar pattern of variation with regard to the use of bonus and paternity leaves is shown in certain occupations, as represented in Figure 15. Men working in the technical sector (architects, engineers and technicians, supervisory staff in the technical sector, etc) were clearly over-represented among the men who had taken a bonus leave. Those working in health care, information technology, the security sector or essential services (firemen, police, custom officials, etc) and soldiers stood out as frequent users of the bonus leave. In contrast, men working in traditional blue-collar occupations were less likely to have taken a bonus leave. In particular, those in building construction, road transport or engineering and metal work preferred the paternity leave to the bonus leave. This group also included commercial agents, and men in packing and warehouse work.
The use of family leaves was also linked to the characteristics of the workplace. Fathers employed at large workplaces and at workplaces where women predominate were more likely to share the parental leave with their spouse or to take a bonus leave than fathers employed at other workplaces. However, this link was not very strong. The use of family leaves was also related to the division of household responsibilities. Mothers whose husbands only took a paternity leave were more likely to bear the main responsibility for childcare than mothers in other families. Moreover, gender role attitudes varied accordingly. Paternity leave fathers agreed more often with arguments for the traditional attitudes than bonus and parental leave fathers.

Finally, we asked why fathers did not use the bonus leave. The most common answer was that the rate of compensation was insufficient (37% of all answers). The inflexibility with regard to the timing of the leave was a common reason as well (17%). One father in ten felt that taking a leave would be harmful to their career. Very few fathers put the blame on their employer (2%). However, some employers expressed reluctance against longer leaves – like bonus leaves. The category “other reason” was the most common answer. Further analysis revealed that many fathers were unaware of the new benefit. Another reason given by many fathers was that the parental leave was seen as a benefit intended for the mother. Fathers did not use it because they did not wish to use their wife’s parental leave entitlement or their wife did not let them stay at home.

Is the Finnish father’s month an effective solution?

To be sure, the use of the parental leave by the fathers has increased since the bonus leave reform. In 2002, 2.6% of fathers received parental allowance, but in 2004, the proportion was 8.8%. However, expectations were higher, and new proposals have already been presented to improve the situation.

Yet the use of the new benefit was not evenly distributed across social classes. Bonus leave fathers – and their spouses – were clearly more highly educated and had a higher income than paternity leave fathers (and parental leave fathers as well). Bonus leave fathers also occupied a better position in the labour market than other fathers. It seems that the inflexible timing of the new bonus leave was not as big a problem for them as it was for the other families where mothers were more likely to stay at home and take a care leave after the parental allowance period.

Moreover, the fact that the father’s month is not an individual right of the father may influence the use of the leave. The mother and father have to agree on who is to take the last two weeks of the parental leave. In those families where the parental leave is seen as the mother’s benefit, the
mother may want to use it all. In these cases, the father is not entitled to the bonus weeks.

In conclusion, further efforts are needed to raise awareness of the father’s month option among employers and employees.
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6.2 “No Problem!” Icelandic Men and Paternity Leave

Ingólfur V. Gislon:

Maternity/paternity leave in Iceland

Although Iceland is one of the Nordic countries and shares many societal traits with them, a number of things have been different. Politically, the other Nordic countries have had a social democratic party as the largest and leading governmental party for most of the 20th century. In Iceland, on the other hand, the largest party has been a centre-right party called the Independence Party. The Social Democratic Party has been rather small. Among other things this has meant that the Icelandic welfare system has been somewhat different from the Scandinavian model and in some aspects has resembled more the system in the United Kingdom and Australia. This has for example meant that social benefits in Iceland have usually not been related to salary but have been administered at a flat rate. This applies for example for unemployment benefits and, until recently, maternity leave benefits. In a similar vein, general support for families was less comprehensive in Iceland than in other Nordic countries.

One of the aspects where Iceland lagged behind regarding support for families was in regard to maternity and paternity leave. Prior to 2000 the leave was shorter in Iceland than in the other Nordic countries, the economic compensation much lower and the leave was not flexible. Coupled to this was the fact that the system was rather complicated, very different rules for those working in the private sector than for those in public service, and in some aspects discriminatory against fathers. Last but not least
it became increasingly obvious that the only way forward regarding gender equality was to increase the participation of men (fathers) at home and to make it a similar “risk” for employers to hire women as men, i.e. that it was not a given fact that mothers more than fathers would (have to) prioritise family life over working life.

*Act on maternity/paternity leave*

This bill was presented to the Icelandic legislative assembly, Althingi, in the spring of 2000. It was unanimously adopted and Iceland experienced a veritable revolution regarding parental leave. The main changes can be summarized in 13 points:

- The total leave period was successively extended from six to nine months
- The mother has a three-months leave
- The father has a three-months leave and those months came in steps, one month in 2001, two months in 2002 and three months in 2003
- The parents can divide three months as they like
- The months assigned to the father and the mother are non-transferable except if either parent dies before having made full use of his or her non-transferable three months
- The parents can take the leave separately or together
- The parents can in cooperation with their employer divide the leave into separate periods or combine it with part-time work
- The parental leave has to be used before the child reaches the age of 18 months
- Employees are protected against dismissal after informing the employer that they intend to take parental leave
- Parents who have been working full time receive compensation during the leave, which amounts to 80% of their salary. In the original act there was no “ceiling” on the payment but now an upper ceiling has been introduced so that those who earn over ISK 600,000 receive only 80% of ISK 600,000. This is a very high ceiling, affecting about 3% of parents. On the other hand there has always been a “floor” meaning that if 80% of the salary is lower than a certain minimum the sum is raised.
- Minimum labour market participation for receiving salary related payment is 25%
- Students and people outside the labour force are entitled to a flat rate benefit if they have been living in Iceland for the past 12 months
- The payments come from a Parental Leave Fund which is financed by a part of the insurance premium which all employers pay as a part of the wages
Generally speaking the reform has been a huge success. The political consensus has been complete and opinion polls show that Icelanders generally support it. The only major surprise has been how easily and willingly Icelandic men have adapted to the changed circumstances. In fact, one of the main reasons why a ceiling had to be introduced and the insurance premium (or pay roll tax) raised somewhat that many more men used the parental leave than had been expected so that the Parental Leave Fund was rapidly diminishing. With the changes in the Act the fund is now sustainable.

Results so far:

**Table 2. Some figures on the use of maternity/paternity leave**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications from fathers</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of days used by fathers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of days used by mothers</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fathers using more than their basic right</td>
<td>484 or 14.5%</td>
<td>472 or 13.9%</td>
<td>584 or 16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of mothers using more than their basic right</td>
<td>3,819 or 94.2%</td>
<td>3,798 or 93.4%</td>
<td>3,811 or 90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fathers using less than their basic right</td>
<td>161 or 5.1%</td>
<td>342 or 10%</td>
<td>516 or 14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of mothers using less than their basic right</td>
<td>36 or 0.9%</td>
<td>31 or 0.8%</td>
<td>42 or 1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of fathers taking all of the leave in one package</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of mothers taking all of the leave in one package</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Around 86% of fathers use their right in full or in part, the average number of days used by fathers is 97 while the average number of days used by mothers is 183. Around 16% of fathers use some part of the three months that the parents can divide between themselves compared to around 90% of the mothers. About 14% of the fathers do not make use of all the time allotted to them, the same concerns only about 1% of the mothers. More and more parents divide the leave in one way or other (86% of the fathers and 54% of the mothers in 2003) but unfortunately we still do not have information regarding how the leave is divided. The

---

1. i.e. applications from men as percentage of applications from women
2. Only those who have been on the labour market
3. Only those who have been on the labour market
4. i.e. the percentage of men using more than their basic right, one month in 2001, two months in 2002 and three months in 2003
5. Three months
6. The leave can either be taken all in one package or divided in different ways
changes have obviously meant that more Icelandic fathers than ever are actively involved in the care of infants.

Qualitative studies: the fathers’ say

The main impression to be gained from the few qualitative studies that have been done so far is that the whole thing is running relatively smoothly. The fathers in general do not experience active opposition neither from their employers nor friends, family or others. Secondly the impression is that of cooperation between parents. They try to work the leave period out so that they share the joys and burdens and this is also something that characterises an ordinary day. One of the fathers was no longer living with the mother and the child was in her custody but he was still on full paternity leave and took care of the child except for the nights when the girl was usually with her mother:

I always have her during the day, it is different for how long but always from seven thirty except for the weekend. And it varies if I come and pick her up or if the mother brings her. We only live three minutes walk apart. ... I live in the next street. And I woke up at... the rule is that I wake up around seven thirty, go to her, her mother goes to school and I... Yesterday she was sick, my daughter, so I just stayed at their home and you know, fed her and did this and that until her mother came from school at six o’clock.

The fathers also say that generally speaking their employers were positive when they announced that they intended to take paternity leave. The general attitude among employers is simply that the fathers’ right to paternity leave is a social fact that every company has to take into account and solve the potentially emerging problems. Female dominated workplaces have always had to cope with this, now it concerns every workplace, female-dominated, male-dominated or mixed.

And last but not least the fathers say that their involvement has clearly meant that the parents are on a more equal footing regarding the child. Almost all the fathers mentioned something to that effect and also that their use of paternity leave was clearly a key factor in that area. When asked if his partner had had any difficulties handing him the main responsibility for the child and domestic labour one of the fathers replied:

No, that’s just it, you see. I think that because we are very much in this together, all of it, you see, and as a matter of fact that is how it has always been. And that is just so, that is why this time has been so, that’s why it is so important. Because when you can be there on the spot, when you can learn these things together with her, what you have to learn, then you are on equal footing. Even though she of course has a certain responsibility that I cannot shoulder, you know, breastfeeding, I can of course do everything else. And I have, during the time that we were together, then she could go out and leave me with the child and everything you know. Therefore I think that ... we have been equal in this.
But it is still obvious from the interviews that the mother is the gatekeeper in many ways. For example the parental leave is mainly planned by her or on the basis of her wishes. It is highly unlikely that a father would protest if the mother states that she intends to use the sharable months, even if he might have had other wishes. Generally though, the issue simply does not come up for discussion. One of the fathers was asked if it had always been clear that he would use the paternity leave:

Yes, yes that was never an issue. It was only a question of what the mother would do, how she wanted to... She just decided that she, she thought that it was practical to be on leave for eight months, especially since as it happens, the six months are over in the beginning of summer, which is a low point in her work you know and really not that interesting to come back then. So she decided to take her summer holiday and then a period without pay, and come back after the summer.

Finally, the fathers have generally met positive reactions from their immediate surroundings. No one regards the taking of paternity leave as something “unmanly” or tries to make fun of a father taking care of his child.

We don’t seem to have any attitude problem here, that people look down on men on paternity leave, I think it is quite the opposite. Now you are regarded as weird if you don’t use the paternity leave.

The employers say

Employers that have been interviewed express similar views. Obviously it presents problems when employees take leave but the problems can be solved. The flexibility also means that several possible solutions are always present. One female Director of Human Resources with a firm employing around 630 people was asked what she did when approached by a prospective father with a request for paternity leave:

Well we of course just discuss it, how do you want to take the leave? How long are you going to take? Some want to be away for a whole year. And we have accepted that. Then we just hire someone temporarily to take that place. People get their old job back when they return... if there are special wishes then we try to meet them, it is easier if it is a job that is done in the evening. It is more difficult with daytime jobs. It is difficult to find people for the daytime jobs and if someone wanted to be on leave one week and work the next and so on then it would be difficult for me to solve that. But of course everything is possible.

It is also obvious from interviews with employers as well as fathers that parents use the leave period very differently. However it appears that it is usual that both parents are on leave for one to three weeks following the birth. Then the father returns to work while the mother makes use of her months and the shareable months and when that time is over she goes back to her work and the father enters the home to make use of what is
left of his time. One of the employers interviewed described the general use of paternity leave thus:

... there always is in the beginning, some time together, but for those with women on the labour market, then I think it is more common that those fathers use the paternity leave after six months. To lengthen the period at home with the child.

When the employers were asked if they saw paternity leave bringing anything positive into the firm the answers were hesitant. It should be kept in mind that it is a relatively new situation and possible effects have not shown yet. One Director of Human Resources in a male-dominated firm contributed this:

On the other hand I think that this is going to change a certain culture within the firms. I mean regarding children or, how should I put it, people’s opinions or how superiors think regarding parents who need certain flexibility in their work today. And more so nowadays than often before. And people have to be at home with sick children and so on, as much fathers as mothers. And this has been changing. I imagine that many superiors, especially the old ones, have a hard time coming to terms with this change.

Final remarks

All in all the new Act on maternity and paternity leave in Iceland has been a huge success. Families with children are clearly better off financially than before, more fathers are actively involved in the care taking of young children than before and there are clear indications that the labour market is becoming more egalitarian. And, perhaps as a result of this, the fertility rate in Iceland is again going up, from 1.93 children in 2002 to 2.03 children in 2004. But obviously we still have a long way to go regarding gender equality. Much in the culture and structure of society still underpins the notion of women being first and foremost mothers while a man’s major role in life is to be the provider in the family. However due to the massive changes that have taken place in gender relations since married women, mothers, decided to enter the labour market in the sixties these factors are more relics of the past than something that actively shapes the life of men and women. Icelandic men have not had any difficulty in adapting to the new situation. On the contrary, they welcomed this opportunity to do what they had earlier said that they wanted to do. And they were not encumbered by ideas that it was unmanly to take care of a young child or that is was incompatible with masculinity to change diapers or put on an apron to make the home a better place for themselves, their partner and the children.
6.3 Nordic Experiences on Parental Leave and it’s impact on Gender Equality

*Friða Rós Valdimarsdóttir*

**Short historical overview on parental leave**

The main motivation for the first law on leave for new mothers in the beginning of last century was the hope of reducing the rate of infant mortality. Another aim was to protect the health of mother and child as well as to strengthen the relationship between working mothers and their children. But this early legislation was not conceptualised as a way of accommodating working mothers in their careers.

In the 1960’s, when women’s participation in employment rose greatly, there was much discussion about whether to hang on to the idea of the male breadwinner or instead to turn to a model that could facilitate two breadwinners in a single household. As women were participating in the paid workforce to a much greater degree than before, it became necessary to establish public childcare and other types of support for parents to enable them to both work outside the home and raise their children.

There were two main routes taken when men were granted parental leave. One was via a father’s quota, which could not be transferred onto the mother. The other was by creating a joint parental leave, which the two parents could share between themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Iceland</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length in weeks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length in weeks</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sweden was the first country in the world to establish leave for fathers when the relevant laws were passed to give parents 7 months of shared parental leave in 1974. The first leave for fathers was however introduced in Norway in 1977. The first paternity leave\(^7\) was introduced in Norway 1993 and called “father’s month”. Now all the Nordic countries have father’s quotas. The main motive of these laws is to get men to take more responsibility in homes and in childcare and strengthen women’s position in the work place.

\(^7\) To be used when the mother is also at home

\(^8\) That type of leave for fathers is called father’s quota.
Fathers’ utilization of rights

The success of parental leave legislation can be defined, for example, in terms of how well men exercise their rights. The more they use their rights, the more successful it can be seen. There are several ways to measure success in this sense and one is by looking at how many men utilize their right to the leave.

When we look at how common it is for men to take parental leave compared to women, it appears that Sweden has the greatest level of balance in the Nordic countries in this respect. Sweden is followed closely by Iceland, then Denmark, Finland, and finally Norway has the least number of men, compared to women, who take parental leave.

Table 4. Men’s usage of parental leave (as percentage of women’s usage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Iceland</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nososco, 2005

This development has been relatively stable in Denmark, Finland and Norway. In Sweden, the ratio of men-to-women taking parental leave has risen faster but Iceland has had the greatest increase of this ratio in all of the Nordic countries. It is worth noting that out of the five countries, Sweden and Iceland are the only places where the total number of men utilising parental leave has reached 60% of the number of women who use parental leave each year.

Another measure of success is how much leave men are taking. When we look at how parental leave is divided between men and women until 2003, it becomes apparent that women use the bulk of leave-days.

Table 5. Men’s share of total days of parental leave (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Iceland</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nososco, 2005

In 1995, 2000 and 2003 the men-to-women usage ratio was quite similar in Denmark, Finland and Norway. Men used less than 9% of all parental leave days – leaving over 90% of all parental leave to women. Sweden has usually had the highest percentage of male days, rising from 10% to 18% between 1995 and 2003.
Iceland is a bit unique compared to the other Nordic countries. Early on men hardly used any parental leave but as soon as they were given non-transferable father’s quota things have developed rapidly. In 2000 the percentage of male-days was still fairly low but in 2001 – when men got 1 month of independent non-transferable leave – it went up to 11.5%. In 2002 they got their second month and that year men in Iceland used 19.6% of all parental leave days. This development has continued and in 2003, Icelandic men took, in a manner of speaking, the lead and now use 27.6% of all parental leave days that are paid out in Iceland.

Flexibility and restrictions on paternity leave

It is important to examine the possible reasons why men in Denmark, Finland and Norway take less parental leave than elsewhere in the Nordic countries, and also why these two countries seem to have the slowest growth of men using parental leave among the Nordic countries.

One thing that sticks out is that in these countries there are greater restrictions on men’s right to parental leave than in Sweden and Iceland. It should be obvious that the more restrictions we place on people’s rights, the harder it is for them to pursue their rights. And it seems logical that the harder it is to pursue them, the less likely people actually exercise their rights. Rights can hardly be seen as real if people do not have a realistic chance of using them and it appears that in some of the Nordic countries the restrictions imposed on parental leave are limiting the potential of this opportunity for the advancement of gender equality.

It appears that parental leave laws in Finland are structured in a way that limits the potential of parental leave as a tool for furthering equality. Firstly, the laws do not seem to be flexible enough for parents to exercise their rights. One reason is that a person must take all of his or her leave in one stretch; it can not be split into smaller portions. This, in all likelihood, reduces people’s chances of utilising their right to parental leave in full.

There are also some restrictions when people want to combine leave and paid employment at the same time. For this to happen one must have the approval of the employers of both parents, since it is only possible to have partial leave if the other parent does the same. Not to mention single parents, for this is not something they can do.

Finland has a form of “father-bonus” scheme, which gives those men who have used 2 weeks or more of the joint parental leave, the option of 2 extra weeks. But for this to be possible one must satisfy two conditions. The first is that the mother must have entered paid employment before the father can use his 2 extra weeks. The other condition is that these bonus weeks must come at the very end of the entire period, which the parents are on leave.
This bonus scheme is an interesting concept and can be seen as a reward for those fathers who use a greater part of the shared leave period than others. But due to these conditions one would expect that their usefulness is somewhat limited, and by lifting the restrictions it is likely that it would act as a greater force of motivation for fathers to use more leave.

Finland is not the only country that faces problems in relation to this, and it cannot be said that any of the Nordic countries has a perfect system. But it also seems that the countries could learn quite a bit from each other, and I would now like to discuss some elements in the legislation of other Nordic countries that Finland might want to consider.

In Norway for example, there is more emphasis on flexibility, particularly with regard to partial leave. The Norwegian government has also taken actions designed to help parents combine paid employment with parental leave and this is especially designed with men in mind.

Iceland rose from the lowest level of male participation in parental leave usage to a very active involvement among men in a very few years. It appears that by giving a part of the total leave period specifically to men the government has managed to motivate men enormously in this respect. Iceland and Sweden are currently the only countries where men and women have an equal amount of leave days earmarked for them. In Iceland, that amounts to 3 months. There is also some degree of flexibility in the parental leave legislation in Iceland, it is for example possible to take leave in several parts, although the leave must be taken in the first 18 months of the child’s life. And it is also possible to combine employment and partial leave, but this depends on the acceptance of the employer.

Sweden can be said to be spearheading the development of parental leave in the Nordic countries in some ways. Although Sweden allots 2 months specifically to men, where Iceland allots 3 months, the total leave period in Sweden is the highest anywhere in the Nordic countries. The level of flexibility is also highest in Sweden and parental leave can also be spread out over a long period. The parental leave laws in Sweden therefore appear to be structured with the aim of encouraging people to use it rather than to enforce conditions that may limit the potential of the laws.

It is important to remember that one of the goals of parental leave legislation is to aid parents in the upbringing of their children. Where paternity leave is concerned, one of the aims is to motivate fathers to be active participants in the household and by doing this, to help balance the position of men and women in the workplace. Naturally, it is important to carry these ideas out in the best possible way in order to extract the maximum gain from them.

If we look at the factors that appear to be most important, our starting point might be the length of the parental leave period. One question immediately comes to mind: Should we emphasize longer parental leave, or should we focus on how well parents are compensated? Naturally, a long
leave with 100% compensation would give the best results. This is perhaps not realistic, and so we must weigh the options. Longer leave will give parents more time with their children, but higher compensation will attract a greater number of people when it comes to using parental leave. Here Norway has provided an interesting option, allowing parents to decide themselves whether to get 100% compensation or 80% compensation with longer leave period.

Apart from the length of leave and compensation, the level of flexibility seems to play an important part. Low levels of flexibility limit the usage of parental leave. But when flexibility is greater and parents are given more chance of making the parental leave fit other elements of their lives we should see an increase in the levels of leave utilisation.

However, flexibility alone is not enough. In Denmark, for example, where the system is quite flexible, men took less parental leave in 2003 than in 2002. What may explain this reduction is that the fathers’ quota was partly removed. Fathers in Denmark now have only 2 weeks of leave which they must use before the child reaches 18 months of age.

Also, in the case of Norway, while flexibility is high and a father’s quota is used, there are still certain restrictions. For example, the payments the father will get while on leave depend to a large extent on how much the mother works. If the mother works half time (50%) but the father full-time (100%), the father will only get 50% of his usual salary while on leave.

Why don’t some men use paternity leave?

Some studies suggest that parents discuss how to utilise their parental leave, while other studies imply that they do not. Again, there are studies that indicate that men are not aware of their right to paternity leave, while results of other studies tell the opposite. But what does not seem to be disputed is that in the Nordic countries, childcare is still generally considered to be the task of the mother. This mentality is something that authorities in each country must do their best to change. Men’s usage of parental leave beyond their own quota is still not considered to be a “normal” consequence of them becoming fathers. In the end, the shared parental leave often functions as a part of the mother’s quota.

Conclusions

It is evident that the introduction of paternity leave in the Nordic countries was a huge step forwards for gender equality. A great deal of preparation and resources has gone into this ambitious project in all the Nordic countries, but we must still examine if we can do better.

---

9 These laws were changed in January 2005. From then on, fathers get payments relative to their own previous salary.
There is strong reason to believe that the limitations and lack of flexibility when it comes to paternity leave reduce the usage of it among fathers, and it would be justified to wonder whether this is a case of saving the penny while losing the pound.

Perhaps the most important thing relates to the father’s quota. There is good reason to believe that earmarking a substantial part of the parental leave for the father, functions as a motivating force for them to use parental leave. If I were to suggest just one change in the parental leave laws in Finland, this would be it.

In my opinion it is important to do away with the legal hindrances that reduce men’s chances of utilising paternity leave to its full extent. If we do not the aim of this otherwise excellent piece of legislation — to help bring about equality between men and women in the workplace and in the home — may not be fulfilled.

In conclusion: If we do not try to make it easier for men to take paternity leave we are missing a fantastic opportunity for paternity leave to become the powerful tool it has the potential to be in the fight for the equality of the sexes.
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6.4 Workshop Report

Reetta Siukola

Discussion

One of the three workshops discussed parental leave legislation and the father’s quota in the Nordic countries. Participants found the father’s quota an important and effective way to offer men better possibilities to take family leave and play a more active part in childcare. Most importantly it was seen as a significant individual right for men – not as an obligation. In addition to legislative tools attention was also paid to some contextual factors, e.g. cultural attitudes, employment situation and other social benefits, which may work so that they either encourage men to take the leave or discourage them from it.

The discussion focused on two themes. The first theme was about its goals: whether or not it helps to promote gender equality and give men better possibilities to take part in childcare as equal parents. This was seen possible only if the man was given the time and possibility to act as the primary caretaker; to care for the child (or children) and build a relationship with them independent of the mother. To reach this goal four possible alternatives for developing the legislation in the Nordic countries were mentioned:

- One possibility is to lengthen the parental leave period to, for example, one year.
- To increase the level of parental leave compensation is one way to make it more tempting also for men.
- A third possibility is to focus on the flexibility of the parental leave, e.g. when and in how many periods one can take the leave.
- Finally, it is possible to reserve a share of parental leave only for men (father’s quota). This share must be non-transferable.

The second theme in the discussion was the Icelandic parental leave model, which gave a good standard for comparison for other Nordic countries. The Icelandic model seems to have reached the goals that have been set for it: it has increased the fertility rate and the participation of fathers in childcare. It has also improved the economic situation of families with children and probably also the position of women on the labour market. The model has been a success not only among the fathers but also among employers (this mainly because the costs are paid collectively). However, in the discussion some further questions were raised about the special features, preconditions and, most importantly, the applicability of the
Icelandic model in other countries. For example it is possible in Iceland for the mother and the father to take their three-month shares of the parental leave at the same time. This does not necessarily increase men’s participation in childcare. In reality it seems also that the Icelandic women do not return to work after their parental leave period is over. Instead they stay at home without any economic compensation at least until they are provided with access to day care for the child. This happens normally when the child is between the ages of 1.5 and 2 years. Furthermore, one of the main reasons for why the model has been such a huge success in Iceland is the situation of (almost) full employment. The employees have better opportunities to negotiate about the use of their parental leave than in other countries where options are more limited due to the fear of harming one’s career opportunities or even the security of keeping the job.

In all, contextual factors in each country were seen important when considering parental leave legislation. One of the main factors is the mother’s position on the labour market. If a woman is educated and actively involved in working life she is more willing to let the father do his share of the parental duties. On the other hand, if a woman has intended to take a longer child-care leave it might be difficult for her to return to work during the father’s quota period. Also attitudes and social expectations play an important role. This includes the views and attitudes of the parents – mother and father – and also the attitudes at the workplace (employer’s and other employees’ views) and in society in general. For example the views about (proper) masculinity and femininity, a man and a woman, may be very restrictive and have an impact also on parental leave practices. For example, if the woman’s role in childcare is seen primary or essential it is very difficult for the man to step in.

Recommendations

1. Legislation

- The most important thing is to give men an individual right to take parental leave. This right should be independent of the views of the employer and the mother of the child.
- In Finland a genuine father’s quota should be implemented. The existing father’s bonus leave benefits only the more educated and well-paid families, who can afford to take the leave even without any compensation.
- The father’s quota should be long enough to encourage the father to take the leave and give him a real possibility to be the primary caretaker of the child. It should also be possible to use the father’s quota at any time after the child is born.
- The costs of parental leave benefits should be paid collectively.
• Parental leave which is taken on a part-time basis should lengthen the whole parental leave period.
• Diversity, meaning different kinds of family models, sexual orientations, ethnic backgrounds etc., should be taken into consideration when reforming family legislation.

2. Research
• More comparative research is needed about the parental leave models and contextual conditions in the Nordic countries. Also parental leave negotiations and practices in the families should be investigated, e.g. how the shareable leave is divided and how the parental leave is used?
• Information is needed also about the effects of the implementation of the father’s quota: has it really promoted equality?

3. Information and education
• Both men and women need information of their rights and possibilities concerning parental leave. Information should be given e.g. at maternity clinics or at local social security institutions.
• Mothers and fathers also need motivation to change their values and attitudes about childcare and parental leave practices.
7. Workshop Group 2: Can an Employee of the 21st Century Have a Family?

Chair:
Minna Rantalaiho, Norwegian Centre for Child Research (NOSEB), Norway

Speakers:
Hanna Sutela, Senior Researcher, Work Research Unit, Statistics Finland.
Jouni Kempe, Researcher, Work Research Centre, University of Tampere, Finland.
Katri Otonkorpi-Lehtoranta, Researcher, Work Research Centre, University of Tampere, Finland.

7.1 Men’s Reconciliation of Work and Family – Latest Trends According to Quality of Work Life Surveys

Hanna Sutela
Finnish wage and salary earning parents are offered quite a variety of measures for facilitating reconciliation between work and family life. Especially young fathers are increasingly taking advantage of these opportunities. This paper studies men’s reconciliation of work and family life basing on the findings of the Finnish Quality of Work Life Surveys.

Value placed on work – and family

There has been discussion in recent years on whether “soft values” and so called familism are gaining ground as a counterbalance to the ever increasing demands of working life (Jallinoja 2003, Julkunen et al. 2004).

---

10 The Quality of Work Life Surveys are extensive studies involving between 3,000 and 6,000 persons and covering the entire wage and salary earning population in Finland. Up to now, Statistics Finland has carried out five of them, in 1977, 1984, 1990, 1997 and 2003. The surveys are implemented as personal, face-to-face interviews lasting, on average, one hour. The response rate of these surveys has varied between 91% in 1977 to 78% in 2003.
The Finnish Quality of Work Life Surveys (QWLS) does not indicate any notable decrease in the importance employees place on work in general. However, an analysis by age shows that something has changed, indeed, among young men and young fathers aged under 35. Among these employees there has been a clear decrease in how highly gainful employment is valued – and at the same time some growth has occurred in the value placed on family.

In 1997, two in three male employees (63%) and a good half of women (58%) regarded gainful employment as a very important life content. Six years later, in 2003, the respective shares were 61% for men and 56% for women. The most notable change is to be found among fathers aged under 35: the share of those valuing work as a very important life area had dropped from 67 to 57%. (Figure 16.) Interestingly, no change is to be found among young women between 1997–2003. For young women aged under 35, the respective share had remained at 56%, and for mothers in this age group at 52%.

Figure 16. Gainful employment very important life content. Male employees by age and family status

Home and family life are highly valued by practically all wage and salary earners. Women value this area of life even more highly than men – the difference is clear especially among employees without a partner or children. However, there has been a slight growth in this area among men since 1997, especially among fathers aged under 35 as well as among older men of childless couples. (Figure 17.)
Figure 17. Home and family life very important life content. Male employees by age and family status

Source: Quality of Work Life Surveys 1997 and 2003

Thus, it is interesting to observe that the attitudes of young men and fathers tend to approach those of young women and mothers as regards the importance placed on different life areas.

Family leaves

Attitudes at workplace

In the past few years fathers have been more and more actively encouraged to use their rights to family leaves. The reform of the parental leave system in 2003 was part of these endeavours.

The Gender Barometer indicates, indeed, that the attitudes of employers towards men’s family leaves have become more positive during the past few years. It is clearly easier for men to take paternity, parental or home care leave in the public sector than in the private sector, though. In 2004, about 70% of employees in the public sector – compared to less than 60% in 2001 – believed that it was not at all difficult for fathers to take parental or home care leave at their workplace. In the private sector the respective proportions were about 40% in 2004 and 30% in 2001. Attitudes towards short paternity leaves were considered to be more positive. Roughly 90% of employees in the public and 80% in the private sector reported that it was not at all difficult for fathers to take paternity leave. (Melkas 2004.)

According to the 2003 Quality of Work Life Survey, every sixth (17%) wage and salary earner had noticed special measures taken at his/her workplace to encourage men to take family leaves. This is more commonly observed in the state (24%) and municipal sectors (20%) than in the private sector (15%).
Paternity and parental leaves
Quality of Work life Surveys show that the use of family leaves has clearly increased among fathers from the beginning of 1990s. The younger the fathers, the more commonly they have taken family leaves. In 2003, two in three male employees with children aged under 18 living at home told that they had been temporarily absent from working life for continuous periods because of caring for children (Table 6). Among fathers aged under 35, as many as three in four had been absent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father’s age</th>
<th>1990*</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20–34 yrs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–44 yrs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–54 yrs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64 yrs</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only those entitled to family leaves (children aged under 12)
** Not enough observations

The attitude of the employer is of crucial importance here. The fathers, at whose workplace men are encouraged to take family leaves, have used their rights more often (77%) than other fathers (63%). Like the results of Johanna Lammi-Taskula (2004), the QWLS also show that middle-income fathers have used their rights more commonly than fathers with either low or high income.

The family leaves fathers have taken seem to be predominantly paternity leaves: the average duration of the absence of the fathers having been absent from work has been about a month or less.

Temporary care leave
When a child under the age of ten falls ill, one parent is entitled to four days’ leave from work in order to arrange childcare. Whether the parent is paid salary during this period depends on the applicable collectively bargained agreement.

Today, it is no longer obvious that it is the mother who stays at home with the sick child. According to the 2003 QWLS, in families with two full-time employed parents and children aged under ten, 71% of mothers and 64% of fathers had been absent from work due to a child’s illness in the previous 12 months. The difference between the sexes has narrowed down considerably since 1984 when mothers had been absent from work due to a child’s illness twice as often as fathers.

Almost 40% of the fathers with children aged under ten did not know for how many days, if any, they would be paid during the absence. About
one in ten (12%) told that they were not paid for a single day of absence in 2003. However, it seems to make no difference whether the parent is paid during his/her temporary care leave.

Only those parents who were paid during their absence and who also knew for how many days are considered in the following. Under this definition 75% of mothers but also 72% of fathers with a partner employed full-time and children under the age of ten had been absent due to a child’s illness during the last 12 months. Even though upper white-collar fathers have absences much more commonly than blue-collar workers when all fathers are considered, the difference between the socio-economic groups narrows down if pay is taken into account. Furthermore, among white-collar employees as well as among blue-collar workers, fathers tend to have more absences than mothers if only those employees who get paid during their absence are considered. (Figure 18.)

The results may indicate that in many cases the decision about which of the parents will stay at home is today based on economic reasons. Couples may consider that it is economically more beneficial for the mother rather than the father to be absent from work if the absence would mean the loss of a day’s salary – men’s pay is usually higher than women’s. This seems to apply especially to blue-collar workers.

Again, attitudes at the workplace play a role. If men are encouraged to take family leaves at the workplace, 77% of fathers have been absent due to a child’s illness, whereas the respective share is 63% for other fathers with a partner employed full-time and children aged under ten.

**Working hours**

A culture of full-time employment prevails in Finland. Finnish women and mothers do not work part-time as commonly as women in other Nordic countries – and when they do, it is rather because of lack of full-time
work than because of taking care of children. Among Finnish fathers, part-time work is practically non-existent (2%). Indeed, Finnish parents in families with two carers work full-time more commonly than other wage and salary earners, and the average weekly working hours of these families are also the longest. In autumn 2003, the average usual weekly working hours were 40 for fathers and 38 for other men. Fathers with children aged from 3 to 11 accumulated the longest weekly working hours exceeding 40. However, it is interesting to note that among the fathers with children aged under three the length of weekly working hours had decreased from the late 1990s, being roughly 39 hours in 2003.

Overtime work
The shortening of weekly working hours among fathers with small children is quite an interesting development over the past few years. In the 1990s, fathers of children aged under three worked the longest hours and did more overtime work than other men (Lammi-Taskula 1997, Sauli 1998, Sutela 1999). However, in 2003, expressly these fathers worked less overtime weekly than other men. It is true that overtime work has decreased for men in general, but this decrease is particularly clear for fathers with small children. (Figure 19.)

Figure 19. Working overtime weekly. Male employees by age of youngest child

Furthermore, if these fathers do work overtime weekly, they consider their overtime work as excessive more commonly (44%) than other men working weekly overtime (33%).

This development is reinforced when we examine the views respondents have of their partner’s workload. In 2003, female wage and salary earners with an employed partner expressed less frequently (45%) than in 1997 (53%) the view that their partner worked too hard. The biggest decrease is, again, to be found among the views of mothers with children under the age of three. Actually, these mothers considered their partner’s
workload as too hard less frequently than other women in 2003. In 1997, the situation had been almost the opposite. (Figure 20.)

A decrease is also to be seen in men’s views on their partner’s workload. In 1997, half of the men with an employed partner thought that their partner was working too hard, whereas in 2003 the respective share was 38%.

**Demands at home**

Household chores

In general, childcare and playing with children is quite equally shared by both partners in Finland nowadays. Especially the elder fathers have become more active than before in this respect. In families with two full-time employed carers, over 80% of the fathers aged under 35 reported both in 1997 and in 2003 that childcare and playing were shared equally between the partners. In 2003, the respective share among fathers aged 45 and over was also 77%, having been 63% in 1997.\(^\text{11}\)

However, when it comes to actual household chores, like cleaning, cooking, etc., it is still the wife who shoulders the main responsibility – even when both partners are employed full-time. Nevertheless, some positive development is to be seen. In this respect, it is the age of 35, which seems to make the difference. In the 2003 QWLS, respondents aged under 35 reported clearly more often than their older counterparts – and clearly more often than their peers of the same age in 1997 – that

---

\(^\text{11}\) These figures are calculated for those fathers who consider the question of childcare (still) applicable. About 40% of fathers with the youngest child aged over 11 do not consider the question of childcare and playing with children applicable any more.
housework was shared equally between spouses. This applied especially to cooking, food shopping and cleaning.12

It has been shown that the distribution of household chores tends to grow more unbalanced for young couples when the first child is born, though (Niemi & Pääkkönen 1992, Takala 2005). Generous family leaves contribute to this process if women continue to be their predominant users: during a long family leave the wife assumes the main responsibility for household chores even in couples where a more egalitarian model prevailed before. It is difficult to rebalance the situation when the mother returns to work. (Moss & Deven 1999, Nyberg 2004).

This can be observed also on the basis of the QWLS. When considering couples aged under 35 and employed full-time it can be seen that the distribution of household chores is more equal in (yet) childless families than in those with children. Fortunately, there has been some progress in this respect compared to the situation at the beginning of the 1990s. (Figure 21.)

There is some evidence of the fact that the men who have taken family leaves also do more household chores than other men – at least according to their own reporting (Lammi-Taskula 2004, 54; Brandth & Överli 1998, 50–51, quoted by Lammi-Taskula 2004). The QWLS also shows that the fathers who have been absent from work because of childcare for at least three months report the distribution of household chores to be more equal than other fathers in families with two carers employed full-time even when adjusted for age. During a short period of paternity leave the father is at home simultaneously with the mother. It is only during the parental

---

12 In this respect taking and fetching the children to and from day care, school or hobbies is an interesting exception: older fathers are more active in this respect than their younger counterparts. Since older fathers have older children, this taking and fetching is connected with hobbies rather than day care or school.
or home care leave, when the mother has returned to work, that the father has to take the main responsibility at home. It may be only then the father realises the extent to which the housework has increased with the birth of the child. On the other hand, the presumption that fathers taking longer family leaves are from the outset more family oriented than other fathers may have some effect.

The distribution of housework is by no means a detail of minor importance from the point of view of the family’s and men’s own well-being. According to the Gender Barometer, the distribution of household chores is the primary reason for conflicts among couples. Money and childcare come long after it. (Melkas 2004.) The QWLS also shows that the distribution of household chores and the prevalence of conflicts at home have a clear correlation.

Conflicts about time
Conflicts about working hours, household work and personal time are clearly connected with the family stage. Conflicts are almost inevitable in families with small children – the younger the children and the more of them, the more commonly conflicts prevail. About 70% of parents with children aged under three report conflicts at least from time to time, whereas the respective share for parents with children aged 12 to 17 is “only” 44%.

Figure 22. Conflict about time at home, at least from time to time. Employees by overtime done and family stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overtime Weekly</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No children, under 40 yrs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (aged under 7)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (aged 7 to 11)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (aged 12+ yrs)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No children, 40+ years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Quality of Work Life Survey 2003

Frequent overtime work, work done or frequently thought about at home as well as being contacted in work matters outside actual working hours are factors increasing the likelihood of conflicts at home. (Figure 7.) So do also long working hours and unequally distributed household chores, as already mentioned above. On the other hand, the parents’ possibility to
use flexible working hours sufficiently for their own needs decreases conflicts at home.

Work – Life Balance?
Feelings of neglecting home matters because of one’s job were no longer quite as common among wage and salary earning men in 2003 (23%) as they were six years earlier (28%). The younger the children and the more of them, the more frequently parents encounter such feelings. Among parents of children aged under three mothers tend to have these feelings more commonly (46%) than fathers (37%), but there is no difference between the sexes (23%) any more when children are aged 12 and over.

The problems in reconciliation between work and family are increasingly given emphasis in today’s discussions. However, this also encompasses positive aspects. On the one hand, the family can be a source of strength for coping with working life. For example, to their surprise Julkunen et al. (2004) found that parents report less frequently fatigue due to work than do other employees. They contemplate whether the children provide in this case the important “other” on which to focus and protect oneself from the harmful effects of working life. On the other hand, opportunities to express oneself at work can contribute to a more balanced family life. According to the 2003 QWLS, it seems to be especially important for Finnish mothers to be able to work outside the home in order to cope better with the children – and two thirds of fathers are also of this opinion (Figure 23).

Figure 23. “I cope better with my children when I also go to work”. Employees by sex and age of youngest child

By European comparison, Finnish fathers seem to cope relatively well in combining work and family demands. In the European Working Conditions Survey 2000, respondents were asked how well their working hours fit with their family or social commitments outside work in general. At
the EU-15 level, male wage and salary earners employed full-time and
with children aged under 15 had problems in this respect more commonly
(24%) than their peers without children (17%). Interestingly, there was no
difference between fathers and non-fathers in Finland, and the overall
proportion of men having problems in this respect (15%) was not very
high, either. (Figure 24.) (Pärnänen et al. 2005.)

To sum up, the Quality of Work Life Surveys seem to indicate that some
sort of family-centeredness has been increasing in particular among
young fathers in the past few years. Young fathers use more actively their
rights to family leaves and are more often absent from work due to a
child’s illness than in the late 1990s. The effect of active measures taken
at the workplace to encourage men to take these leaves cannot be over-
looked here.

Furthermore, especially the fathers of small children have reduced
their working hours and work considerably less often overtime than in the
1990s. This trend is confirmed by the mothers of small children: they
report less frequently that their partner is working too hard. Young men
also participate more actively in housework, even if there still is room for
improvement in this respect.

This workshop raised the question of whether an employee of the 21st
century can have a family. Basing on the findings of the Finnish Quality
of Work Life Surveys I would say that the answer is yes, he/she can. I
would even go further and claim that yes, he/she wants both, work and
family.
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7.2 Family-Friendly Personnel Policy and Workplace Culture – Challenges for Working Life

Jouni Kempe & Katri Otonkorpi-Lehtoranta:

Introduction
This article addresses the possibilities and challenges for a family-friendly workplace culture and looks at the issue from the standpoint of the work community. We briefly look at various dimensions of supporting family–work reconciliation at the workplace level and address some points in participatory action research as a method to increase family-friendliness and to make it a part of the workplace culture. Finally, we present a few examples from the data collected in our ongoing project to shed light on this subject.

This article is based on two projects carried out at the Work Research Centre of the University of Tampere, one of them being “Family-friendly Practices in Working Life” carried out in 2002–2003 and the other an ongoing project called “Family and Work” carried out in co-operation with The Institute for Extension Studies (TYT) at the University of Tampere in 2004–2006. The “Family and Work” project is a participatory action research project whose main task is to study and support workplaces in developing family-friendly practices.

Dimensions of supporting Family – Work reconciliation
In Finland, the legal framework for reconciliation of work and private life consists of legislation and collective agreements as well as by local agreements. Although there are various arrangements created to reconcile family and work, the problem is that there is not much information on the possibilities or incentive to use these arrangements, which in turn leads to their inactive use.

According to the survey conducted in the “Family-friendly Practices in Working Life” project among persons responsible for personnel administration (n=125), employers do not actively recommend or even inform the personnel about family leaves and other statutory arrangements that make reconciling family and work easier. The most common way to provide information on these kinds of arrangements is to give it when the employee asks for it (36%), and nearly as often they are included in the job orientation material (34%). Of the respondents, 72% stated that family and work issues and their reconciliation are not raised at the time of recruitment. Furthermore, 79% stated that the needs to reconcile family and work have not been systematically investigated at their workplace. The interviews made at five workplaces (n=25) also revealed the employ-
ees’ feelings about the fact that the initiative and responsibility for clarifying these issues in practice lie with the employee. (Kivimäki & Oton-korpi-Lehtoranta 2003, 106–107)

Considering the work community level, another important dimension of reconciling family and work consists of work processes, the nature of work and organization: when, how much – regarding working hours and amount of work – and where work is performed. Also, functioning and flexible working arrangements which take into account the needs of both the employer and the employee have been seen to increase work satisfaction and commitment to the job (e.g. Antila 2005, 169–172). In the light of the data gained in the research project “Family-friendly Practices in Working Life”, a particularly important factor in making the reconciliation of work and private life easier is the flexible working hours; in other words, the possibility to have influence on when the work is done. The employees’ spouses (n=17) were also of the opinion that one criterion of family-friendliness is flexibility in working hours. (Kivimäki & Oton-korpi-Lehtoranta 2003, 56–65).

Recent studies have emphasized the roles of personnel management and the workplace culture in making the reconciliation of family and work easier and in supporting the well being of the personnel (e.g. Antila 2005, 169–172; Mauno & Kinnunen 2003, 113–116). Workplace cultures often influence employees subconsciously and they may have a significant impact on which practices in reconciling family and work are felt to be acceptable without being actively discussed. From the standpoint of management, what is important parallel to supporting reconciliation of individual employee’s family and work is the reconciliation of different life situations and solutions of all members of the work community at the workplace, in other words, personnel management at the individual and collective level.

Supporting and increasing positive attitudes towards family by development through democratic dialogue

The aim of the ongoing project “Family and Work 2004–2006” is through development work and methods of action research to tackle the issues that in the previous project were not yet studied. What factors support and hinder the realization of a family-friendly workplace culture? How can we create practices in support of the reconciliation of family and work, which are accepted by employees and management, to which the entire work community is committed and which it has jointly decided to aim at?

The project is carried out at five workplaces from different branches and of different sizes. Our research starts with a survey that clarifies the experiences and needs of employees concerning the work–family interface at the workplaces studied. Some interviews are also made to complete the data gained through the survey. The working method we employ
in our development work is a work conference method based on democratic dialogue. When addressing the possibilities and challenges for a family-friendly workplace culture in this article, we use as an example a male-dominated organization in passenger transportation business involved in the project.

In project, we use the concept of family to loosely refer to relationships that are important to people, to emotional bonds and care relationships. Family-friendliness as a concept is as difficult to define as is its mere prefix ‘family’. We can, however, consider as a starting point the key objectives identified by Lisa Harker, who has examined family-friendly workplace policies in the context of EU member states (1996, 48):

- Policies must enable people to fulfil family as well as work demands
- To enable all employees to do so, policies should be based on the promotion of gender equality and the sharing of family responsibilities between men and women
- Policies must be non-discriminatory, employee-friendly and accompanied by acceptable working conditions
- No family-friendly policy is successful unless a balance is established between the needs of the employees and the employer, which balance has been variously referred to as the ‘invisible’ contract or ‘trust’ relationship. In other words, a family-friendly workplace refers to such workplace culture that

“makes it possible to balance all employees’ private life and the basic objective of the organization, the needs and priorities of effective production”

(Mauno & Kinnunen 2002, 113).

We as researchers have not set any more exact criteria than those presented above for a family-friendly workplace or any strictly defined goals for the development work. During the work conference based on democratic dialogue, the members of the work community define themselves those issues and matters that are important to them and that they together start to attend to in order to increase their well-being and to make it easier for them to reconcile family and work. The development work done in the project will take various shapes in the course of the process at each workplace. The nature of work and work processes set their own limitations for the development process, which is what we discuss later in this article in more detail. However, by re-evaluating organization of work and these limitations, employees can produce new ideas and working practices to make reconciling family and work easier and more flexible.

In the case study organization presented next, our initial investigation raised the following issues: awareness of the workplace culture (family-related attitudes, values and norms), strengthening an open culture of information provision and discussion (instrumental and emotional sup-
port), strengthening participatory co-operation through democratic dialogue, taking care supporting of the diversity of the work community.

Reconciling family and work in a male-dominated transportation organization – a case study

Challenges for reconciliation work and family set by legislation and the nature of work.

Through a male-dominated case organization involved in the project “Family and Work” we can look more concretely into the challenges that reconciliation of family and work might present in an individual organization and profession. The organization in question focuses mainly on passenger transportation, and the majority of its employees and respondents to our survey are drivers. In addition to drivers, the organization also employs supervisors as well as repair and office personnel. Here we concentrate on the drivers in particular, because in the course of the project it has become clear that it is the driver’s profession that presents a challenge regarding reconciliation of family and work, not only because of the nature of the work, but also because of the legislation governing it. However, the figures included in this presentation describe the answers given by the entire personnel, unless otherwise mentioned.

This line of business is also strictly governed by legislation regarding driving and resting times. In addition, the framework of the scheduled departures within which the final schedules and routes are decided is defined by cities and municipalities as service orderers. The schedules and routes are also defined by people’s needs to get about – most shifts take place in the mornings, afternoons and evenings because that is when employees commute and children go to and come home from school. During the day there are fewer people on the move and the drivers might have to have a one-and-a-half-hour-long unpaid break, which makes their workdays longer. Because the buses have to run daily from early in the morning to late at night except on a few public holidays, there have to be some drivers in the shift continuously. Also, the drivers may have to stay overnight in another town or city because of the limitations concerning driving and resting times. In principle, within two weeks the drivers’ working hours amount to 80, but the length of their workday may range from four to ten hours.

For the above reasons, the drivers’ work process is not very flexible in nature. In addition, for example, they cannot transfer their duties to others or leave them undone during their own shift. Their work process regarding the start and end of the shift is not very flexible either. It is largely regulated by schedules, according to which the buses have to run.

The nature of the work is also a reason why unexpected absences on short notice are considered problematic especially by management, because they cause a considerable amount of extra work to people responsi-
ble for drawing up the shift rosters and for running all departures as planned. The fact is that all departures have to be driven and there always has to be a driver to replace the absent one. Also, not anyone on leave or at work can be asked to fill in due to strict regulations regarding resting and driving times. At its worse, an unexpected absence of one person may have an impact on the shifts of five people.

Also, because of the nature of the profession, one important way for the drivers to make their working hours more flexible is to ask for changes in the shift roster, regarding either shifts or requests for days off and holidays. When the shift rosters are drawn up, the employees’ wishes are considered as often as possible. Our case workplace has already before the start of our project made an effort to listen to the employees when drawing up the shift rosters, but in connection with the “Family and Work” project, the organization has also started to think about increasing the drivers’ possibilities to participate in the preplanning of the shift roster and through this improve their possibilities to reconcile family and work.

Personnel policy and workplace culture

Reconciliation of family and work is often related to working hour arrangements and absence for family reasons, which are issues also dealt with in our project (Figure 25). As mentioned earlier, the employers do not actively inform the employees about family leaves or issues dealing with reconciliation of family and work. The workplace in question is not an exception either. Many answers to our survey reveal that most respondents do not seem to have information about what kinds of leaves are allowed always or which are case-specific. Many questions are mostly given an “I don’t know” answer. For example, the question “Is it easy at your workplace to stay at home to take care of a 10-year child that has suddenly fallen ill?” is given an “I don’t know” answer by over half of the respondents. In addition, only 27% of those respondents whose household includes both adults and children answer that absence when a under 10-year-old child falls ill is always accepted at their workplace, although this is a right guaranteed by the Contracts of Employment Act. The most acceptable reasons for absence are only one’s own doctor’s appointment or the funeral of a close relative. Generally, speaking about family matters at the workplace is felt to be difficult by one third of the respondents. One third felt that it is easy and one third gave a neutral answer or answered, “I don’t know”.

---

13 Parents with children younger than 10 years have a right to take a 1- to 4-day leave to take care of the sick child or to arrange for the care.
Nevertheless, at this workplace, taking family leaves is felt to be rather easy than difficult. If we look at the male respondents’ answers about how easy or difficult they feel about taking parental leaves (Figure 26), 72% of the male respondents feel that taking paternity leave is fairly easy or very easy and only 5% feel that it is fairly difficult or very difficult. Furthermore, 31% feel that taking parental leave is fairly easy or very easy and 8% feel it is fairly difficult or very difficult. For 16% of the male respondents it is fairly difficult or very difficult to take childcare leave and for 28% it is fairly easy or very easy.

For 33% feel it is fairly easy or very easy to take leave for taking care of sick children for 1 to 4 days and 17% feel that it is fairly or very difficult. For 16% of the male respondents it is fairly difficult or very difficult to shorten their weekly working hours for family reasons and for 29% it is fairly easy or very easy.

In general, men feel that it is clearly more difficult to take a longer family leave than a shorter paternity leave. Furthermore, a large number of “I don’t know” answers (at least 50%, except for paternal leave) tells that longer parental leaves are not used by men and it also might be one reason why men do not know what the managers’ and co-workers’ attitudes towards parental or family leaves really are.

---

At this workplace, only one man had taken other leaves in addition to paternity leave.
We also asked how the employees themselves feel about the situations in which the fact that a colleague has family comes up (Figure 27).

```
Figure 26. Is it easy at your own workplace to take following family leaves? (Male respondents, n=57–58)

Figure 27. How do you take the following situations? (n=68–70)
```
Mainly the visibility of having family is taken positively, but probably because of the nature of the work, being late and leaving in the middle of the workday are not very clearly accepted. It was also surprising to find out that not all respondents accept even family-related phone calls.

**Concluding remarks**

When developing family-friendly personnel policy and workplace culture, we have to remember that all members of the work community, regardless of family background, should also consider it equal and just. When we talk about reconciliation of family and work it is important that at the workplace both management and colleagues understand people’s different life situations, look at them as part of a big picture and accept the fact that at some point in life everyone may need to arrange their working hours to reconcile their private life and working life. Often when the reconciliation of family and work is talked about, those without children feel that they have to be more flexible on the account of those with small children. Still, it should apply to all employees regardless of family type or background. In the future this may set more and more challenges for employees and work communities from the point of view of reconciliation of work and family. For example in Finland, an employee taking care of his or her next of kin (husband, wife, parents or father- or mother-in-law) does not have the same statutory rights to be absent and to make arrangements regarding working hours as parents with small children have.

In general, the workplace-specific challenges will lie not only in how to create at the workplace a positive atmosphere towards reconciliation of family and work, but also in how this atmosphere can be turned into working practices. At our case workplace, a good example of these working practices is the attitude towards the participation of the father in childbirth: despite all difficulties it causes (getting a substitute), an effort is made to ensure that all male employees willing to participate in their child’s birth would get a chance to do so – the drivers know that they can leave for the hospital even in the middle of their shift: “It was a surprise to me, when we were expecting, it was a pretty exciting time when I drove to (a city) and to (another city) that I was pretty far away, so I felt pretty confident, I knew that if I have to leave (for the hospital), they will arrange it” (male driver).

**References**


7.3 Workshop Report

Maria Forslund

Workshop two focused on the question “Can an employee of the 21st century have a family?” As it is today men do have both family and work which zeroed the discussion in the workgroup mainly on reconciliation of work and family. In the same way as fatherhood and the father’s roles are changing in the public discourse so is the perception of a family father changing for fathers and fathers to become as well. The existing diversity on the labour market is a great challenge for policy-makers and researchers seeking ways to reconcile family and work. The labour market as such consists of an immense variety of workplaces and specific workplace cultures. A diverse labour market also encompasses particularly complex social relationships which pertain to gender relationships, public vs. private, employer vs. employee – just to name a few.

Different workplaces emphasize children and family differently, which in many cases divides the possibilities of fatherhood along socio-economic lines in society. One dividing line that was discussed to some extent in the work group concerned the differences between so called white-collar and blue-collar workers. Workplace flexibility in knowledge-based work fields, which on one hand reflect advanced possibilities for a fulfilled fatherhood, have on the other hand many disadvantages compared to not knowledge-based work. For some working fathers work tends to follow everywhere as others can leave it mentally and concretely as the shift or day ends. Thus flexibility doesn’t necessarily guarantee enhanced possibilities for family time and therefore the fields that provide their employees with flexibility can be equally restricting as those that don’t offer their employees opportunities to worktime flexibility. Even though the concepts as such are broad the example does underline the challenges that are specifically concentrated at the workplace and on the employer level.

Although the equation of family and work as such is inevitable it also needs to be addressed. Reconciling both is by no means axiomatic. The distance between men and children is increasing and the new perceptions of fatherhood are not given the possibility to come true. It was questioned whether it even is possible to address the issue without putting it all in a broader context. Women and children form in many cases the framework of the family unit, which led the discussion inevitably to gender roles and equality. The discourse on reconciling family and work has traditionally focused on women, which made it difficult to maintain a purely male and father based focus. Whether it is even appropriate to separate genders in order to intensify comprehensive reconciliation of family and work was questioned. The relationship between two adults who are trying to recon
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cile family and work unavoidably also affects the child. To which degree children can be considered the greatest losers in today’s family and equality debate that addresses the problems from an adult-oriented view came up on several occasions.

Work life is ever more demanding for both men and women, which leads to great contradictions between family values and work values. Whether these even meet on the labour market can be questioned. Time squeeze affects both men and women, and as work tends to be constant in our societies everything else in life is shaped according to it, in particular family quality time. Time squeeze is also something that should be acknowledged by men and consequently affect their choices. Motivating men to participate has far-reaching equality aspects, which ought not to be dismissed. According to Hanna Sutela’s presentation, which preceded the discussion, household work is the number one conflict source in families. By activating men also on that front it is possible to develop an understanding of the difficulties women face in reconciling family and work. Activating men in the house/home has also other positive effects. They can better be heard in the traditionally female-dominated household and can legitimately share their thoughts on reconciliation of family and work and thus assume their roles as fathers.

Workplaces and cultures tend to face the greatest challenges and the group did not consider purely legislative measures very helpful. In many ways it appeared as if the work group members considered markets as the ruling and decisive factor that is reflected in greater societal changes. The concept of a work-friendly family, which bends and bows for the workplace, was also discussed. And related to the previous, questions were raised on who harvests the economic yield of those families? The discussion reflects in some way the general attitude towards societal market-driven changes as something above policymaking.

The overall discussion evolved around family to a great extent. Family as such was also discussed from several angles and as an extended definition. Grandparents and siblings are also included in the family and form cornerstones in the reconciliation of family and work in many households and thus are reflected in different stages in family and work life. This in turn increasingly demands for life as a whole to be seen more as an arched bridge. This evidently brought the discussion back to workplaces that should embrace and develop policies that favour and are able to accommodate better to this arched bridge model. Family is seldom all about joy, and as tragedies or illness of children or workers’ own parents occur these should also be considered at the workplace. The discussion also reflected gender differences. Divorce was discussed as an example that is handled differently by men and women. As women often become concerned of how to manage and carry on with work, men tend to wake up and realize the importance of family. The employer level should embrace the fact that employees also belong to other important social groupings.
and that work is only one of those. A well-balanced combination has proven to be cost-effective also for the employer and should idealistically hence also be in their best interests.

So can a man in the 21st century both work and have a family? What kind of concrete measures should be taken to facilitate the reconciliation of family and work?

As the questions as such are extremely broad it became apparent that no effortless solutions were available either. The main concerns facing both the debate and the implementation are knowledge-based. More research should be done both on the micro- and macro-level. Micro-level research might effectively illustrate the difficulties traditionally male-dominated branches and especially male work cultures face in embracing men as caring husbands and rearing fathers. By exemplifying the structures that sustain the traditional roles and thus don’t enhance fatherhood we could make solutions more within reach. Macro-level research is essential in bringing to light the character of globalized labour markets, which currently differ greatly from those in the 70’s and 80’s. As current large-scale companies operate in a reality not bound by borders, should the employer even more be made responsible for providing required circumstances for the reconciliation of family and work on the national level? This reflects also the above-mentioned aspect of harvesting the economic yield of malaise in families. A further aspect in research involves showing concretely by numbers the economic benefits of reconciliation of family and work. Problems facing this can be related to the globalized markets and the difficulties of convincing the extensive and far-reaching economic gains.

Legislative measures were to some extent considered important. Real changes might not take place through them but they could oblige the employers to inform new employees of their possibilities and rights to reconcile family and work. The group did consider though that the power of real changes however lies on the local employer level.

Change can in many ways only take place by illustrating reconciliation of work and family as a win-win situation for everybody. Fatherhood can be embraced, relationships do better, children have involved fathers and even the employer feels satisfied with a committed worker. The group considered that informative measures, such as campaigns, should be supported by tangible examples of successful reconciliation of fatherhood and work at workplaces.

Recommendations:

1. Information and research needs

- Information to fathers and fathers to become as well as information to workplaces. Information should also be supported by concrete
examples, which could facilitate both working fathers as well as their employers.

- More research should be done both on the micro- and macro-level. Micro-level research might illustrate the difficulties traditionally male-dominated branches and male work cultures face in embracing men as caring husbands and rearing fathers. Macro-level research is essential in bringing to light the character of global work markets and consequently underlining the responsibility of the employers.

2. Legislation

- Legislative measures could oblige the employers to inform new employees of their possibilities and rights to reconcile family and work.

3. General recommendations

- Illustrating reconciliation of work and family at work places as a *win-win* situation for everybody.
- Especially illustrating the long-term cost efficiency in promoting an active fatherhood for everybody.
8. Workshop Group 3: Is the Diversity of Men’s Life Situations Taken into Account When Tools for the Reconciliation of Work and Family Life are Being Developed?

Chair:

Marita Karvinen: Work- Life Counsellor, Transgender Support Centre, Sexual Equality, Finland

Speakers:

Ralf Sund, Representative, The Finnish Confederation of Salaried Employees (STTK).
Jukka Lehtonen, Project Manager, University of Helsinki, Finland
Anne Alitolppa-Niitamo, Project Manager, Kotipuu- project, The Family Federation of Her dissertation

8.1 Reconciliation of Divorced Fathers

Ralf Sund

Divorced men and the reconciliation of work and family life

This event happens to be on a very special day for me personally. Today my publisher will start to print my book on divorces. My special concern is to help men to survive divorce. During my work I have noticed that divorced men do not usually have any family life. I have very little information on the situation in other countries, so I will be talking only about the situation in Finland, but I will try to say something general so it may be useful in other countries too.

In this presentation I will be discussing the possibilities of family life for divorced men. Divorced men are rarely engaged in family life.
My material for this presentation is mainly from my earlier work among divorced men in the Miessakit organisation. It is the only organisation in Finland focusing on equality matters from the men’s point of view. On women’s side there are about 50–100 organisations doing the same work. It is obvious that men have little say in these matters and their voices are not heard. But the men have to look themselves in the mirror.

**Same rights to all fathers**

First I would like to express my support for all efforts to promote equal rights in working life for all men, divorced or not. Just now we in Finland have been discussing whether divorced men should have the right to take leave from work in order to care for sick children.

In general, divorced men should have exactly the same rights as men who are living with their children. There is a lot of room for improvement with regard to fathers. In general, the men need more possibilities to take care of their children.

**The role of divorced men has to change**

In the background is the role the society gives to men after divorce. There are two different roles the man can get after divorce. He is either an economic resource for the family or he has an active role in his children’s everyday life. Usually divorced men play mainly the economic part in their children’s life.

The men have not chosen this role. It has been given to them by the society. In this situation there is no problem. Divorced men have only to concentrate on earning. This is his role.

This role of the man as the breadwinner is a traditional one, stemming from a society that no longer exists. Legislation and the social system assign this role for the divorced man. This model is very bad for the children. Over 60% of divorced men do not take part in their children’s everyday life.

In the Nordic countries, the situation of men in the family is very good both in general and after divorce. However, of all the Nordic countries, gender equality is the least realised in Finland. The situation of divorced men is particularly poor in Finland. Although the purpose of the system is to benefit the child, it does in fact a lot of harm to children. I’m not joking. Working life conditions are a part of this problem. But in the end I think the main problem is an assimilation of many things.

**Joint custody**

In order too give the men a firmer role in the family after divorce we need to adapt the idea of joint custody. In joint custody, both parents have a
significant role in the life of the children. In order to bring about this change, modifying attitudes in working life play a significant role and there is a lot to do there. The main problem, however, is within the social sector where the role of parents after divorce is determined.

8.2 Family and Work – The View Point of Sexual and Gender Diversity

Jukka Lehtonen

In the discourse regarding the reconciliation of family and work, the traditional view of family is heteronormative. Family in this discourse is usually without questioning seen as a heterosexual nuclear family. In this paper I will broaden this image of family from the viewpoint of sexual and gender diversity.

Sexual and gender diversity: key concepts

Each one of us has a specific sexual orientation and gender identity (see Lehtonen & Mustola 2004). Our sexual interest is directed either towards persons of the same sex, opposite sex, both sexes (homo-, hetero- or bisexuality), or neither sex. The term ‘gender identity’ refers to what we conceive ourselves to be: a woman, a man, or something in between or beyond this categorisation. During our life course, our sexual orientation and gender identity may change and take on different meanings. These various options and possibilities create the sexual and gender diversity we live in.

Sexual orientation and gender identity are independent of one another as analytical categories. Trans people can be homosexual, heterosexual, or bisexual in terms of their sexual interest, while persons with a homosexual, heterosexual, or bisexual orientation can occupy a variety of positions on the female–male gender continuum.

The diversity of different sexualities is further increased by the fact that not all women who have affairs or sexual relations with women, or men who have affairs or sexual relations with men, identify themselves as homosexual or bisexual. On the other hand, some people who identify themselves as lesbian, gay or bisexual do not, in fact, have sex or partnerships with persons of the same sex. Some of them may be married to persons of the different sex.

Gender is not something that we ‘have’, but rather something that we ‘do’. Although there is an undeniable biological and anatomical dimension to gender, it is the social and cultural production of gender that plays a more substantial role. This is rendered visible by the reactions to people
who deviate from what is expected by transgressing the preconceived patterns of behaviour or dress. These expectations are often normative in that unusual gender expression is not only met with surprise but with disapproval as well.

Trans people are defined as persons who deviate from the expected gender roles and transgress the gender boundaries. The category of trans people includes transsexuals, transvestites, transgenders and intersexuals. Trans people can have their anatomy reassigned to match that of the gender they identify themselves with. Those who choose not to change their anatomy through surgical or hormonal treatment may express their gender identity by assuming the dress code and behaviour typical of their desired gender, or by mixing preconceived gender patterns.

The concept of heteronormativity refers to ideas, which are characterised by a restricted view where a person can only be a heterosexual man or a heterosexual woman. Heterosexual maleness and heterosexual femaleness are seen as the sole, self-evident and natural premises of sexuality and gender. Other alternatives may be presented as inferior or less desirable. Heteronormative thinking is reflected in the institutions, structures, interpersonal relations and practices in working life: heterosexual maleness and heterosexual femaleness represent the natural, legitimate, desirable, and often the only possible alternatives of being a human and a member of a work community.

The impact of heteronormativity in working life depends on whether you are a woman or a man, heterosexual or non-heterosexual, or on whether you are someone who questions the expected gender patterns or someone who adheres to the more traditional gender roles. The intensity of heteronormative pressure and expectations varies in accordance with one’s age, family background, family situation and cultural experience.

Owing to the fact that heteronormative assumptions of gender and sexuality are interlinked with so many of our everyday practices, heteronormative notions of gender and sexuality are perceived as natural. However, as a culturally and socially produced construct, heteronormativity is open to challenge.

Many angles in the diversification of families

Most people belonging to sexual and gender minorities were born into a family as the rest of the people. Many of them have formed their own families later in adult life. Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons are family members in many ways: they can be sons, brothers, fathers, step-fathers, father’s partners, mothers, grandparents, spouses, husbands, wives, etc. They may live in same-sex relationships or different-sex relationships, or they may be single, married, divorced, or widowed. And today in the Nordic countries and in some Western European countries, in registered partnerships or even in same-sex marriages. Transsexual per-
sons, who go through the gender reassignment process and still want to stay in their relationship, may face challenges when they and their partners have to re-think their family and relationship.

Many gay, lesbian and bisexual men and transgender persons have children. Many of them have formed a heterosexual family at some point in their life. They can have their own biological children with different-sex partners, or they can be parents, who are not biological parents to their children. Especially many bisexual men and women can live with a different-sex partner and have a family, which resembles a typical heterosexual family. Many gay men and lesbians have been in a heterosexual relationship or even in marriage in which they have had children. Transgender persons can also have many types of family situations. It seems that most transvestite men live in heterosexual relationships and have families with children. Transsexual persons can have formed families and had biological children before their gender reassignment process. After this process the child can have a father who is actually a woman, or a mother who is actually a man. All these various situations might create problems for the heterosexual or non-transgendered partners and their children as well as for the people belonging to sexual or gender minorities. From the point of view of men, in this case, it is also important to consider the family situations of lesbians and bisexual women since men can be biological or social fathers to the children of lesbians and bisexual women.

Nowadays it is more typical than before that people belonging to sexual minorities create families, which are already based in the same-gender relationships. Lesbians can have artificial insemination or adopt children. Adoption might be possible also for single men and male couples in certain countries. Many lesbians and gay men decide to have and raise children together. Usually in these situations a lesbian or a lesbian couple is living with the child or children and a gay man is a father who lives elsewhere.

Research on sexual and gender minorities at work

In the following chapters I will concentrate on analysing a few points in relation to non-heterosexuality and families. I will analyse these aspects from the point of view of research conducted in the project “Sexual and gender minorities at work”, which was funded by the Finnish Ministry of Labour and the European Social Fund. The project was co-operation project with the Department of Sociology at the University of Helsinki, the National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health (STAKES) and the Finnish National Organisation for Sexual Equality (SETA).

One of the main tasks in the project was to collect information on the situation of sexual and gender minorities at work, and two surveys and
almost 50 interviews were carried out. Both the Finnish and English versions of the research report are available in pdf format at www.esr.fi. The questionnaire form for lesbian, gay and bisexual people generated 726 responses, while the one targeted at trans people produced 108 responses. The data was collected during late autumn of 2002 and early winter of 2003. The questions in the forms deal with education and employment history, current place of employment, openness with regard to sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression as well as workplace atmosphere and discrimination. (see Mustola & Vanhala 2004)

In this paper I will discuss two perspectives: 1) the same-sex and different-sex relationships non-heterosexual persons may live, and 2) non-heterosexual people and their children. These aspects will be dealt with from the point of view of age and openness on sexual orientation. I have not limited my view to men only, while often men have a certain role in families and the lives of lesbian and bisexual women: as partners, ex-partners, husbands, children’s fathers, sons, fathers etc. (see more on these Lehtonen 2002; 2004)

**Same-sex and different-sex relationships**

A substantial proportion of the young survey respondents were living in relationships, although many were only experimenting with their very first same-sex relationship. The majority of all respondents had a partner, and women in particular were likely to have partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Form of couple relationship by age and gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form of couple relationship (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation with same-sex partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same-sex relationship, not living together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation with different-sex partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different-sex r., not living together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No steady relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents in the older age groups lived together with their partners clearly more often than younger respondents. As already indicated, as a whole woman more often than men tended to live in relationships. Women were also more likely than men to have registered partnerships. Different-sex relationships, again, were most frequent among young female respondents, whereas older female respondents were least likely to live in different-sex relationships.

Both female and male respondents in the older age groups were more likely to be married than younger respondents. Married men were more likely to conceal their sexual orientation from their spouses than married
women or women who had been married. This may interact with the degree of openness at work: as the responses indicated, married men were more likely to fear disclosure of their sexual orientation even at work. The husbands of married young women, in turn, tended more often to know about and even accept their spouse’s sexual orientation. Hence, disclosure at workplace may not constitute an equally high risk to such couple relationships.

Young women may be more readily heterosexualised than young men, particularly if a woman has a relationship with a man or children living with her, as tends to be the case with women more often than with men. On the other hand, compared to older non-heterosexual people, young non-heterosexuals overall have less often children and they live less often in registered partnerships – or any other forms of same-sex relationships. Consequently, their homosexuality or bisexuality is less likely to become apparent at work through partner associations. Given that, there is also likely to be less concealing of partnerships among the young at work.

Non-heterosexual persons with children: 15% of the lesbian, gay and bisexual respondents had children.

Table 8. Relationship to children; Openness and reactions of children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to children (N)</th>
<th>Young men</th>
<th>Young women</th>
<th>Older men</th>
<th>Older women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lived with the children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed from the children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had told the children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child did not know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child disapproved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child tolerated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child accepted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men were more likely than women to conceal their sexual orientation from their child or children, perhaps also due to the fact that men were more likely not to live with their children. It is plausible to assume that those who conceal their sexual orientation from their children also tend to conceal it at work. Even though young respondents had less often children than older respondents, those who did have children were more likely to have small or school-aged children. Young parents with young children may feel a need to protect their children from potential bullying at school and may, therefore, prefer to conceal their non-heterosexuality, while older parents – with older children – may have less such concerns.

A supportive partnership or family may be assumed to help in coping with problems in working life, such as work-related stress or burnout. As women were more likely to have a partner or a family, we may assume that they were also more likely to receive such support from their partners, spouses or children. But partnership or family may also constitute a source of stress, particularly to those who conceal their sexual orientation from their family and, therefore, fear its disclosure. Given that men were
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more likely than women to conceal their sexual orientation from both their children and different-sex spouses, they were also less likely to get support from them should their sexual orientation be disclosed at work. Moreover, starting a family – which is less typical among non-heterosexuals than heterosexuals but more typical among non-heterosexual women than non-heterosexual men – tends to collude with people’s working lives. Young non-heterosexual women, for instance, like their heterosexual counterparts, tend to meet suspicion on the part of superiors and employers regarding their plans for motherhood, particularly if their non-heterosexuality is not known in their work communities (see also Kuosmanen 2002, Aarnipuu 2002).

With regard to casual conversation at work, young respondents worked more often than older respondents in places where only different-sex relationships were talked about during coffee breaks etc. Men tended to hear less talk about any forms of families or partnerships at their workplaces than women. Same-sex families or partnerships, again, were least likely to be talked about at the workplaces of young men compared to other groups, and most likely at older women’s workplaces. Heterosexual relationships or any forms of couple relationships were least likely to become a topic of conversation at the older men’s workplaces, while young women were most likely to hear talk about heterosexual relationships at work. Hence, compared to other groups, a heterosexualised workplace climate was most typical among young women.

Conclusions

Family is typically seen as a heterosexual nuclear family constructed by heterosexual masculine male and heterosexual feminine female. This happens often, not only in policy making and research on family issues, but also in everyday language of teachers, social workers and ordinary citizens. This view is limited: sexual and gender diversity should be taken into account. Heteronormativity causes that some people and their family situations are left unnoticed. This means that lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people remain often invisible in their families and also their families are not noticed. The statistics on families do not usually take into account same-sex families or families where parents are not married and do not live together but raise children together. The lack of acknowledgment also creates problems for the people, both adults and children, in these families. Family can be seen from many angles and positions: a non-heterosexual or transgender person can be a child, a partner, a parent, a grandparent etc. Family should be enlarged to cover people who have families whether they have children or not. And also people who do not have children living with them have to consider at work how the reconciliation of work and family works for other people at their workplace. The invisibility of sexual and gender diversity is reinforced by the fact
that many people belonging to the sexual and gender minorities hide themselves in their own family or hide their family from others at their workplaces. Tensions between work and family can be high and risks of conceiving your sexuality or gender identity at work or at home can be revolutionary: you might lose your job, your family or both. Legal status of same-sex relationships and families with same-sex parents are still not yet equal with different-sex relationships and parents. This reinforces the invisibility sexual and gender diversity and makes it more difficult to reconcile family and work for people who do not act along the heteronormative expectations.
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8.3 Families in Migration – Challenges in Integration: Research Perspectives and Some Experiences from the Kotipuu Project

_Anne Alitolppa-Niitamo_

**Background**

Globalisation and the transformation of Europe into a single market economy will increase the migration of individuals across national borders. Although immigration has been the focus of an intense discussion for example in Europe, the issue of family migration has, however, been addressed hardly at all. (Bailey & Boyle 2004) Paying attention to family migration is an urgent challenge that policy makers and service providers even in the Nordic countries are facing.

**Diversity of migrant experience**

In the discourse on immigrants, the greatest challenge is to comprehend the diversity of backgrounds and experiences. Not only the multiplicity of countries of origin and ethnic and cultural differences, but also the variation in gendered identities, age, educational level and life cycle stage will multiply the immigrant experience. Also the growing variety of family constellations, including cohabitation, divorce, reconstituted families and same-sex couples, further increases the variation among migrated families.

The differences among migrated families may also be divided analytically into various migrant categories. The broad categories that indicate the basis for residence permits are (1) work-based migrants, (2) refugees and asylum seekers, (3) students, and (4) marriage-based migrants.

Family migration is, therefore, not a simple concept as it encompasses a wide variety of families, migration forms and reasons, as well as institutional contexts (Bailey & Boyle 2004).

**Consequences of migration and acculturation at the level of families**

In research on migration, theorization regarding the intersection of migration, gender, and family is weak. Accounts on families in migration have focused primarily on geographical aspects of mobility and differential impacts of mobility on members of the household (Cooke 2001 in Bailey & Boyle 2004).
Migration and the subsequent acculturation process include many changes and impacts on the family as a whole as well as on individual family members. Differential impacts on family members may be divided into (1) economic consequences and (2) changes in relations in a household. These two are often intertwined in a complex manner.

Among so-called work-based migrants, the labor market implications are known to differ between married women and married men, since the majority of women migrate because they follow the career of their husbands. As a consequence, women may have negative economic returns of migration—at least in the short run. However, there is empirical evidence indicating that women do not necessarily regret the impacts of family migration since there may be other, positive outcomes of migration as well. (Bailey & Boyle 2004.) Also changes in women’s reproductive roles have been significant, and work-based migration today is less strongly related to men’s occupational prestige. Families characterized by a dual-career or woman as a primary breadwinner are becoming more common. (Smith et al. in Bailey & Boyle 2004)

The acculturation process migrating families face in the new country is often a demanding phase of life. This process includes demands of learning a new language, understanding the structure and functioning of a new society as well as forming new social relations.

The Kotipuu Project of the Family Federation of Finland aims at providing various kinds of support that benefit migrating families. Based on the experiences of contacts with immigrant parents, it is obvious that in the midst of challenges of acculturation, many immigrant parents, both men and women, face the challenge of reconciliation of family and work as well. Their challenge is triple-fold: demands of acculturation, family, and work! Raising-up children in ‘unknown territory’ further adds to the level of stress these parents may experience.

Changes in relations among family members

When looking for a common ground to encompass and understand the enormous variety of migrating families, the concept of change may be useful. Anthropologist Ruth Krulfeld (1993) has pointed out that research on immigrants always includes research on change. By accepting this remark, it is claimed that an essential element in trying to understand the experience of an immigrant family is to understand their experience of change. Experience of change, although sensed and managed differently by different families, is to some degree shared by them all.

Although immigrants seek change in certain aspects of their living conditions (e.g. sense of security, control of life, better economic conditions), the change caused by the migration and acculturation processes often takes place in and affects virtually all aspects of their lives. Sometimes the fast pace of change is stressful and threatening. Particularly
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first-generation immigrants often attempt to slow down and control the change by trying to maintain the ‘old ways’ and enforcing ethnic boundaries. How individual immigrants and immigrant families manage the challenge of multiple changes connected to the migration and acculturation process depends largely on the resources at their disposal, their social environment, and the characteristics of the receiving society. (Alitolppa-Niitamo 2004)

Changing roles, responsibilities, and power relations make migrating families ‘intense dynamic sites’, where members are involved in balancing between tasks of production and reproduction. (Bailey & Boyle 2004, also Holtzman 2000.) As mentioned above, we have some empirical evidence on the gendered economic consequences of labour force migration. Our knowledge of changes in family relations particularly from the male perspective is, however, less extensive.

Different ideologies of family, family policies and laws, norms on gender and generational roles, and economic and educational opportunities in the receiving society form the context in which immigrants often need to rework their family relationships (see also Holtzman 2000, Foner 1997: also Alitolppa-Niitamo 2001). In Finland, such concrete policies as child allowances paid to the mother’s bank account and educational and occupational opportunities available for women seem to challenge the traditional male authority particularly within immigrant families arriving from more patriarchal societies.

Different family policies, laws, and gendered norms and roles cause changes in family relations that in turn may challenge the cohesion of an immigrated family (e.g. Foner 1997, Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco 2001, García Coll & Magnuson 1997, Rumbaut 1997, Alitolppa-Niitamo 2001). Even in Finland, divorce rates are high particularly among intercultural but even in same-culture migration families (Heikkilä 2005).

It often happens in families with an immigration background that different family members are ready to accept socio-cultural change at a different pace. This ‘dissonant acculturation’ (Portes 1997) may cause conflicts between family members, often between generations, but also between genders. In many Western countries, for example, immigrants have to relate to new world views like individualism over familism, or emphasis on gender equality and the non-authoritarian socialization of children, which may generate differing views among family members.

From the perspective of the Kotipuu experience with immigrated families, the participation of fathers in the reproductive activities at home is an issue of intense discussion in many non-Western families. Women may refuse to continue to take the full responsibility for home-making chores. They wish to take advantage of study and work opportunities and to share the reproductive responsibilities with their spouses. Many husbands find it hard to assume this new role at home although their contribution is badly needed particularly in families with several children.
In divorce, the position of partners and children is vulnerable: Not only the economic situation but also the residence permit may be at stake for a non-working spouse. Based on the experiences of the Kotipuu Project, also the arrangements of custody of children among partners may be sensed as culturally alien by parents. These arrangements may also compel former spouses to live in the same country against their will. Many families with immigration background would need more knowledge on family policies and family legislation in their new country of residence. Many families would also benefit from knowledge regarding the typical family processes during the acculturation. Kotipuu at the Family Federation has in cooperation with the City of Espoo developed a model of discussion groups for immigrated parents. This group model, that emphasises the understanding the impacts of migration in the parenthood and in the family roles as well as the importance of peer support, has been found very much needed and liked by immigrated parents. However, despite our efforts, no fathers have yet participated in the groups.
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8.4 Workshop Report

Tanja Ketola

Discussion

Workshop leader Marita Karvinen opened the discussion by asking why we always, such as during this conference, have mostly talked about fathers when we talk about men’s reconciliation of family and working life. Why do we not talk about the working life or other aspects of being a man than fatherhood? A suggested explanation was that the diversity perspective is such a complicated, new and broad topic, that it is hard to keep all the diversity in mind when discussing this theme. Furthermore, it was considered that in our culture there is still a rather strong stigmatisation on those who do not have children, and the expectation of a man being a father is strong. A critical question, which was raised but not answered in this workshop, was whether childless families have to pay for the families with children? For example, it is seldom noticed that there are groups of men, like transgender men, who cannot have children and become biological fathers. Also, the meaning of care is wider than a father caring for the children, and can mean, for example, a man caring for his parents. Furthermore, it can be questioned, whether it is only people with children who have a right to have a (family) life besides the working life.

During the workshop the diversity of men’s life situations was identified. The diverse situations may be related to men of different identities and social stratification factors such as sexuality, gender, ethnicity, age, education, income, place of residence, disability, social status, citizenship rights, marital status, biological/social fatherhood, unemployment etc. “Men in diverse situations” may also be in a “diverse or same situation” in relation to family and working life. For example, a father may be defined as a single, biological, social, second, or a remote father. Even though many diversity factors were mentioned during the workshop, there was not enough time to deal with them in more detail. Another challenge is the tension of universality and specificity: the diversity factors are often many in a man’s life and then the discussion of diversity on a general level may not reach the situations of the men of “many diversities”. As an example, immigrant men in Finland come from very diverse cultural backgrounds representing different gender roles and systems. Their possibilities and position on the Finnish labour market are diverse depending on whether they are highly educated, easily employable knowledge employees or immigrant men with severe unemployment problems or socially excluded men.
Problems related to the possibilities of men in diverse situations to combine work and family life were identified. The question of visibility and invisibility was discussed in relation to the situation of men of sexual and gender diversity. For example, there are 50,000 transvestites of which none have “come out” at the workplace. There have been cases where the coming out of a transgendered employee has led to the laying off of the person. Also many homo- or bisexuals are hiding their families at the workplaces. It was noticed that the invisibility of gender and sexual diversity is an act which is produced in the everyday life, as in the heterosexual culture of the workplaces, as well as in legislation and official practices. In statistics, the families of homosexual men are often invisible or not adequately visible, as in the case of same-sex couple of fathers the other one is defined as a single father and the other one is not defined as a legal father of the child. The other side of the coin is the right to be invisible: heterosexuals do not have to “come out” either. The key challenge is to create the kind of working culture and culture in general in which the sexual and gender diversity is seen as a continuum, not labelled by the dichotomies of normal/ not normal and natural/ unnatural.

The task of the workshop 3 was to discuss the question: “Is the diversity of men’s life situations taken into account when tools for the reconciliation of work and family life are being developed?” A simple answer drawn from the multifaceted discussion would be: “No. Often the tools for the family and work reconciliation are based on the assumed standard life situation of the men.”

**Recommendations**

1. **Research and information needs**

   - More research, statistics, and information on the field of men’s diverse life situations and family and work reconciliation is needed. There are diversities of men’s life situations that are seldom discussed, such as age, income, other career roles than fathering, or negotiations between biological and social fathers.
   - The concept of family is still narrow and based on the assumption of a heterosexual nuclear family. The reality of family forms is much more diverse and the diversity should be taken into account better in the official statistics and research agendas.
   - In statistics, more sophisticated tools should be developed in order to get information on the family forms of sexual and gender diversities. Furthermore, the true number of remote fathers is not shown in the statistics even if there are a great number of remote fathers who are involved in their children’s lives.
• More research on the needs of the immigrant men and fathers is needed: the group is very diverse varying from highly educated and well-off to marginalized unemployed immigrant men.

2. Legislation
• Men in diverse situations should have the same rights and possibilities to combine work and family life as men in so called standard situations.
• Remote fathers should have the right to be involved in their children’s lives and have as good a possibility as the mothers to get the custody of their children. Remote fathers should also have the legal right to take care of their sick children.
• Both same-sex parents should have the right to be the legal parents of the child. At the moment only the other one can be the legal parent of the child. Adoption rights of homosexual men should be improved.

3. Processes and Practices
• There should be more organisations and workplaces where you can be yourself. Men who openly talk and take care of their families should become the norm.
• For companies and workplaces the open gender diversity and family-friendly culture should be developed as a matter of competitive advantage: a place where people want to work.
• The question of minority rights is often silenced as it is related to the issue of what is statistically general/ not general: this “fact” should not be used as an instrument to marginalize the voices and needs of these groups.

4. General
• The responsibility to improve the possibilities of minorities to combine work and family life should rest more on the institutions, not on the minorities.
• The sexual and gender diversities are still often invisible and marginalised phenomena in working life. Information and/ or other good-practice campaigns targeted for workplaces should be considered, but these campaigns should be carefully planned, and the management of the workplace should be genuinely involved in the process.
During the three decades of working toward gender equality, the Nordic Council of Ministers has continued its efforts for achieving full gender equality in the Nordic societies. Indeed, the Nordic democracies have distinguished themselves through their active work to promote gender equality in each country.

Equality between the genders means that power and influence are divided equally between women and men and that both women and men share the same rights, obligations and opportunities in all areas of life.

In a gender-equal society, both women and men contribute with their skills and resources equally. In addition, gender equality plays a role in the formation of shared values and the developments that take place in national political areas, including welfare, working life and economic development.

Gender equality also includes fundamental human values, such as respect, equality, understanding, quality of life and identity. The Nordic countries and the autonomous regions cooperate in the field of gender equality on a common platform of shared traditions and mutual benefits, because they face many of the same issues and challenges. It is natural for the Nordic welfare societies to exchange experiences, make use of one another’s knowledge and skills to encourage and engage in political debate.

The Nordic focus on men and gender equality is unique in an international context and provides a good example of the advantages and necessity of involving all groups in gender equality work.

Taking into account the different skills, knowledge and experiences of men and women influences and enriches the development of all areas of society. Both men and women must have an opportunity to take on new tasks and responsibilities while turning over others, both in working life and at home within the family. In order to achieve our goal of creating an equal society, it is absolutely essential that men are active participants in gender equality work.

The opportunities of Nordic women and men to combine parenthood, caring responsibilities, working life and political participation are closely connected to the development of the welfare state and the politics of care.

Since the 1960s, the establishment of the Nordic welfare states as well as legislative efforts to achieve gender equality, have helped to reach
many of the goals that have been set for gender equality. Other important issues, for instance in working life, still remain unresolved. The labour market, education sector and economic life of the Nordic countries and the autonomous regions continue to be plagued by gender divisions. The top posts in industry and commerce are dominated by men, and the same is true in the research field.

The first five-year Nordic co-operation program on gender equality was adopted in 1987. The focus was on women’s participation in political decision-making, education, equal pay, the situation of immigrant women and on how women can combine their family life with their working life. The Nordic discussion today concentrates on how men can combine working life with family life.

In spite of the positive changes that have taken place in men’s participation in child care, women often still bear the primary responsibility for the home and children – in the family, in the official care institutions and in pre-schools. A Nordic project has discussed how to encourage men to work as teachers in kindergartens and schools.

In most of the Nordic countries and autonomous regions men also make scant use of the parental leave available to them. In Iceland in 2000 the Parliament passed a new Maternity, Paternity and parental Leave Act. The new act put the parents in Iceland in a totally new position. The new act allocated the parents totally nine months’ parental leave, and introduced a division, with three months allocated to the mother, three months allocated to the father and three months the parents can divide between themselves as they wish. The months allocated specifically to each parent are not transferable unless one of the parents dies before using her or his entitlement in full. All the leave must be taken before the child reaches the age of 18 months. Parents who are active on the employment market receive 80% of their wages while on maternity, paternity or parental leave. These payments are made from a special fund that is financed by a certain proportion of the social security tax paid by all employers. There is a minimum for these payments, and also a ceiling. The maximum monthly income is 6,800 EUR.

During the first year after the new law on parental leave was effected, the directors of the Reykjavik Fire Brigade realized that they were facing a problem. About a quarter of the men in the fire brigade had wives who were expecting babies during the year, and the men intended to use their leave entitlement. Naturally this had never happened before in this traditional workplace of men. The consequence was that new firemen had to be taken on, which meant an increase in costs. The management had to apply to the city authorities for additional funding, since paternity leave was something that had never been included in the fire brigade’s annual budget before.

One of the largest trade unions in Iceland has reported that there has been a large increase in the number of men complaining that they have
been dismissed from their jobs because they take paternity leave. This is, of course, against the law, and most cases have been cleared up without conflict after the employers have been made aware of the new law. Women often experienced discrimination of this type in the past, and now men also face this discrimination.

Minister Arni Magnusson, minister for gender equality has said:

I am convinced that the money spent on maternity and paternity leave has been well spent. Certainly, large sums are involved, but I see this as an investment, rather than an expense, and a good investment too. Involving men more in the upbringing of their children will have a good effect on the future of our children and of our whole society.

In the Danish telecompany TDC Father’s Hug (Fars kram) program was established to encourage and support fathers to take parental leave. These kind of initiatives are welcomed as they encourage men to take more responsibility in children’s daily care. Gender equality should be seen as an important tool in making economic development sustainable. Women and men must share responsibility for both family and society. This approach has given the Nordic countries a competitive edge. It ought to be an instrument to make the Nordic countries even more successful.

Violence against women and children, and prostitution-driven human trafficking remain grave problems affecting also the Nordic countries. Reports on violence that have been published in the Nordic societies have raised public debate and increased the awareness of violence against women. Women and men meet violence in different places. Women meet violence in their homes and men meet violence in the street or in the public sphere: It is question of men’s violence against men and men’s violence against women. In Norway Alternative to Violence has developed programs for violent men. Men talk to other men. The results have been very encouraging. The Governor of Åland Islands Peter Lindbäck has said that there will be no change before men take a joint responsibility for the violence in our societies.

Trafficking in human beings has developed into an integrated part of international organized crime. The magnitude, forms and impact are more alarming and devastating than before. Women and children, mostly girls but also boys, are recruited, transported, sold and purchased by individual buyers, pimps, traffickers, and members of organized crime networks within countries and over national borders for the specific purpose of sexual exploitation in the sex industry.

It is often said that we cannot buy love and happiness. To buy sex seems to be a question without problems, and because it is easy to buy, the argument is that it is better to legalize it, so it can be controlled via the laws just as we try to control the economy in general. But the question is: Can we at all talk about an ordinary profession when we are discussing an unpleasant mix of prostitution, organised crime, and sex? I dare to say...
no! Prostitution is a question of men suppressing women, and of criminal behaviour. The politicians, public authorities, including civil servants, lawyers, police, as well as NGOs, have a lot of political tools that could be used to control the “market” for trafficking in human beings. So what can we do?

In the Nordic countries governments have taken different steps to tackle these problems. However, we must all be aware that a long-term effort will be required to change attitudes in society towards sexual exploitation. One way of achieving this is through the media. The media exerts a powerful influence on our knowledge of the world. The way abuse of women is portrayed in the media influences our perception of the relationship between women and men. More focus should be set on the role of media.

A second way is through government policies. New laws can influence the public opinion and change the basic values. In 1999 Sweden adopted a law that prohibits the buying of sexual services. But, it is not possible to combat trafficking in women solely at a national level. Prostitution and trafficking have a trans-national dimension and are often carried out by highly organised criminal groups. It requires closer cross-border co-operation.

It is important to reduce the demand for sexual services of women, young men and children. It might be obvious that without a demand there will be no supply, but this is a fact that is often forgotten. As long as men and women accept this behaviour it will continue. Both women and men have a moral responsibility for the fact that some persons among us buy sex.

The Finnish President Tarja Halonen has said:

Each of us is responsible for our own behaviour. Together with our fellow beings we can affirm the right kinds of behaviour. This responsibility must be underlined. This can be done totally independently of what kind of legislation is in effect. As a human being and as a president, I, however, wish to say that all that is legal is not right.

The politics of gender equality is a continually evolving process and is influenced, on the one hand, by overall social development, and on the other hand, by various operators who are engaged in gender equality work on behalf of the government, labour organisations or civic organisations. An evolving society requires a gender equality policy that is also constantly adapting to a new operating environment. The Nordic Council of Ministers intends to work toward the inclusion of the many different players in the gender equality field in the formation of gender equality politics.

At the Nordic conference Towards new masculinities in 1995 one question that came up several times during the conference was whether
men should feel guilty for what male society stands for today. Jens Orback, today minister of gender equality in Sweden, answered in 1995:

Nordic men are many-faceted beings, but one thing they have in common is that they all live in societies characterized by a desire for equality between women and men. Until now working towards equality has mainly been a women’s project. However, it is not entirely the fault of men that we still have not achieved an equal society, but for equality to become a reality requires that endeavors towards it are a joint matter for both women and men. Every individual man, along with every individual woman, has a responsibility to ensure that the prevailing inequality is cleared away, whether it be injustice in individual cases for girls, boys, women or men.

It is important that men initiate a discussion on gender equality policy from men’s perspective. It is crucial that men talk to other men and formulate which kind of gender equality issues they wish to put on the political agenda in their society.

Developed gender equality policies benefit not only the individuals. When all areas of society begin to utilize the know-how, skills, experiences and values of both women and men, and when these values are allowed to influence and enrich social development, society becomes increasingly democratic. In order to make gender equality more visible in everyday life – in working life, family life, and in other contexts – both women and men must be willing to take on new tasks and challenges. To achieve the goal of equality, men must be actively involved in the public debate and political process.
10. Isäkäs – Paternity Leave Information Campaign

_Reetta Aho_

The paternity leave campaign is an information campaign of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health. The campaign wants to make space for families in the workplace and society. Its aim is to motivate fathers to take more family leaves. The campaign emphasizes children’s and fathers’ point of view in reconciliation of work and family. An essential part of the campaign is to inform citizens about the family leave system and possible changes in it.

Message of the paternity leave campaign

The message of the paternity leave campaign is that every child has a right to get time and care from her/his father. Equally, every father has a right to be involved in his child’s growth. The care the child gets from her/his father makes their relation close, which is in the interests of the child. The growth of the child cannot wait. That’s why it is important that the father is involved in his child’s life from the very beginning.

The campaign operates at three levels. First, there is the family level, which emphasizes the child’s right on the one hand and the father’s right on the other. Then, there is the level of work communities. That means that we try to influence workplaces by informing both employers and employees about the right to family leaves. The aim is to improve attitudes towards families and family responsibilities at workplaces. The third level is the level of society. The campaign tries to affect general attitudes and political structures by increasing knowledge of the legislative processes and the labour market agreement processes.

Target groups

The target groups of the campaign are also at different levels. At the individual level our target groups consist of all potential fathers, men who are about to become fathers, fathers of small children, and mothers. At the community level the target groups consist of work communities, maternity clinics, social partners and media.
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Aims of the campaign

One aim of the campaign is to strengthen fathers’ position in families. We want to motivate fathers to take more parental and childcare leaves and take their space in the family. In general, we have a reason to believe that if fathers participated more in their child’s everyday care, the well being of children would increase.

The other aim is to increase the appreciation for families in society. If fathers took parental and childcare leaves as often as mothers, women’s labour market position would be improved. That would partially increase the equality of the genders in society.

Symbol of the campaign

The symbol of the paternity leave information campaign is an animated figure Isäkäs (in Swedish Papsen), which is designed by a recognised Finnish graphic artist and comic strip drawer Pentti Otsamo. The same figure was also the symbol of the former paternity leave campaign, which the Ministry carried out in 2002–2003.

For that former campaign, the Ministry ordered black and white comic strips from Pentti Otsamo. These strips were offered to the use of the press. The Ministry also published a brochure about family leaves that was based on the strips. During the former campaign there were several adversaries in the press. The brochures, posters and canvas bags were distributed at fairs and seminars. Also outdoor advertising and a television adversarial based on the figure Isäkäs were used.

Operations and plans

In the autumn 2005, there has been an advertising campaign in movie theatres around Finland. The brochures have been distributed in seminars and other events.

A new edition of the family leave brochure will be published. Next year the brochure will be distributed in the maternity pack. That way most of new parents will get information about family leaves. There are also plans for new advertising campaigns on the web, in the press and on milk cartons.

The paternity leave campaign aims to receive publicity in the media. We also wish to get direct target group contacts by distributing material at workplaces and different events.

The campaign pursues co-operation with social partners, e.g. labour market organizations and the Network of Female Members of the Finnish Parliament.
11. Panel: Discussion on the Workshops’ themes and Conference Summary

The panel discussion on the workshops’ themes and the conference summary focused on the possibilities to improve parental leave legislation and working life conditions. The main objective was to give concrete suggestions, which could offer men a real opportunity to take part in childcare as equal parents. The topic was considered in two respects:

The main point of departure was the father’s equal role in parenting: which policy proposals would enhance men’s role in the families?

There was also discussion about what are the gains if men play a more active part in parenting from the viewpoint of a family, a father, a mother, an employer and the labour market?

Men’s commitment to family life was seen very important especially from the viewpoint of working life. First of all family life was seen significant to the well-being of an employee: a family-oriented employee is perhaps more balanced than a person dedicating his whole life to work or updating his CV. Secondly, the social skills which come from parenting may turn out very useful in many professions. Finally, it was also stated that parental leave legislation or promoting gender equality shouldn’t be considered opposite to the economic interests of working life. On the contrary, it was seen that the Nordic welfare state and its economic prosperity have developed hand in hand, not independent from one another. Besides, it goes without saying that we need employees also in the future. In all, the participants were of the opinion that employers have the obligation but also good reasons to promote fathers’ active role in parenting (as well as mothers’).

The main way for employers to promote men’s parenthood is gender equality planning in personnel policy. Also superiors and shop stewards should be educated so that they could give adequate information about the employees’ rights and possibilities concerning parental leave. They could also help with the procedures and perhaps even set an example and take parental leave themselves. One of the main factors behind men’s choices is the other men’s attitude in the workplace and in society in general. This means that normalizing men’s parental leave practices (e.g. setting examples and encouraging hesitant men) is very important.

One of the main suggestions to promote men’s reconciliation of work and family life (in addition to parental leave, the father’s quota and the above mentioned employers’ means) was reduced working hours when
children are young – in some comments until they are ten years old. This of course means that some financial compensation would be needed to make it economically possible: either part-time parental leave benefit or other child care allowance. However, fatherhood was considered to last longer than the duration of the one, three or even six-month father’s quota.

In addition to the main topic, men’s reconciliation of work and family life, also motherhood was discussed. In some comments women were seen as “gatekeepers” trying to defend their primary role at home and limit men’s possibilities to become equal parents. In this scheme men’s task would then be to “conquer” their place in parenthood. On the other hand, some were on the opinion that also a mother benefits from a father who is more involved with his family: it improves mutual understanding between the spouses, perhaps helps to balance the uneven distribution of household work and also improves women’s position on the labour market. Instead of a battle between the sexes this could be seen as a situation of mutual benefit.

Recommendations

1. Legislation

- The compensation and the practices of part-time parental and childcare – leave should be improved.
- Parental leave should be one-year long.
- Equal shares of parental leave to mother and father would improve men’s position at home and women’s position on the labour market.
- Six-hour working day should be a possible choice (or perhaps even statutory?) to people with small children.

2. Information and education

- In order to assess the need for increasing fathers’ group activities
  - evaluation research about the positive and negative effects and cost
  - effectiveness of fathers’ groups needs to be carried out.
- Information should be given especially to men about their rights and possibilities by employers, superiors, shop stewards, labour unions, maternity clinics and social security institutions to name but a few.

3. Practices

- Labour unions could play a more active part in improving men’s possibilities to reconcile work and family life.
• Practices at the workplace should be reconsidered from the viewpoint of parents with small children. For example, meetings should be rescheduled if they are usually held very early in the morning or very late in the afternoon.

• Fathers groups should be a normal practice at maternity clinics. Fathers groups could be organized also at workplaces.

• Maternity clinics should be called parental or child welfare clinics and “maternity package” should be called for example baby package. Current terms emphasize the mother’s primary role in childcare.
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Leila Kostiainen

Dear Conference Guests,

Fatherhood is a very general phenomenon in society but, at the same time, it is still surprisingly often at risk. Fatherhood arises with a child and family, but it is justified to ask whether there is enough space for realising fatherhood in families, various communities and society. What is the father’s role and what are the dimensions of fatherhood?

There appears to be a clear ‘social order’ for strengthening the status of fatherhood. New generations of men are more interested in being involved in the growth and development of their children, starting from a child’s birth. The views on the father’s right to fatherhood but, on the other hand, also on the child’s right to spend time with both parents, are being raised as basic questions in the discussion on fatherhood, and thereby, it is to be hoped, as values internalised by society at large.

The fatherhood discussion is part of the discussion on gender equality, ‘the other side of the coin’. Men’s demand for the right to multifaceted fatherhood includes the equality view on shared parenthood. Taking care of children and running the everyday life of the family on an equal footing also presupposes equal structures for the reconciliation of work and family life.

Sometimes the development of gender equality in working life appears to be very slow. Therefore, we need various streams, even very small ones, to give rise to a change. It still is a fact that it is mostly women who take parental leave.

The Nordic countries have, in European comparison, retained their high fertility rate and simultaneously a high employment rate among women. We have managed to create social structures that enable solving the basic question of how to reconcile work and family life. The comprehensive child day care system and free meals at school are examples of those structures.

Women and men with a family must be able to take part in the labour market as flexibly as possible. With the changing labour division between the sexes and the changing society this demand applies, besides to women, increasingly to men too. Therefore it is important to continue and
develop further the discourse and policy on men’s reconciliation of work and family life, as we have done during these two conference days.

The Nordic countries have managed, in somewhat different ways, to build up favourable structures enabling women and men to combine employment and parenthood. The challenge is to retain and improve those structures, in particular as regards family leaves. This theme was dealt with in several addresses yesterday and today. Legislative amendments can vitally influence fathers’ use of their entitlement to family leave, as we learned about the situation in Iceland.

Structures and laws however are not enough to solve the challenges of reconciling work and family life. Also attitudes play a vital role. Finns’ opinions on how easy it is for women and men to take family leave were surveyed in the Gender Equality Barometer 2004 study carried out by the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health measuring attitudes to and experiences of gender equality.

According to the outcome of the Barometer Finns find that it is easier for those employed in the public sector to take family leave than for those employed in the private sector. This applies to both women and men. Furthermore, people are of the opinion that it is easier for women to stay at home on a family leave than for men. It is interesting that it was said that it is considerably easier for fathers to take a short paternity leave than a longer parental leave.

The outcome of the Gender Equality Barometer can be interpreted so that taking paternity leave has become a normal and accepted praxis. The goal in the future is that also men’s taking of parental leave should become a normal and ordinary practice. In this, change of attitude and taking of leaves are interlinked. As men’s parental leave becomes more usual, at the emotional level it becomes normal. At the same time it will be noticed that taking leave does not cause a catastrophe at the workplace. There are clearly three points of view on reconciliation of work and family life: the equality point of view, the family point of view and the socio-economic point of view.

The population in Finland is ageing more rapidly than anywhere in the European Union. Therefore we have seriously emphasised that changes in working life must support the objective of the Lisbon Strategy of raising the employment rate. Reconciliation of work and family life is an essential component of this change in working life.

The wellbeing of families and children is one of the cornerstones of a safe society. Children’s right to both their parents is one of the most important rights for them. A successful reconciliation of work and family life can support the child’s right to both his/her father and mother.

There is a female and male point of view on the reconciliation of work and family life. Most often the issue is looked at from women’s point of view. However, men and fathers must have a right to parenthood in the same way as women. Workplace practices and attitudes must therefore be
adjusted so that it is natural and easy for men to leave work and the workplace for a time and take responsibility in guiding the life of their children.

An important model for the reconciliation of work and family life must be for both women and men the opportunity to be good parents and active members of their workplace community. An important tool in achieving this model is the theme now on the agenda: strengthening the status of fatherhood and fathers.

This conference has also discussed divorces and separation of spouses and reconciliation of work and family life in that connection. A divorce or break-up is a situation in which many men have to ponder their relationship to children and can experience that they are at risk of losing their contact with children. Indeed, the relationship between men and children in separation situations, especially in connection with decisions on custody, is one of the themes that typically make men interested in gender equality, even on a larger scale.

An objective for gender equality policy has long been to increase men’s responsibility for the family’s everyday life and active parenting.

Gender mainstreaming is a central element in the Nordic gender equality policy. One tool of mainstreaming is gender impact assessment. It assesses how issues experienced as important for gender equality influence women and men. The assessment can concern for instance a law, budget or action plan. It is important to remind at this conference that gender impact assessment should also include impacts on men. Furthermore, when choosing the objects to be assessed it is advisable to ponder about possibilities to assess in particular such issues that are assumed to be significant to men.

It is important to continue the discussion about the male point of view on reconciliation of work and family life. One forum for this discussion will be the expert Conference on men and gender equality during Finland’s Presidency of the European Union in the latter half of 2006. The conference will deal with men and gender equality at a more general level, but also with the reconciliation of work and family.

I believe that the discussions at this conference will contribute to the success of our Presidency conference on men for the benefit of all European men and women.
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14. Summary in Finnish


Osana konferenssinähtelyä oli paneelikeskustelu isäryhmistä, joita oli esittelemässä yhteensä kolme panelistia Suomesta, Ruotsista ja Norjasta. Isäryhmat ovat tuoreille isille tarkoitettuja ryhmiä, joiden tarkoitus on tukea isäksi tulevista ja isänsä olemisista. Isäryhmien avulla pyritään vähentämään isyyteen liittyviä paineita ja ristiriitoja. Useiden vuosien kokemusten perusteella panelistit arvioivat, että isäryhmät myös onnistuvat tässä.


Raportti sisältää kaikki konferenssissa pidetyt esitelmät. Lisäksi raportissa on työryhmien ja paneelikeskustelujen tuottamat ehdotukset. Työryhmien ehdotukset löytyvät työryhmäraportteista.
15. Summary in Swedish

Konferensen "Möjligheter och utmaningar – samordning av männen arbete och familj" hölls i Helsingfors 21–22.11.2005. Konferensen sam-
lade sakkunniga som arbetar med frågor om samordning av arbete och familj från Finland och de nordiska länderna. Konferensen ingick som en del av programmet av Nordiska ministerrådets arbetsgrupp för män och jämställdhet och för dess genomförande i praktiken svarade jämställd-
hetsenheten vid social- och hälsovårdsministeriet i Finland. Ett allmänt mål som gäller jämställdhet mellan män och kvinnor är att bygga forum och förbättra möjligheterna för män att delta i diskussionen om främjan-
det av jämställdheten mellan könen.

Konferensens föredrag granskade faderskapet ur flera synvinklar. En av synvinklarna var att faderskapet samtidigt både stärks och försvagas. En del män är mer aktiva än tidigare som fäder medan andra är mer pass-
iva. Fler män än tidigare förblir helt barnlösa.

En paneldiskussion om fadersgrupper, vilka presenterades av sam-
manlagt tre paneldeltagare från Finland, Sverige och Norge, var en del av konferensprogrammet. Fadersgrupperna är grupper avsedda för nyblivna pappor med syfte att stödja den som blir pappa och att vara pappa. Ge-
nom fadersgrupperna strävar man att minska stress och motsättningar i samband med faderskap. Paneldeltagarna anser utifrån mångårig erfaren-
het att fadersgrupperna också lyckas med detta.

Vid konferensen fanns även tre arbetsgrupper som granskade män och samordning av arbete och familj ur olika synvinklar. I den första arbets-
gruppen utvärderades pappakvoten inom ramen för föräldraledigheten vilken genomgått förändringar i de nordiska länderna under de senaste åren. Islands, ur nordisk och även global synvinkel, radikala modell rönte – naturligtvis – särskild uppmärksamhet och den konstaterades ha upp-
fyllt sina mål väl. I den andra arbetsgruppen koncentrera man sig på arbetetslivet. En av utmaningarna vid samordning av arbete och familj är att finna övertygande argument för en satsning på att samordna arbetet och familjen i en situation där "alla tjänar på det". Nyttan tillfaller såväl arbetsgivaren, mannen och hans familj. I den tredje arbetsgruppen grans-
kades mångfalden. I arbetsgruppen behandlade man frågan huruvida den brokiga mångfalden i männens situation beaktas tillräckligt och vad som kunde göras för att den skulle beaktas bättre än idag?

Rapporten innehåller samtliga av konferensens föredrag. Dessutom ingår i rapporten de förslag som arbetsgrupperna och paneldiskussionernas bidragit med. Arbetsgruppernas förslag finns med i arbetsgrupperrapor-
terna.
Confence Programme


Monday 21 November

09.00– 09.45 Registration and coffee
09.45–10.00 Opening Speech. Minister of Social Affairs and Health, Tuula Haatainen
10.00–10.45 Negotiating Gender and Working Life – Men’s Work, Men’s Family
Senior Researcher Johanna Lammi-Taskula, National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health, Finland
10.45–11.15 New Directions and Diversity of Fatherhood. Professor Jouko Huttunen, University of Jyväskylä, Finland
11.15–11.45 Fatherhood – Between Ideology and Demography. Professor An-Magritt Jensen, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway
11.45–13.15 Lunch
13.15–14.45 Panel: Directors of fathers’ groups tell about men’s experiences of reconciliation of work and family life
Chair: Psychotherapist Eero Keinänen, Oulu Mother and Child Home and Shelter, Finland.
Fatherhood Trainer Ilmo Saneri, Fellowship of Men Association, Finland.
Director Ulf Rikter-Svendsen, REFORM – Resource Centre for Men, Norway
14.45–15.15 Coffee
15.15–16.45 Workshops: 3 groups
19.00–22.00 Dinner

Tuesday 22 November

08.30–09.30 Morning coffee
09.30–10.30 Nordic Men – Cooperation and Gender Equality. Advisor Carita Peltonen, Nordic Council of Ministers
10.45–11.00 Break
11.00–13.00 Workshops: 3 groups continue
13.00–14.00 Lunch
14.00–15.30 Panel: Discussion on the workshops’ themes and conference summary.
Chair: Jouko Huttunen.
Participants: Senior Researcher Anita Haataja, Government Institute for Economic Research, Finland.
Johanna Lammi-Taskula
Minna Rantalaiho
Marita Karvinen
15.30 – 15.45 Concluding Words. State Secretary Leila Kostiainen, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland
Conference Speakers

Reetta Aho, MsocSc, Information Officer, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland. She has worked in the Ministry’s Paternity Leave Information Campaign during 2002-2003 and 2005. She is a mother of two children. reetta.aho@stm.fi

Anne Alitolppa-Niitamo, PhD, Project Manager, Kotipuu-project, The Family Federation of Her dissertation “The Icebreakers. Somali-Speaking Youth in the Context of Formal Education in Metropolitan Helsinki” was published in 2004. The Kotipuu-project aims at developing multicultural family-centred work among professionals in the educational and social sector. anne.alitolppa-niitamo@vaestoliitto.fi

Mats Berggren, Project Leader, Fathers’ Groups in Stockholm, Sweden. Berggren was behind the initiative for the project “Pappa på riktigt” – true fathers. He currently leads the project. The project is about fathers’ groups in Southern Stockholm. info@pappagrupperna.se

Ingólfur V. Gíslason, Sociologist, head of department for research and information, Centre for Gender Equality, Iceland. Gíslason has a broad interest within the field of gender studies. Lately his main interests have been masculinities, labour market, gender pay gap and violence. ingolfur@jafnretti.is

Anita Haataja, PhD, Senior Researcher, Government Institute for Economic Research (VATT), Finland. Haataja’s recent research has focused on comparative research of Nordic parental leave schemes and earner – carer models, the impact of family policy reforms on women’s, men’s and families’ income and poverty as well as on women’s and men’s position in the labour market. anita.haataja@vatt.fi

Jouko Huttunen, Professor, University of Jyväskylä, Finland. His main research area is the fatherhood within shared parenthood and related issues in the field of family research. Additionally, he has spoken practically to different audiences and authored various articles on the “new” fatherhood and generative fathering. Huttunen has been a member of Subcommittee on Men’s issues in the Council for Gender Equality within the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health. jouko.huttunen@edu.jyu.fi

An-Magritt Jensen, Professor, Dept. of Sociology and Political Science, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway. Her main field of interest is fertility and family change with particular reference to the role of men and fathers. ammagritt.jensen@svt.ntnu.no

Marita Karvinen, PhD, Work life Councillor, Transgender Support Centre, Sexual Equality, Finland. Karvinen has researched women’s work and the interaction of their work and daily life. Currently she works with issues related to sexual and gender diversity in working life, both as a researcher and as a practical worker. marita@seta.fi

Eero Keinänen, Psychotherapist, Oulu Mother and Child Home and Shelter, Finland. Among other things, Keinänen has been involved with the “father in maternity clinic” – project. eero.keinainen@oulunen.si.jouhvkotki.fi

Jouni Kempe, MsocSc, Researcher, Work Research Centre, University of Tampere, Finland. Kempe has worked as a senior researcher officer in the Council for Gender Equality and in the Gender Equality Unit of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, with men and gender equality as his expert area. Since 2004, he has been a researcher in the project “Family and Work”. jouni.kempe@uta.fi

Johanna Lammi-Taskula, MsocSc, Senior Researcher, National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health (STAKES), Finland. The main interest of Lammi-Taskula is the reconciliation of work and family life. She has been involved with many projects related to men and reconciliation and men and gender equality more generally. Additionally she has been involved in several Nordic projects that deal with these issues. johanna.lammi@stakes.fi
Possibilities and Challenges – Men’s Reconciliation of Work and Family Life

Jukka Lehtonen, PhD, Project Manager in ESF project “Sexual and gender minorities at work”, University of Helsinki, Finland. jukka.p.lehtonen@helsinki.fi

Katri Otonkorpi-Lehtoranta, has worked as a researcher at Work Research Centre, University of Tampere. She is currently working in a research project “Family and Work 2004–2006”. The project focuses on research into and development of arrangements supporting the reconciliation of family and work at workplaces. katri.otonkorpi-lehtoranta@uta.fi

Carita Peltonen, Senior Adviser, Department of Welfare, Trade and Industry, Nordic Council of Ministers. Peltonen coordinates Nordic co-operation on gender equality. The Nordic gender equality co-operation policy is based on the Nordic Co-operation Program on Gender Equality 2001-2005, and followed up by a yearly action plan. A new co-operation programme Focus on Gender: Working Towards an Equal Society 2006-2010. cp@norden.org

Minna Rantalaiho, MsocSc, Researcher, Norwegian Centre for Child Research (NOSEB), Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Norway. Rantalaiho’s research interest is on the transforming representations and constructions of parenthood and childhood especially in the context of public welfare policy. She is currently working with a doctoral thesis focusing on the changing constructions of childhood in post-1970’s Finnish and Norwegian childcare. minna.rantalaiho@svt.ntnu.no

Ulf Rikter-Svendsen, Director, REFORM – Resource Centre for Men, Norway. Educated and trained as a family therapist, he has been working mainly with men for the last four years at Reform. His focus is men’s ability to cope with pressure and difficult situations, men’s health and the conditions of what’s creating change. ulf@reform.no

Ilmo Saneri, Fatherhood Trainer, Fellowship of Men Association (Miessakit ry). His work is focused on enhancing fatherhood through education and support. ilmo.saneri@phnet.fi

Ralf Sund, Representative, The Finnish Confederation of Salaried Employees (STTK). Among other things, Sund has been involved in a project offering help for divorced men. ralf.sund@sttk.fi

Hanna Sutela, Senior Researcher, Work Research Unit, Statistics Finland. Sutela is mainly involved with Finnish Quality of Work Life Surveys. These extensive studies cover many different aspects of work life. Her main interests in this area are precarious employment, reconciliation of work and family, working times and gender equality. hanna.sutela@stat.fi

Pentti Takala, Senior Researcher, Research Department, The Social Insurance Institution (KELA), Finland. His main professional interests are research on family policy and family benefits, family sociology and time use research. pentti.takala@kela.fi

Friða Rós Valdimarsdóttir, wrote a summary report titled “Nordic Experiences on Parental Leave and its Impact on Gender Equality” while working for the Centre for Gender Equality in Iceland. Now living in Brighton, England. She has a BA degree in anthropology and gender studies. Founding member of Briet, an Icelandic feminist NGO in 1997, whose projects she is still involved in. Her research interests include parental leave, women’s movements and violence against women. frida@litmyndir.is
List of Tables and Diagrams

Table 1. The manifestations of the different meanings of “father” in diverse family types.................................................. 30
Table 2. Some figures on the use of maternity/paternity leave .......................................................... 68
Table 3.................................................................................................................................................. 72
Table 4. Men’s usage of parental leave (as%age of women’s usage)................................................. 73
Table 5. Men’s share of total days of parental leave (%)......................................................... 73
Table 6. Absence from work due to family leaves. Fathers with children aged under 18, employees........................................... 84
Table 7. Form of couple relationship by age and gender...................................................... 112
Table 8. Relationship to children; Openness and reactions of children.............................................. 113

Figure 1. Men’s families in Finland.................................................................................. 18
Figure 3. Men’s branches of employment in Finland (Thousands)......................................... 20
Figure 4. Attitudes at workplaces ................................................................................. 21
Figure 5. Caring for an ill child .................................................................................... 22
Figure 6. Justifications for parental leave........................................................................ 23
Figure 7. Help to own parents.................................................................................. 25
Figure 8. Children born outside marriage. Scandinavia 1845–2000......................................... 38
Figure 9. Extra Marital Births. European Countries 1970–2002 ........................................ 39
Figure 10. Childlessness among women and men at age 40. Norway ........................................ 40
Figure 11. Children living with the father among all children living with one parent..... 42
Figure 12. Children by residential parent. 1988–2002...................................................... 43
Figure 13. Mothers’ and fathers’ time use on care of children 0–2 years. ...................... 44
Figure 14. Family leave taken by the father according to the father’s income (%)........... 63
Figure 15. Bonus and paternal leave use and the%age of the male employed workforce in certain occupations (%). ................................. 64
Figure 16. Gainful employment very important life content. Male employees by age and family status ................................................................. 82
Figure 17. Home and family life very important life content. Male employees by age and family status ........................................................................................................ 83
Figure 18. Been absent from work due to child’s illness in the last 12 months. Parents with children aged 10, by sex, socio-economic group and pay during absence.................................................................................. 85
Figure 19. Working overtime weekly. Male employees by age of youngest child......... 86
Figure 20. Partner works too hard. Female employees with employed partner, by age of youngest child .......................................................... 87
Figure 21. Which partner does more household chores. Employees aged under 35, both partners employed full-time.................................................. 88
Figure 22. Conflict about time at home, at least from time to time. Employees by overtime done and family stage ................................................................. 89
Figure 23. “I cope better with my children when I also go to work”. Employees by sex and age of youngest child ................................................................. 90
Figure 24. Difficulties to fit working hours with other commitments outside work; Male full-time employees................................................................................ 91
Figure 25. Is absence for the following reasons accepted at your own workplace? (n=63–71)..................................................................................... 98
Figure 26. Is it easy at your own workplace to take following family leaves? (Male respondents, n=57–58)................................................................................. 99
Figure 27. How do you take the following situations? (n=68–70)................................. 99