

STAYING ATTACHED

Fathers and Children in Troubled Times



GILL GORELL BARNES



STAYING ATTACHED

Systemic Thinking and Practice Series

Charlotte Burck and Gwyn Daniel (Series Editors)

This influential series was co-founded in 1989 by series editors David Campbell and Ros Draper to promote innovative applications of systemic theory to psychotherapy, teaching, supervision, and organisational consultation. In 2011, Charlotte Burck and Gwyn Daniel became series editors, and aim to present new theoretical developments and pioneering practice, to make links with other theoretical approaches, and to promote the relevance of systemic theory to contemporary social and psychological questions.

STAYING ATTACHED

Fathers and Children
in Troubled Times

Gill Gorell Barnes

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2018 by Karnac Books Ltd.

Published 2018 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 2018 to Gill Gorell Barnes.

The right of Gill Gorell Barnes to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with §§77 and 78 of the Copyright Design and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprint or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, whthout permission in writing from the publisher.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are use only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A C.I.P. for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978 1 78220 594 4 (pbk)

Edited, designed and produced by The Studio Publishing Services Ltd
www.publishingservicesuk.co.uk
email: studio@publishingservicesuk.co.uk

CONTENTS

<i>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</i>	vii
<i>ABOUT THE AUTHOR</i>	ix
<i>SERIES EDITORS' FOREWORD</i>	xi
<i>PREFACE</i> by Sebastian Kraemer	xv
<i>INTRODUCTION</i> Speaking up for fathers	xix
CHAPTER ONE The changing social context for fathering in the United Kingdom in my lifetime: the family and fathers remembered following the Second World War	1
CHAPTER TWO Attachment theory, child development research, and mothers' and fathers' connections with children in everyday life	25

CHAPTER THREE	
Becoming a father in non-live-in fatherhoods	45
CHAPTER FOUR	
Getting connected after a long absence—fathers re-entering their children’s lives: conflicts of interest, belief, and attachment	69
CHAPTER FIVE	
Fathers, children, and conflicts in family arrangements following divorce	91
CHAPTER SIX	
Processes that alienate one part of the family from another	119
CHAPTER SEVEN	
Fathers, stepfathers, and complex families	137
CHAPTER EIGHT	
Violence in couple and family systems: anxious attachment and disorganised love, power, and control	165
CHAPTER NINE	
Working with couples: developing skills in managing unregulated emotion	189
CHAPTER TEN	
Working with fathers within family court proceedings: disorganised attachments and violent outcomes.	203
CHAPTER ELEVEN	
Mental illness, fathers, and families	225
CHAPTER TWELVE	
Reconciliation and forgiveness	249
NOTES	259
REFERENCES	261
INDEX	277

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In addition to thanking my editors, Gwyn Daniel and Charlotte Burck, without whose friendship and encouragement the book would still be in one hundred and forty folders, I would like to thank the following people who helped me get started and keep going: Susan Fyvel for her patient reading and incisive comments, Rose Martin and Elizabeth Kyriakides for their work on the text, and Alan Cooklin for many discussions, his input on families and mental illness over the past fifteen years, and his assistance in making a complex text more simple.

*This book is dedicated to my father Jack and my son Chris;
and to the fathers of the future, the grandsons in the family:
Sam, Tom C-S, Dan, Joe, Nick, Tom C, Finbar, Milo, and Felix*

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Gill Gorell Barnes, MA MSc, has been working with children and families since the 1960s, first as a psychiatric social worker and subsequently as family and couples therapist, in both the Child and Family Department at the Tavistock Clinic and at the Institute of Family Therapy, which she co-founded with colleagues in the 1970s. As Training Director, she subsequently co-founded the Master's Degree in Systemic Family Therapy with Birkbeck College, London. The nature of her work has always reflected the changing nature of family life, including divorce, step-family living, single parent family living, and the growth of gay and lesbian family lifestyles.

Gill has written three books on working with families in social change, with a focus on multi-cultural family lives, and co-authored another five, as well as over fifty scholarly articles and chapters relating to working with families.

Gill has taught internationally since 1980, and specialises in keeping her teaching grounded in clinical practice. Her three research studies, on step-family living, on children's experience of going through divorce and post-divorce living, and her current writing about fathers are all related to clinical practice as well as to research.

In her civic work, Gill has been a Trustee of the Medical Foundation for Victims of Torture (now renamed Freedom from Torture) for twelve years, and was Trustee or chair of the Post Adoption Centre for ten years. She sits on a grant-giving charitable foundation, which keeps her in touch with current social issues relating to poverty and mental health in the UK today.

SERIES EDITORS' FOREWORD

Charlotte Burck and Gwyn Daniel

Fatherhood has always presented challenges of definition, since it mainly tends to be theoretically elaborated in relation to constructions of motherhood. As ideas about gender, about mothering, and about family have evolved and radically changed, so fathering has been brought into focus, which, in turn, has posed questions and dilemmas for both men and women. For this reason among others, this exciting book by Gill Gorell Barnes is extremely welcome. Here, she places fathers, with all their complexities, at the centre of her thinking and practice, thereby redressing their marginalisation by clinicians working with children and families and by family relationship theorists.

In this rich and comprehensive book, Gill invites us to share her extensive experience of working with fathers and their families over many years. First, she lays out the history and context of contemporary fatherhood in the UK before going on to explore the many meanings and issues of fathering in the families with which she has worked, as well as sharing her experience of her own father. As her title implies, Gill has particularly focused on, and is acutely sensitive to, the many dilemmas facing men and their families when they are living separately, needing to find ways of “doing family” across more than one household. She considers different contemporary family

structures and multiple variations of relationship between fathers and children. She works with a range of social fatherhoods: fathers going through relationship transitions, non-live-in fathers, fathering in the context of acrimonious divorce, and fathers re-entering their children's lives after long absences.

The book is bursting with lively descriptions of family therapy at its best. The reader will find riveting accounts of Gill's skilled and nuanced clinical work. Her work is embedded in a framework that incorporates cultural and societal influences and draws upon a wide range of family therapy influences. She is a systemic therapist, accomplished at eliciting and holding complexities and moving between levels in her work. Her unique way of interweaving the pragmatic and concrete details of family life with meaning-making and emotional matters is illuminating and inspiring.

Gill demonstrates a fluidity in her therapeutic practice with an ability to move between different therapeutic positions to find creative ways of enabling different conversations between family members. At times, she explicitly elaborates systemic thinking with fathers and other members of their family. She sometimes incorporates "child developmental talk" which she and fathers together can consider with regard to their wish to connect more fruitfully with their children and which can free them from a polarised position in which they often seem trapped. Her tracking with fathers of micro interactions in their relationships with their children enables a focus on strengthening their abilities to tune into their children, bypassing their emphasis on rights and entitlements that has often left them disconnected. This is particularly helpful for many fathers brought up within patriarchal frameworks who struggle with changes in expectations and whose attempts to replicate patriarchal ideas can contribute to oppositional and troubled relationships with mothers and their children. Crucial here is Gill's validation of the men she works with as fathers with serious intent. Her ability to engage with their wishes for better relationships acts as a powerful driver in the therapy.

Gill breaks new and exciting ground in the ways that she invites children into increasingly bold questioning of their fathers, holding them to account for developing their relationships, while simultaneously supporting both children and fathers. There are lovely examples of Gill's conversations with individual children, bringing forth their moral positioning and puzzling over questions such as "What are

Dads for?" This direct work also challenges traditional ways of locating fathering as dependent on mothers. Gill tangles with the dilemmas of mothers who have given up on the need for fathers and ways that have informed children's own views of their fathers. She works with fathers to be tenacious in demonstrating that they do have something different to offer, instead of being consumed with rage about these "unfair" influences. This goes alongside her sessions with children that unpack the fragments of stories and small episodes that have sometimes constructed a "bad" father identity. This is therapeutic work that has frequently been interwoven with families' entanglement with lengthy court processes.

Gill addresses the additional complexities involved for families who are living separately when mothers or fathers experience depression and mental illness. Helping parents to step into each other's roles when needed and the particular ways in which fathers can be helped to manage this process has been a particular interest in Gill's clinical work and is elaborated in fascinating detail here.

We believe this book will become a landmark for clinicians working with families. Clinicians will find it a powerful provocation to "think fathers" in their work. The wide-ranging challenges facing fathers and children living separately when relationships have become fraught are considered alongside the many challenges for therapists working in this context. Therapists should discover ways to hold on to their confidence to persist with this often difficult work. The book provides many relevant ideas and stimulates important reflections for clinicians. Gill Gorell Barnes' book should ensure a place for fathers in family therapy that is long overdue.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

PREFACE

Sebastian Kraemer

This is a monumental text. It encompasses half a century of practice, always—wherever located—a public service. It is inconceivable that Gill could do anything less. Neither could she work with clients in any context without being therapeutic. This is an effect that can also be shared by longstanding colleagues like me. If you have not met Gill in person, you will find her here. “I’d like to see Daddy. I’d like to talk to Daddy,” says the child. “Shall we ring him now?” says Gill.

As a social worker in a 1960s children’s department, Gill learnt to see families from the child’s point of view. It was less than twenty years since the 1948 Children Act had encouraged social workers “to view children as individual human beings with both shared and individualised needs, rather than an indistinct mass”. Yet, this enlightened view was soon to be swept aside by Seebohm reforms that diluted practice knowledge of children into a too-ambitious focus on families, now to be supported by generic social workers. Rather than abandon one position for the other, Gill combined both in what became her singular style of working therapeutically with parents and children, where her early experience is still evident decades later: “much of what we have to do with fathers requires a practical and educative stance in addition to a ‘therapeutic’ stance”.

In her consultations with fathers, Gill locates the man emotionally suspended between his own childhood and his child. "Anxious, jealous and over possessive fathers may narrate stories of being locked in the 'coalhole'; having their heads put under the cold tap, made to eat out of the dog's bowl on the floor," She offers father a "culture-free science", showing him that "a child's brain is influenced by the environment into which he is growing". He learns that his child's brain has to be respected as much as his own, still reeling from the terror of the coalhole. He finds out from Gill that what a father does and says to his child when he is in a rage with the child's mother can affect the child for life, just as he was affected.

"Working with estranged fathers, I have found that talking in detail about their interactions with their children when they were very small, and taking an intensely child focused approach to their 'remembering' about their own childhoods, allows for rapid cognitive and emotional processing under the intensified lens of wishing to regain their relationships as parents to their children. Men who are so often reported as 'reluctant to engage' are very keen to engage in these circumstances".

Thus, the man learns something about the experiences of childhood, while retrieving a "memory of quarrelling voices" from his own. Instead of a reflex rebuke that "he's just a little devil", father now notices that his child "gets upset when the wife and I shout at each other".

This work, a distillation of decades of national leadership, scholarship, and practice in family therapy, is systemic social work of the highest order. It is informed by an attachment theory that has developed in parallel with Gill's own life, which she now shares with the reader. "Following a good principle of female sociology to work from the bottom up" she recalls her growing up:

my network consisted of a fulltime working mother, a working father whose work life I often shared, a live in Irish "nanny/companion", a Greek grandmother and aunt whom I visited more than once a week, and an English granny with whom I spent much of my early years' school holidays. In spite of multiple kin care, I have no doubt that my mother "held me in mind", but each of them also held aspects of my "mind" in their minds, and in my professional thinking this wider knowledge is often not sufficiently taken into account either in

psychoanalytic thinking or in attachment theorising, or, indeed, in many developments of a systemic approach.

All theories fall under the critical gaze of this lifelong practitioner, holding the light of lived experience to them. Gill brings to her task a unique mix of a permissive childhood where all things seemed possible, a privileged education, immersion in the cultural revolutions of the 1960s and 1970s, a leading role in the first generation of British family therapists as trainer, conference presenter, and writer, and decades of intimate therapeutic contact with families in conflict. These families find themselves in the presence of someone fearless and eminent, yet without a trace of arrogance. With her clients, Gill is plain-speaking and practical; accepting what she finds yet determined to help change it so that children and parents can get on better—and more safely—with one another. Quite a presence.

I have stepped into the remit on several occasions where a father had been accused of child neglect, sometimes supervising childcare at home where neglect was a contested issue, teaching a father how to keep children safe while cooking their tea, or making sure they were able to give a child a wash-down safely, without being accused of inappropriate touching, in addition to thinking about wider safety issues in the home or the street.

Besides coaching the father, Gill puts herself in the place of the besieged child caught between feuding parents. Mother says, “He’s trying to label me mentally ill again. I haven’t got mental illness.” Father says, “You see and hear one thing, I recollect another.” Gill writes, “this interview showed me how this couple had the capacity to drive each other into a state from which there is no returning to a middle collaborative position. I commented on this, and on the confusing effect of our conversation on my own mind”. Here, she is suggesting that their daughter refuses to take part in family life precisely because she does not want to be in this disturbing place between the parents, which Gill is occupying now. How often mental illness is invoked, yet family consultations reveal the breakdown that is between parents, rather than in one or the other. By temporarily experiencing and reporting on it, Gill shows them, there and then, what they do to their child.

Here you can see the product of years of experience with children in families, but also of having worked in places where there are child psychotherapists as colleagues:

He showed me a puppet he had made with strong legs for walking “a long way”. I said he had a lot to deal with in his young life and had needed his strong legs, and I congratulated him on all he had done and been through. He said, “Sometimes I am like a young man and sometimes I like to be a baby as well”.

I think another source of Gill’s intuitive understanding of unconscious family process could be more openly acknowledged. What is it about fathers that makes them so important to children? It is not always an attachment, but it must be an idea. Children know how they were made. Whatever the facts and present circumstances, in the child’s mind there is a sexual relationship that is both fundamental to her existence but from which, at the same time, she is excluded (Kraemer, 2017). A psychoanalytical formulation is entirely consistent with systemic, developmental, anthropological, and sociological discourses, and is recognisable in this simple and poetic observation: “One continued experience I have had in much of the clinical work described in this book is that the father is not held in mother’s mind in any ways that can be of value to the child”.

Staying Attached: Fathers and Children in Troubled Times is, in many respects, a report from a war zone. Gill describes being screamed at by a persecuted father who could not allow her to express a view at odds with his own. Her courage in keeping her head under that kind of fire is evident. The capacity to tolerate being the bad object is fundamental to the analytic process. Therapeutic neutrality means holding on to your own mind while straining to acknowledge the value of another’s. As Gill says, this comes first from “wider knowledge” in one’s own development. Working as a nine-year-old in her father’s Soho café, “I was taught to greet all around me with respect and make and serve coffee as well as I could. This gave me a security in the world which has never left me”.

INTRODUCTION

Speaking up for fathers

This book is a tribute to the many committed and involved fathers I have worked with over the past forty years, fathers who have contributed to my thinking about what it takes to go on being a dad when the going gets tough. The caring by these fathers, in the context of mothers suffering from long-term physical illness or major mental illness, was outside the “normal” parameters of what was expected of men as fathers in the decades that followed the Second World War, so that they were challenging norms of what was laid down as expected male behaviour at that time. My father was the starting point for stories of unorthodox masculinity in my own life. Additionally, the book focuses on fathers whose relationships with their children were in trouble, in the context of working with them in child and family mental health settings as well as alongside the family court, where they were struggling to maintain or regain relationships with their children. It could often be seen that fathers were not keeping up with mothers’ wishes and expectations of them and, in some situations, had become marginalised and were in danger of disappearing from their children’s lives. Why was this happening and how had they arrived in these complex, troubled, oppositional situations? Solicitors, often stuck for a way forward, were looking for some therapeutic intervention on

behalf of their clients into family systems that had reorganised without them and often against them. While a new job description for fatherhood was clearly needed for many of these men, there was little discussion about this and such an idea was very slow to develop in any public forum. In relation to this work, I have asked many questions about father's visions of their own role in their children's lives and included ideas and accounts of how fathers, over my lifetime, have now largely become repositioned in public and private thinking about family life.

Throughout the book, I have paid attention to some of the impacts of extreme emotional distress which co-exist on a continuum with many forms of mental disturbance, and which can affect both mothers and fathers. Stress-related illnesses have an impact on fathers, and have been part of my clinical concern, whether with couples or with fathers living alone, as well as in relation to making decisions around the lives of children. In the family court context, I also worked with the families of mothers who no longer saw their children, in each case for reasons attributed to their own mental illness, which had dominated their children's early lives. In these cases, fathers had become primary carers very soon after birth. The book pays particular attention to mental health difficulties, and ongoing mental illness, which is often unaddressed as a component in the lives of families in mainstream social family research. It also remains largely neglected in family therapy theory and training. The ways in which mental ill-health can complicate the lives of all members of a family, so that the ideal relationship a father might wish to have with his children has to be re-positioned in the light of changing rhythms of mental disturbance, is revisited as a subject in different chapters.

Many men present with extreme forms of behaviour that can include failure to connect to others' feelings, often a lack of awareness about themselves, and sometimes accompanied by violent responses towards others. What can move someone between extreme emotional distress, on the one hand, and mental illness, on the other, how these two states of being are defined and categorised for any one individual, and how this affects the work we do in particular contexts of children and families, is a question that always remains open to scrutiny. In general, fathers who manifest high levels of poorly regulated emotion, leading to attitudes perceived by others as irrational, are unlikely to be seen as being in need of therapeutic services unless they can

attract a defined diagnosis of a major mental illness (McLean et al., 2002). States of intense distress and “mental illness”, defined and undefined, are, in principle, thought of throughout the book as being on a continuum, and are further discussed in the chapters that follow.

*Gender equality in parenting practices: doing “male”
and “female” in the post-war decades*

Although, in North European societies, we now have, as part of mainstream social narratives about the family, models of fatherhood which subscribe to gender equality in relation to responsibility for children, the way fatherhoods are, in reality, played out shows widely differing performances. These differences are practised both within and between diverse cultural groups, and include a wide range of fatherhoods lived and carried out away from the child’s daily home with her mother. Following the Second World War, the shared ideologies of cohesive family life and ways of “doing male and female” in families in the UK were more commonly defined by work structures and associated “accepted” definitions of class than is now the case. There might never have been a single framework for marriage and family life to which women subscribed, but researched descriptions of family life showed more homogeneity than would be the case now, and little was researched or written-outside the context of war itself-about children’s relationships with fathers who did not live with them. Following two World Wars, ideologies constructed around recreating a secure society in the UK, as described and defined by sociologists and journalists of the time, are discussed briefly in [Chapter One](#). New arrangements of gender and sexuality, and associated practices around responsibility for children, continue to change the shape and definition of what might be recognised and socially allowed as “family”, which is touched on throughout the book.

Fathers on the margins of family lives: 1975–2015

Since 1945, family configurations and roles within families have been in continual change. Some fathers described in this book (from 1975 onwards) have never lived with the mothers of their children, while

some have co-habited but ceased to live in the family home, separating early in the lives of their infants or toddlers. Some have married and divorced and are struggling to develop new ways of maintaining meaningful relationships with their children in the context of ongoing hostility. Many of these men were experiencing competition or conflict with other men who were “social” fathers to their children, whether live-in partnerships, or married “step fathers”, to whom mothers had subsequently given preference in the role of father. In these diverse contexts, many conflicts of interest between mothers and fathers can be generated, not only about how the bringing up of children is to take place, but also over whether a father can have a serious place in his child’s life at all. Further complexity was stirred up by many fathers who continued to have assumptions about “patriarchal” rights, beliefs that usually belie the reality of the way the families they are part of actually think about family life. The positions to which men might become relegated by their families, which have become primarily constructed around women and children and outside which fathers have to struggle to redefine their own relevance and importance in their children’s lives, has been my particular interest, working alongside solicitors and the family courts since the 1990s.

Fathers’ invisibility within the professional “gaze”: why are fathers left out of personal and professional thinking?
Findings from research

Fathers are often the less visible members of family households, and may frequently live separately from their children. As an “entity”, their needs have been, and remain, relatively neglected by the mental health and therapeutic services. Walters (2011) in her book on working with fathers in the child and family mental health service described this as both extraordinary and sad, given the rapid changes in the roles of fathers in the previous twenty years. Many fathers, both in and out of families, struggle with prolonged, and sometimes severe, states of mental illness or depression for which there is, in reality, no service provision (and themselves often generate unsympathetic discussion from professionals). A study of views about fathers in social work offices found that they were mainly given a negative press and that there were few discourses around fathers which were

positive (Scourfield, 2006). Fathers often do not fit current diagnostic priorities and the type of services available rarely meet their social and emotional needs. Furthermore, qualitative research has shown that fathers have been seen to be neglected by professionals working with families, including within the field of systemic family therapy (Smith, 2011). At the same time, contemporary research from studies of families that focus on parenting programmes has shown that including fathers in thinking about family, and working with them alongside mothers and children, whether or not they live in the same households, increases both the likely long-term involvement of these fathers with their children and increases the support they give to the mothers (Matta & Knudson-Martin, 2006).

Other work additionally found that the competence of “high risk” fathers with their children increased, in direct relationship to their capacity to work closely within the framework offered by the child’s mother (Ngu & Florsheim, 2011). Where a mother is demoralised or depressed following a child’s birth, including fathers in the thinking about the children can also increase a mother’s involvement in positive ways (Vik & Hafting, 2009). Yet, a recent overview of many thousands of family interventions worldwide has found that fathers are still largely ignored by parenting programmes (Panter Brick and Leckman, 2013). Family intervention programmes rarely evaluate their own impact on *both* parents: impacts such as co-parenting quality, overall family functioning, depression, or stress within either parent. This omission is likely to be partly due to the ongoing shifts and influences between often rapidly changing cultures that do not fit easily into pre-planned research formulations. However, in my view, the omission might also reflect a wider social difficulty in thinking about whether there is a distinctive role that fathers have in family life, and a lack of commitment at higher organisational levels to create changes in working patterns and working hours, both for fathers who are clients and fathers who are professionals.

Working with fathers in the UK over fifty years

What is my own interest in fathers and their special place in the lives of children? During my clinical work with fathers over half a century, I have seen many changes in the expectations held of them between

different generations and within diverse family groups of different cultures and ethnicities. My direct work with fathers has been mainly limited to the multi-cultural contexts of the UK, although I have also worked with families in Greece, in Singapore and Hong Kong, mainland China, and in Russia. In my early family therapy days (1968–1972) working at Woodberry Down Child Guidance Clinic (as it was then known) in Hackney, under the clinical directorship of Robin Skynner, there was an emphasis on whole family work and the inclusion of fathers wherever possible in all families seen in the clinical service (Gorell Barnes, 2011). While the families in our geographical catchment area were predominantly white working-class and Caribbean families who had only recently arrived in the UK, the area also included a small number of Nigerian families, who were mainly in the UK to study. The range of ways of “doing father” in the Nigerian families included fathers who were absent from their children’s lives for many months at a time, moving between Nigeria and the UK, yet who, it seemed, did not lose their own idea of fatherhood, or their identity as fathers, and neither were they devalued by mothers and children. Caribbean fathers, on the other hand, were often seen by their mothers, partners, and sisters to have a more tenuous identity as fathers, and were frequently less valued as part of the ongoing child-rearing structure (Arnold, 2012). Caribbean parents, at that time, suffered from the lack in this country of grandparental and other kinship networks that would normally have cared for the children. However, the older generation had generally stayed in the Caribbean to care for the children “back home” while the parental generation came to this country both as economic providers and ambassadors for possible new lives.

Further family variations also included the cultural mix which constituted part of my own background: European families from Greece and Cyprus, as well as Turkey, who bordered “cultures” of Western and Eastern Europe and whose “cultural difference” was harder to take conscious account of in my work because it was so familiar to me in life (Gorell Barnes, 2002). Earlier, in the 1960s, I had worked in Islington Children’s Department, the precursor of modern children’s services, doing family work of all kinds, with a similar mix of families from different ethnicities. This work included assessing and supervising foster placements, adoption assessment, supervising day care “child minding” placements, and providing support to

fathers of all cultures when a mother was ill or admitted to hospital and other relatives were not available. Like Jennifer Walters, whose book *Working with Fathers* was published shortly before I started work on this one, I have “repeatedly been struck by men’s love for their children and their desire to participate in family life” (Walters, 2011, p. 83). My own early experience with my father, described in [Chapter One](#), was an inner guide to believing in the potential nurturing capacity of men when a context for the legitimised expression of nurture became socially available. I use the word “legitimised” deliberately, as I believe there have been many social distortions in the development of men’s emotionality, some of which are discussed in the chapters that follow.

*Fathers at the centre and fathers on the margins:
personal research studies*

My own professional interest in developing the subject of working with disenfranchised fathers developed further in the context of two earlier research and clinical studies: the first looking at the experiences of young people who grew up in step-families (Gorell Barnes et al., 1998), and learning from their narratives about both fathers and step-fathers in the 1970s and 1980s. The second study was carried out in the context of a project on children and parents going through separation and divorce in the child and family department of the Tavistock Clinic in the 1990s (Dowling & Gorell Barnes, 1999). Subsequently, a colleague, Mary Bratley, and I interviewed twenty fathers who were the primary carers for their children (Gorell Barnes & Bratley, 2000, unpublished). The study was not finished due to unexpected illness and death in the families of both researchers. However, I have drawn on some of those interviews to illustrate fathers’ enjoyment of bringing up their children in spite of complex and adverse circumstances which led to major adaptations in their own lives. Their narratives of the daily experiences of managing lives as primary carers for their children, sometimes in the context of a former partner who had, and continued to have, a major mental illness, offered varied thoughts and multiple options on how “family life” (offering nurture to, and taking responsibility for, children) can be maintained. I have continued to work intensively with fathers following marital or partnership

separation and re-marriage problems, in addition to fathers living through family changes as a result of mental illnesses in partners or children (involving some 120 fathers altogether).

Key contemporary studies

The book draws mainly on my clinical and court work experience, with a background of key contemporary studies from the large social science literature on fathers and families. To cite all this work would not be possible, but there are special thanks to *Intimate Fatherhood* (Dermott, 2008), *Researching Intimacy in Families* (Gabb, 2010), and from the socio-legal angle, *Fragmenting Fatherhood* (Collier & Sheldon, 2008). In addition, I have referenced studies from the past decade focusing on men, challenging stereotypes in gendered roles, *Do Men Mother?* (Doucet, 2006), and the work on *Contemporary Fathering* (Featherstone, 2009). The dedicated research by Michael Lamb is a necessary companion to writing anything on fathers and will be referenced in later chapters. Earlier work from the 1980s (*Re-assessing Fatherhood*, Lewis & O'Brien, 1987) and 1990s (*Children in Families*, Brannen & O'Brien, 1996; "Fathers and fatherhood in Britain", Burghes et al., 1997) took the form of research studies and reflections to which I have often turned, and which influenced my clinical thinking throughout that period and onwards.

Interdisciplinary influences on clinical work over time: multiple contributions to a systemic approach

My own clinical work has drawn widely on four main fields outside the schools of systemic therapy itself. Each of these has contributed to the ongoing construction of a personal systemic framework.

1. Social research into families and the effect of social policy on families; the intersection of the public and the private.
2. Child development research in different social contexts,
3. Psychodynamic relational understanding extended through twenty-five years working at the Tavistock Clinic, given a complementary framework of attachment theory by John Bowlby, whose

attachment research from the 1970s onwards influenced my thinking. In my own mind, the added lens of being a working woman, as well as a different cultural lens from Dr Bowlby regarding the value of wider kin care for any single child, brought additional questions to the focus of the mother–child attachment frame.

4. An earlier and continuing influence which brought together the three areas above within a wider systemic framework was ethology (or the patterning of relationship structures within animal as well as human living systems). This started as a child when I read Konrad Lorenz's early studies (1952) and continued in the 1970s through the reading not only of Gregory Bateson, but of his nephew P. P. G. Bateson (1976) and colleague Robert Hinde (1979). My later friendship with Patricia Minuchin, a developmental psychologist, brought together through her own writing and connections further reading of attachment theory within the wider frame of ethology (Hinde & Stevenson Hinde, 1988; Minuchin, 1988).

Recently, neurobiology has further contributed to my understanding of particular developmental difficulties and how these can intersect with relational complexities in family struggles, and has again drawn attention back to wider social contexts and the impact these can have on individuals and the internal effects of social stress. The book draws on these diverse but intersecting frames and puts them together within a systemic approach that addresses them at the levels of individual and family. This makes sense for clinical work with fathers finding and maintaining relationships with children in difficult circumstances

*Idiosyncratic threads that help fathers
hang into therapeutic work*

Although what follows is not a manual or detailed guide to practice, I have tried to draw out aspects of my work with fathers which I believe have made it more possible for them to pick their way through tangles of troubled family relationships, regain threads of connection,

and, when they persevere, scaffold more secure relationships with their children. These include the following.

1. A recognition of their often passionate feelings about children, frequently a depth of emotion not formerly discovered through previous partner relationship experience.
2. Drawing on an approach that is educative about child development and child care.
3. Describing openly a systemic framework that takes into account and discusses mutual influence in family relationships.
4. Collaborative conversations, thinking with fathers about their own life experiences and the intergenerational influences on these, as well as the larger social discourses that have a bearing on their views about, and practices of, fatherhood.
5. Using a sense of humour as part of communal reflection on life's mistakes, life dilemmas and pitfalls, and the ways that we try to overcome them. Often, the work with a particular father and family has been long term, sometimes more than two years, through provision made by both County Court and High Court judges for family conflict cases of exceptional complexity. My thirty-five years of independent practice has allowed for consultations with fathers over long periods, sometimes ten years or more. These three settings of the National Health Service (NHS), of family courts, and independent practice have allowed me the richness of working across boundaries of class and ethnicity. I have always been vigilant about the nuances of cultural difference, though sometimes making wrong assumptions that have got me into trouble. I have been able to work with fathers from a diverse range of social and employment settings, from penal institutions to lawyers, businessmen, and entrepreneurs to fathers dependent on welfare, government and NHS employees, doctors and clergy, as well as a range of therapeutic practitioners and healers.

Unlike social research, which focuses on what specific groups of fathers have *achieved*, this book addresses some of the relational struggles that co-exist with the potential for both the achievement and the failure of good relations with children for men of different classes and cultures, within wider contexts of their families. It considers how

professionals can help with processes of mediating emotional difficulties between fathers, partners, and their children. This can take the form of modifying their “wished for” and sometimes unrealistic fantasies about relationships between fathers and children towards more solid emotional territory, embedding them in realities which are smaller than the fantasies, but which can grow and develop their own momentum. It draws on “local knowledges” (Geertz, 1983) developed on a case-by-case basis with fathers, whose own subjective experience I might have shared over periods of between two and ten years. I also take aggregated knowledge into account, reflecting settings in which performances of “father” have been required by others: by mothers, by children, by ex-wives, by kinship networks, and by the courts. In these different settings, I try to look at those specificities of the meaning of “father” that is being “sought” in any particular family, and by the different individuals within it.

*Following the decline of patriarchy, how does
a father think about his role?*

Once the securities of “patriarchy” were dislodged during the second half of the past century, which is discussed in [Chapters One](#) and [Three](#), a puzzle for many fathers became how to position themselves within a family. This involved different dilemmas in different cultures. There is no single father role to which all fathers should aspire. A successful father, as defined in terms of his children’s development, is one who finds the right fit between the demands and prescriptions of his own social and cultural context and his own interpretation of these in terms of love and responsibility within which his children can thrive. In our family practice, the urgent need to redress the balance between men and women in the direction of women’s empowerment might have led to some lacunae in our own thinking as professionals about concurrent developing dilemmas for fathers around “how to be a father”. Most women taking on feminist ideas in the 1960s and 1970s believed men should be responsible for their own thinking. This necessary neglect by women ignored the “perturbations” urgently needed in men’s thinking at that time to allow for more rapid and positive changes to occur, if fathers were to “keep up” in relation to changing ideas about fatherhood, contemporary to each decade.

Current research shows that families can thrive well with and without fathers, which further complicates thinking for men about “father and family”. However, fathers themselves might not thrive without their families, particularly when they are excluded from the lives of their children, and this recognition entered the field at a later date, when research on men’s health in response to post divorce living began to emerge (Hetherington, 1989). Not to think “about” fathers and their changing positions in families, as well as “thinking with” them, seems to me now to be unsystemic. That is with the reflective capacity of hindsight, rather than the anger of an earlier time, and the associated vigour for women of “getting on with it”. For a professional as well as for a family, it can become a habit not to think about the possible effects of ignoring one part of the “circuits of relationship” in which a child grows. Following the increased social freedom to divorce, as well as to create families without marriage at all, there was a failure to think about the changing relational processes resulting from break-away and the development of new systems. Thinking about family continued along former paths, in too many habitual ways. Habit, as Bateson delineated it, is a major economy of conscious thought, but might be an economy carried out at a price (Bateson, 1973c). When fathering becomes “tokenised”, and acts of “performing fatherhood” are disconnected from the changing emotional and intellectual matrix of the child’s mind, it becomes difficult for the child to think about “family as a whole” and a father’s part in it. Separated fathers suffer from this.

Throughout this book, I do not think about the “performance of fatherhood” as a universal constant in pattern, shape, and practices throughout any child’s life. It is the recognition and witnessing of the changing nature of what a family requires of a father within the lifetime of one or two generations, which long-term clinical work can offer, that fleshes out sociological analysis of fatherhood. What fathering entails can vary in detail within the life of one man; it is a constant work in progress. A person’s understanding of their own intimate life, and the sets of relationships within which their own execution of the role of father has been constructed, can dramatically change from year to year, and even from week to week.

CHAPTER ONE

The changing social context for fathering in the United Kingdom in my lifetime: the family and fathers remembered following the Second World War

Men, women, work, family, and babies

Following the end of the Second World War, family life had to reorganise around the inclusion of fathers returning from the world of combat. Contemporary studies of the family did not include any difficulties this reinstatement had involved, and also ignored variations in gendered family practices—ways that men and women might have behaved within the privacy of the family that were different from roles publically assigned for “mother” and for “father”. Idiosyncratic contradictions that might have been tolerated and even enjoyed in family life in the 1950s were not reported, so that how fathers “behaved” in families is recorded under broad research agreements on how family life was put together: the domain of sociology *vs.* the idiosyncratic and anecdotal interpretations of how this was actually have lived (more the domain of diaries, biography, comedy, popular songs, and seaside postcard jokes (Orwell, 1941)). The larger institutionalised construction of family, with a preferred frame of two parents, is our official version of family life (Mogey, 1956; Young & Wilmot, 1957).

The 1950s and the 1960s marked the rise of “maternal” pre-eminence (Bowlby, 1951). Women were urged to prioritise looking after their babies over working outside the home. This emphasis on childcare was in part to compensate for the retreat of women from the marketplace, encouraged in order to allow men back into the labour forces at the necessary level after the war. Anecdotally referenced by Grace Robertson, who herself went on to become a world-famous photographer, was the gratitude and guilt women felt towards the men who had fought and won a terrible war and

not wanting to steal their work . . . you couldn't avoid the men who had been hurt in the war: they were everywhere, blind or scarred, on crutches or in wheelchairs. This made women less voluble on the subject of equality than they might otherwise have been . . . I could no more have thought of feminism in the face of what I could see in the streets than I could have flown to the moon. It would have been indecent as far as I was concerned. (Robertson, quoted in Cooke, 2013, p. xix)

The primary role consigned to women, to have babies, also marked the significance given to re-populating a society decimated by war through bombing and loss of civilians as well as loss of fighting men: “the chief means of fulfilment in life is to be a member of and reproduce a family” (Oakley, 2014). During the Second World War, men had been distanced from the daily experience of their families and in the immediate post-war period of re-entry and accommodation into family life their role as breadwinner was privileged. A father's role was socially defined as “the economic provider and the emotional support of mother” (Bowlby, 1953, p 15).

Creating homes for families: public policy and private life

Standards of living for families as a whole improved in the context of massive rebuilding programmes following the bombing and destruction of civilian life in some of the major cities in the UK (Imperial War Museum London Blitz Archives), creating new possibilities for family living. The population of Britain at every social level had been shocked to discover the quality of life many families had suffered in pre-war housing, and there was a national wish to give families of all

social classes the opportunity for a better quality of life. A further emphasis on the importance of motherhood as an activity arose from public recognition of the deprivations experienced by children during the war, both within their homes through bombing and as a result of evacuation, an attempt to avoid the effects of bombing on children. Evacuation itself had opened up wider public awareness of the poverty and associated poor nutrition and health standards within which many children were raised, creating a public momentum for social change. There was a “spirit of hope” pushing forward the legislations of the Welfare State—health, housing, and benefits all being proposed as part of a better quality of life. The importance of the well-being and connectedness of people throughout the country was a new social recognition, and became a post-war principle of shared belief embodied in the early post-war construction of the Welfare State “a place where young people, besieged for six years of war could finally feel they had a future. You could fairly feel the rush of air as they raced forward to greet it” (Dundy, quoted in Cooke, 2013, p. xv). In the early 1950s, rationing ended, economic policy showed growth, and there were higher wages. Numbers of babies could be controlled through increased use of birth control (but within marriage only; at that time, contraception was provided only if a woman produced a marriage certificate). These were all factors contributing to pleasanter homes, husbands more at home, shared activities such as radio listening and, subsequently, watching television, more participation in family life, a move towards the modern “involved” dad and, though not yet realised, the father as co-parent.

Fathers in family life following the Second World War: glimpses of gender and role

Lamb (2013), the foremost researcher on fathers’ roles in family life, confirms that social scientists of the 1940s and 1950s did not study fathers. In the aftermath of war, little was recorded about how meaningful emotional and psychological relationships were formed by and with fathers. Unusual performances of “father” in daily life, therefore, falls to those of us who remember these from our own lives to supplement what research studies describe. A vignette of my own family variations follows below. Fathering, like mothering, involves the

repetitive enactment of patterns of daily care and the distribution of these among family members depending on their age, gender, and competence: feeding the family, doing the laundry, paying the bills, management of children's lives, problem-solving, boundary-keeping, regulation of emotions, homework assistance, stress management, demonstration of affection and aggression at expected and unexpected times. Patterns of family "chores" as well as emotional and relational life for fathers in families are unlikely to have been organised in any single manner.

Women sociologists of the time dismissed the "romanticised" stereotyped picture emerging (from the male sociologists of the 1950s) of the large, three-generation, gender-divided, working-class family. Oakley noted how Gavron, the first woman and feminist sociologist to address similar terrain in the UK, considered men's and women's particular experience in her analysis. Gavron's accounts of family life differed from other pictures painted of fathers by showing how small numbers of men were actively entering the domain of hands-on fathering (over five per cent doing "anything or everything" and a further twenty-seven per cent doing most things except nappies (Gavron, 1966, cited in Oakley, 2014). The Newson studies (conducted by a married couple, thus including perspectives from both genders) concurred that men were playing a larger part in family life, with thirty per cent of fathers of one-year-olds putting their children to bed and over eighty per cent playing with them regularly. Their study shows differences related to social class, with more involvement from fathers higher up the class scales of their time. Their population was not in London, but in Nottingham, and social, gender, and family norms were likely to have been differently constructed relating to the labour practices of their population (Newson & Newson, 1963). The research field of sociology, and, therefore, the subjects studied, was itself tightly controlled by men, including a patriarchal stance held at the London School of Economics. This is likely to have affected what could be investigated and recorded in relation to changing patterns in family life and controlled research into gender and change itself (Gavron, 2015; Oakley 2014).

Female strength was acknowledged in the reporting of family life in the UK, but not complemented by knowledge of men's changing behaviours in the family. In the 1960s and the decades that followed, rates of maternal employment amplified, with the growth of industries

that were machine or technology led and offered new, as well as part-time, employment for women. So also did the growth of commerce and administration, catering, and the service industries, providing further work for women compatible with family life. The expansion of teaching, nursing, and social services also provided opportunities for women, like myself, to train and work in professions approved by the contemporary male “gaze” as non-threatening. Attitudes were changing between generations. The increase in the employment of married women naturally had an effect on married relationships, as many wives were now released from complete financial dependence on their husbands. Therefore, they became freer to think for themselves, exchange ideas with other women in the workplace, and express different opinions at home (Gorell Barnes, 1990). The high wages that school leavers were able to obtain gave sons and daughters more financial independence from their parents, and the establishment of the Welfare State—in particular the National Health Service—now offered services for those events in life for which parents were once the only source of help and advice. The “family” moved towards becoming a collective of thinking individuals, in many cases with attendant anxieties about role, power, and new gendered freedoms. By the 1990s, fifty-nine per cent of mothers were working; a decade later, seventy per cent of married mothers were working, the hours depending on the age of their children (Brannen et al., 1997).

Family patterns and men's social experience

The social and emotional positions through which boys work towards becoming fathers have always been diverse, affected by wartime or peacetime, by ethnicity, culture, class, family composition, and by idiosyncratic experience. Shared male cultural experience runs in parallel with individual development: schools, religious venues, playgrounds, sports changing rooms, “hanging out” spaces such as teenage bedrooms, music venues, clubs and gangs, coffee bars, workplace canteens, as well as pubs. Shared “cultural” input from radio and, after the 1950s, television is now overtaken by social media and multiple cultural choices. Until 1963, there was also the powerful collective experience for men of doing National Service—two years in one of the armed forces or work associated with defence. War, and

men as fighters of war and “protectors of women and children”, remained a powerful aspect of respected masculinity into the mid-1960s and continued to influence ideas about fatherhood. The job of becoming a father, and developing any parity as a parent, remained secondary to what was required of men in life outside the home, an ideology also subscribed to by many women. This further contributed to the elevated positions of “authority” often accorded to men across a wide number of social domains. The research ideology and premises about how family life should be conducted also remained within this framework, promoting the peacetime ideal of cohesion, rather than looking at differences in family life.

In addition, how might a father’s beliefs about his role in his child’s life have been affected by contemporary wider economic systems? Fatherhood roles in the 1950s and 1960s were strongly related to the requirements of production, and the expectations held of men in the workplace, which “excluded men from the home as effectively as they held women to it” (Lummis, 1982). A father’s beliefs about fatherhood were primarily linked to current traditions related to labour. The structures of many industries and their particular disciplines in different parts of the UK were strongly associated with how family life was run.

*How do men develop their ideas about fathering
from their families as well as society?*

Walters (2011), in her research, found that where fathers had experienced closeness to their own fathers, they were more likely to be participatory with their own children. However, clinical work, as well as non-clinical interviews with fathers, suggest that when a father has had a bad fathering experience himself, good enough care from other relatives can mitigate the effects of this and he could strive to achieve a better relationship with his own children than his father had with him. He might also feel freer to try out better practices. As Sam, who is bringing up his daughter as primary parent said,

“My dad was virtually never home . . . barely at home, used to beat us frequently. What can I say about my dad, I think my dad was awful. My dad was awful, you know, but you still love him don’t you . . . he

was just . . . I think my dad taught me the dangers of excessive masculinisation very early. I just looked at it even as a kid. This is weird . . . this is not right . . .” (Gorell Barnes & Bratley, 2000)

Quality of fathering alone might be less significant in influencing a father’s determination to become a hands-on parent than wider family experience of being nurtured by mothers, sisters, elder brothers, uncles, and grandfathers. Recent websites (e.g., Fatherhood Institute, 2012) now offer forums where men can explore questions about what makes a “good enough” father with other fathers and offer practical advice and models of practice (Cabrera et al., 2000). However, this was unavailable to the fathers discussed later in this book, who relied mainly on male relatives and friendship groups as well as their “mum” to instigate better fathering.

*Social discourses and individual narratives:
male and female power—multiple intersections*

Men still continue to hold the larger political and economic power in the UK, still dominating the institutions of government, judicial, and military systems and the world of international business. However, the population of men and women is now moving to women in the majority (51% in the UK in 2015), and there has been an increase in women gaining larger percentages of the intake into professional trainings in the old as well as the new universities. The former organisation of gender balance within larger social systems has the potential to be in rapid disequilibrium in the next half century, in spite of male resurgences of power in different parts of the world. Many schools, particularly public schools, have formerly contributed to rigidified ideas of masculinity and fatherhood through their attitudes to growing boys. They have traditionally reinforced distance from femininity, and paradoxically created idealisation of it, dependence on it, and disrespect for it (Burck & Daniel, 1995). This has had the power to shape and restrict men’s tenderness and their capacity for intimacy, and to form emotional connections with others close to them. With the increase of co-education in all sectors of education within the UK, girls’ influence will have more ongoing impact on these former arrangements of power and intimacy in the future,

despite the chauvinist backlash that many girls are experiencing in schools and on line. Men's capacity for intimacy will change. The patterns that still affect the majority of men over fifty who are currently fathers are now largely in flux for those under forty.

While recognising the reality of men's power, I have chosen, for diverse reasons, to take a position in my work with fathers estranged from their children that also considers men's emotional disadvantage. This is often shaped by the same social and economic processes that gave them power in more public domains. When power is moved from one domain to another, from public to private, to contexts constructed around intimacy and caring, some men might not understand the basic principles of the systemic change involved and find themselves on the margins of family life. How can we usefully harness the complementary power of women on men's behalf? While changes in fatherhood have inevitably been linked to changes in motherhood, the wider changes and growth in women's power in the world outside the home demand further and more rapid changes of men within the domain of family life—changes for which they have often been unprepared, and have sometimes been unwilling to make.

*What is a father for, and who decides?
Changing social discourses*

The expectations of a father within the home have changed over the past fifty years from being the “mother's part-time helper” of the 1960s to becoming the “co-parent” of the twenty-first century. However, there remain many fathers who have themselves not been raised to share household and childcare tasks in a responsible manner. They are often taken by surprise at the powerful impact of the emotional tasks involved in day-to-day child rearing. Changes in the collective social consciousness about gender, power, and men's roles in the UK and Europe in the past twenty years have left many contemporary fathers behind in an assortment of troubled contexts. They are often ill equipped to respond to the wider de-construction of old style patriarchy, but choose to fall back on its rhetoric when challenged to perform differently in family life. The introduction of greater shared paternity leave in 2015 (Paternity Leave Policy, 2015) offered further opportunity to change this frame; but there are many reasons,

primarily led by the economics and pressures of workplaces, which have militated against change (Jacobs, 2016). Becoming a real dad is less likely to be regarded as an optional “add on” in a father’s life now, and more likely to be a requirement from mothers and from children demanding involvement and responsibility.

Gay fathers

With the legal recognition of same-sex marriage coming into force in March 2014, the primary structural family feature of “institutionalised patriarchy”—father as head of the heterosexual and legally privileged form of family—became invalid. While heterosexual family life remains the predominant form of family, it is no longer exclusive in law. This can further free fathers to “invent” fatherhood forms and expand definitions of family in multiple ways, as gay fatherhood has shown. Inevitably, as male partners are having their own children, there will also be dramatic changes in the range of motherhoods. Some aspects of this are touched on further in [Chapter Eight](#).

Fatherhood following breakup: children as players in the definitions of what a father should be

Following partnership breakup, changes in fatherhood also need to develop congruence with children’s wishes. An influence that men often do not face until they have to do so is the power their own children carry to shape the way they will perform fatherhood. This scrutiny and questioning by children has meant that many fathers can no longer expect that formerly held assumptions about the nature and status of being a father can be taken for granted. Following a separation from a mother which he has initiated himself, a man’s children will be especially unlikely to subscribe to any ideas he might have about “rights” or respect “due to him as a father”. This will be particularly true if the children have no understanding of why he left and of his chosen way of life away from them and their mothers. Even where a father is secure in the knowledge of his own biological parenthood, other men are often preferred as social father by a

mother. Social fathers will often form an equally strong attachment to the child if they are actively involved in co-parenting with the children's mother. The more we go into the texture of what a father is "for", the more we recognise how strategically mothers might re-position themselves on behalf of children and family life. This can involve choosing partners whom they regard as more suitable for social fatherhood, relying on their own family and friends, or preferring to "go it alone" rather than sustain the uncertainty of relationship with former "unsatisfactory" partners.

Non-traditional fatherhood

I have always been interested in the use of the term "non-traditional fatherhoods", presuming, as it did, that there was a "traditional" fatherhood against which other models of "doing father" were to be measured. As noted above, the parental features specific to fathering (other than relations of power and control) were given little attention by early post-war family research. Lamb himself became responsible for much of the research documenting child development in contexts then named "non-traditional" because they did not reflect the demographic characteristics of the traditional families on which contemporary social scientists had largely focused (Lamb, 1999, 2013). One large, under-researched group which itself was "traditional", but not studied, includes the fathers reared in fatherless families following the First World War. This includes my own father. In the 1990s, Lamb published numerous studies on changes in fatherhood in the contexts of changing patterns of marriage, co-habitation, and partnership separation (Lamb, 1999; Lewis & Lamb, 2005). The chapters that follow illustrate aspects of these changes. As clinical practitioners, we are always, in addition, potential pioneers in small-scale research. We enquire about the idiosyncratic way that each family has constructed itself, and record these differences to broaden our historical knowledge of diversity in family forms and behaviours. We are likely to see variations of family that are more diverse than research frameworks are often able to encompass, including hidden "femininities" emerging in the private discourses of men, shown in family life but undeclared to social researchers.

*My own experience of non-traditional fatherhood:
putting it together in a personal frame (1943–1960)*

As my own experience of being “fathered” was non-traditional for the time, I developed most of my personal notions of mother and father outside the contemporary mainstream of the patriarchal culture of the time, and have never carried that particular internal model or the emotional dynamic of a male-dominated family framework. My mother was the economic provider, model of authority, and the powerful and emotionally “violent” one, and my father was the figure of safety and secure attachment. Patriarchy as a lived experience of my own did not become a significant part of my consciousness until the 1960s, when I married a man who worked within the business world of contemporary “institutionalised masculinity”. I then found myself relegated to the fringe of “woman’s work” within the gaze and intellectual framework of his “city” peer group.

While growing up, I was more aware of class, culture, and ethnicity as different lenses through which to view the world and locate ideas than I was of the lens of gender—my own versions of multiple descriptions lodged within the former at the expense of the latter. The wider family I grew up in was a matriarchal family on both sides, the grandfathers having died earlier: one (English) in the service of country in the First World War, and the other (Cretan Greek) in the service of business, losing his venture in the 1920s crash. Thus, the women on both sides (my mother’s mother and sister and my father’s mother), as the holders of family stories, provided a series of robust female discourses which limited my perceptions of patriarchy as an adverse social influence. Throughout my childhood, fatherhood was narrated predominantly within a southern European frame of strong women as the power behind the throne, (“take power but never openly subvert your man while doing so”). In the case of my English granny, father was remembered and honoured, but never discussed at all.

Fatherhood as a childhood experience of my own was also dominated by the two World Wars: during the first (1914–1918) my father lost his own father and during the second (1939–1945) he had to choose what being a man in wartime Britain meant for him. How to perform fatherhood, and how to be a man in and out of the family, required my father to find a new invention for himself. While there is obviously a level at which this is true for every father, he had grown

up without a father himself, and with a clever twin sister and mother as his intimate household companions. I never learnt about what he was expected to do in the way of household tasks as a child, except by the delegation of what he taught me to do in turn. He taught me how to wash and hang up his drip-dry shirts when I was eight (a role I believe he wanted to avoid for himself, as I knew my granny, his mother, had always done all the washing) and how to cook a Sunday lunch by the time I was nine—cooking being a way in which I believe he had allowed himself to identify with some of her skills. The life stories that could organise a role called masculine in his childhood family were absent from the telling, although the articulation of values, mainly subversive to the predominant culture of the time, were handed down in two widely divergent ways. On the one side was a love of music hall and of seaside “end of the pier” humour that specialised in meanings about otherness (not exactly smutty, but always with double meanings). On the other side was a commitment to pacifism and Fabian Socialism, striving for a better world for all, ideals strongly handed down in gender-free and non-specific ways.

During the Second World War, when masculinity outside the home was largely determined by a capacity to fight for country, he chose, and hung on fiercely to, pacifism. This was perhaps the main legacy from his mother’s narrative about his father, who was killed in the final year of the First World War and whom he never saw. He went through the contemporary assessments of authenticity of pacifism, was found to be sincere in his views by the legal tribunals and was, therefore, required to carry out civilian war work. He subsequently spent the war years working for the Pacifist Service Unit. When the Second World War ended, he did not pick up any of the threads of the institutional masculinities available at the time in which he might have found employment. He avoided hierarchical structures with a dominant male at the top. Instead, he opened a café in Soho, which formed a second childhood base during my school holidays (and at weekends) from the age of seven onwards.

In considering how the domains of home, wife, and café mutually influenced one another in the development of his fathering of me, I saw my father as the nurturing, feeding parent and my mother as the economic provider (since the café project barely covered its own maintenance costs). I learnt that it is hard to maintain one without the other

and that it was important to do both. However, it was only later in life that I realised how powerfully contemporary gendered social roles were being subverted in my family at that time. I never had the experience, so powerful among many female colleagues and friends, of a mother who sacrificed herself to domesticity to support her husband's career (see Oakley, 2014). There was little debate about the unusual nature of what had been created, and what had been avoided, by constructing this second intimate familial context of café as companion and rival to the project of home life, although there were endless arguments about the café not making money and my father not having a "proper job".

My father merged levels of intimacy into a single context. We (the café and the customers) were all family. The café was my validation as much as I was part of the café—the context in which I could have my own life witnessed as well as observe and accommodate others. A multi-layered description of aspects of life with my father would include intimacy, nurturance, pacifism, equality, and freedom from gender and class definitions. This could be found in his choice of lifestyle (as well as the lifestyle of many of his customers). Through the experience of life in the café in Soho, I also learnt most of the tenets of respect for people that inform my way of seeing the world. A Fabian Socialist framework, with some complex Marxist reworking on the subject of sex and the capitalist machine, taught me that we were each performing our part and that prostitution is as valuable as making coffee. I was, therefore, taught to greet all around me with respect and to make and serve coffee as well as I could. This gave me a security in the world that has never left me; I operated on assumptions of basic respect and trust, as well as recognition of the value of different skills. At the same time, it left me vulnerable through lack of a developed ability to make certain distinctions. In the intimacy of the café culture, there was an absence of discussion of difference and social discriminations as the rest of the world (my school friends, my mother, and, later, the world into which I married) understood them. I had to learn to perceive, though not necessarily respect, these social and classed nuances as I travelled through life. In a world where, through the eyes of my father, everything except the abuse of power (epitomised by the Nazi atrocities of the war era) was to be respected for its potential intrinsic goodness and necessary function, it was difficult for me to distinguish "bad". This has remained hazardous for me throughout

my working life and, while of immense benefit in getting on with and enjoying humanity, has led me most often to seek consultation about how I distinguish between changeable, or possibly unchangeable, “badness” in the various contexts I have worked in (Gorell Barnes, 1990, 2002).

Gender studies and gay and lesbian studies

Readings about performance of gender in family life and wider social contexts clarify how language itself contributes to maintaining unnecessary dualism and gender stereotypes in social and family groups. Similarly, readings in gay and lesbian writing about family over the past ten years has led to further clarifications in my own mind about my long-term interest in the diversities of fatherhood and my lifelong mistrust of totalising assertions about the “role of father” (Lewis et al., 1976; Parsons et al., 1955; Skynner, 1968). Our everyday language contributes to the discourses about being a father and shapes fathers’ ideas about themselves. Gay men and women have overtly challenged and written about traditional role assumptions in their own family lives over the past twenty years, which throws reflections on to other forms of contemporary family life as well as historically illuminating the shadows of my own (Portch, 2011, pp. 3–8 Reynolds, 2010). My father was bisexual and sustained a hidden gay lifestyle in a period of post-war living when to be gay was to be criminalised. Being “allowed” to be legally gay did not take place until after his death and to be caught in homosexual acts could lead to imprisonment and often did. In my family life, and among the network of my parents’ friends, this was joked about—possibly as a way of distancing themselves from the reality that they faced. My mother was working in the film industry where, as a woman, she was breaking through a number of gender barriers in the male dominated studio and production industry. This meant that, for long periods of time, “the film came first”, with studio hours that were often twelve hours a day. In my later childhood, she also worked away from home in other countries, and so my father operated as the nominal, if erratic, “responsible parent”. My reliable other companion of mind and of humour at that time was my Irish “nanny Kathleen”, who was the person who was there after school, with whom I listened to *Workers Playtime*, *Life with the Lyons*, *Take It from Here*, *The Goon Show*, and other BBC comedy staples of life.

We both deferred to the magic phone call my father would make at 7.45 p.m., which was the time to “stop reading and go to bed”. He rarely came home, but he usually made the phone call. He then conducted his gay life in the Turkish Baths—a place which retained impermeable layers of mystery for me, in that nothing, of course, was explained.

Grannies as caring kin

Nothing, therefore, was run traditionally in the family household. The discordance between these arrangements and those highlighted by the sociological studies of the families of that time confirm how unusual it was for a woman to be the source of economic strength in England in the 1940s and 1950s. My father’s mother became my additional base during school holidays in my pre-adolescent years. She represented the stability of a single-person female household and lived within the framework of a very small war widow’s pension in the small bungalow in Margate where my father had grown up. Under her calm English exterior, a Fabian political stance was quietly imbued in me, along with knowledge of how to make white sauce, the daily reading of the *News Chronicle* and the enjoyment of “end of the pier” entertainments. Too young to train for a profession, she had worked as a clerk before the First World War. The *Sex Disqualification Removal Act*, which allowed women’s entry to the professions, was not passed until 1919, by which time she was the lone widowed mother of twins. The rigid divisions between what constituted male activity and what was considered appropriate for females were further deconstructed by the processes of the war itself (Adie, 2013). None the less she did not gain full women’s franchise (the vote) until 1928, by which time she had lived ten years of managing as a lone mother. She represented a class of women who were widowed and did not remarry—strong and able. In a country that had lost over a million of the young men who might have become fathers, and those whose sons were growing up without fathers, this female power was respected. Undoubtedly, they drew on mother’s brothers, cousins, and available others in their community and school network as male models for their sons, but it was not a “golden era” of two-parent families as is sometimes romanticised by politicians.

Sex, birth control, babies, and rights over children: the slow decline of patriarchy and the emergence of nurturing fathers

Following the ending of the Second World War, changes in attitude towards marriage and divorce continued to alter decade by decade as did attitudes to sexual relationships outside marriage. Marriage initially became more popular and people married younger, but simultaneously an increasingly permissive attitude towards sex outside marriage, which had developed in the earlier context of war, loss and death, continued to develop more openly when those threats had diminished. However, the significant change in attitudes to sexual freedom came with the arrival of safer contraception in the form of “The Pill” in the mid-1960s. For women whose religious beliefs did not proscribe the use of contraception, this drastically changed their options regarding their sexual activity. Increasingly, women in the UK did not feel they had to wait for marriage and “save themselves” for marital legitimisation of their sexuality, however much their parents continued to champion these time-honoured ideas. During the 1970s, much of the mystique around marriage disappeared as freedom to have safe sexual partnerships developed outside marriage, and marriage became more connected to the idea of family than to sexuality on its own. Subsequently, the internet and social media, by creating the possibility for multiple conversations and contexts for legitimising different performances of sexuality, has transformed women’s as well as men’s freedoms to “do sex” on their own terms. The context for different conversations is now pervasive (BBC, 2015). The development of sexual and economic freedoms for women began to affect men and, in turn, the many possible performances of fatherhood.

Being able to regulate fertility more safely also created other freedoms for women. It provided opportunities and time to think without the constant anxiety about not becoming pregnant and about the hazards of surviving the economic and daily physical pressures of a household with many children. Both outside and inside marriage, this new assurance opened up multiple opportunities to critique male assumptions and male discourses. Women were freed, as Goldner later wrote, to become preoccupied with establishing themselves as actors in the public, not just the domestic, arena (Goldner, 1991). The combination of greater earning possibilities, control of fertility, and a

new capacity to think about who defines relationships and how the rules are made, contributed to a huge increase in women seeking separation when the “fault-free” divorce law was enacted by Parliament in 1969. This legislation, in addition, elaborated earlier changes that had given mothers preference over fathers in the rights over the care of children (*Guardianship of Infants Act*, 1925). The welfare of the infant was now to be the consideration of paramount importance in deciding where a child should live. Mothers were able, therefore, to be even less fearful about the potential loss of their children if they chose to separate. This significant shift in legal emphasis towards women as primary guardians further led away from the prevalent model of family that, in the early 1960s, could still be depicted as a cohesive social institution that was father-led.

However, in spite of the advent of women’s greater sexual freedom in the later 1960s, the power base in families continued for many years to be seen and experienced by women as resting primarily with men. This was largely due to their greater earning capacity, but was also because contemporary families were still operating by earlier internalised models of male and female role and power in family life. Sexism remained prevalent in the national ruling educational and financial institutions of the time and it carried over into much of family life (Gorell Barnes, 1990). None the less, the increase in higher education for women and the increasing pace of debate about male and female power, as well as the growth of collective female voices challenging the legitimacy of male assumptions in almost all previously taken for granted social domains, inevitably began to restructure assumptions about family itself and about fathers and mothers and their required performances in family life. Fletcher’s 1962 gender-determined definition of “family” defines the following functions: regulating sexual behaviour, providing a legitimate base for the procreation and rearing of children, providing sustenance and care for its dependant members, acting as an agent of socialisation, of education and the transmission of culture, giving status to its members, both in terms of role and relationship.

Forty years on, Hill and colleagues (2003) offered a set of principles in a different language, suggesting that the key elements of family can be seen as “defining attachment processes and offering affect regulation, interpersonal understanding and the provision of comfort within intimate relationships” (p. 205). This way of thinking

about family is much less dependent on gender and role but, instead, uses descriptions that are more related to domains of nurture and responsibility (Bugental, 2000).

Psychoanalytic framing of fatherhood: what are the “essential” characteristics of “father”?

As family-systems thinking developed in the UK in the early 1970s, the predominant influence, other than sociology, was psychoanalytic thinking. The collected volume on the psychoanalytic study of the father (Trowell & Etchegoyen, 2002) reflects some contemporary thinking about the role of fathers in the second half of the twentieth century. Fonagy and Target were pioneers in pointing out that while mothers' and fathers' roles are not identical in terms of the child's psychic organisation, their roles were not as clearly separated and defined as some psychoanalytic writers assumed. They proposed the view that generalities about fathers are of less value in theory than considering a particular father within the context of a relationship with a particular mother (Target & Fonagy, 2002). However, strong positions on a definition of “the father's job” were put forward by other (male) writers. For them, mothers were central to the formation of the child's psychological wellbeing, and fathers were primarily positioned in relation to acting as a bridge to the world outside the family. Fakhry Davids, for example, proposed that, in both biological and psychological spheres, the mother “psychoanalytically the first object is the essential parent, and the father necessarily has a secondary place” (2002 p. 75).

While advances in assisted fertilisation in the twenty-first century mean that none of the bodily functions, either male or female, need to be held in fixed positions for reproduction, and may even be transferred from other carers of different biological roles, the question of how psychological roles will change remains open for exploration in these multiple changing contexts. In families co-created with other bodies in a number of different ways (for example, sperm or egg donation, in addition to surrogacy, carrying a child for a heterosexual or a gay couple), the notion proposed by Hrdy (2009, p. 25) that “infants with several attachment figures grow up better able to integrate multiple mental perspectives” will be a key model for co-constructed families to practise, as well as for attachment researchers to hold in mind.

*Bringing fathers in or leaving fathers out:
how does a mother's mind affect a father's position?*

Fakhry Davids also outlines a belief, vital to the continuation of the function of "fatherhood" as formerly constructed, that "an internal father can arise even when the child has no direct experience of a father figure within the family", additionally proposing that the child who does not have a father will find "fathers" in the outside world. Theoretically (the analyst) deals with this (absence) by postulating that the "presence of father in the mother's mind is sufficient to compensate for his physical absence" (2002, p. 87).

Alternatively, Kraemer (2017) has put it thus: "in his mind no child is without a father and in the absence of a given story he will invent one" (p. 115).

One continued experience I have had in much of the clinical work described in this book is that the father might not be held in a mother's mind in any ways that can be of value to the child. This experience is replicated across court work, work with mothers who have never lived with the fathers of their children, and with those situations where children have been conceived without a specific father in the mind of the mother (other than as sperm donor for her eggs). Many fathers recognise the possibility of another man succeeding them, choosing to be with their children whether they live with the children's mother or not, before someone else does their work. Sometimes, however, mothers reject the terms on which a father offers a presence, denying that their child has a need for a second parent. Frosh located some of the dilemmas for fathers in positioning themselves in the context of contemporary cultural and social developments, suggesting

not only is it hard to become the nurturing pre-oedipal father created de novo from the absence of any received ideology of fathering but it is difficult to sustain any sense of being a proscriptive father enforcing social values. (Frosh, 1997, p. 49).

*Families should be father led: sociology, and some early
family therapy lenses on fathers' role, authority, and power*

The diversity of what is publicly recognised as "father" from the institutionalised and idealised model so prevalent when I began practice

in the 1960s is discussed in the chapters which follow. "Father as boss" was prescribed by sociologists such as Talcott Parsons (Parsons et al., 1955) and taught by some influential male family therapists of the 1960s and 1970s. (Skynner, 1968, 1976 in the UK; Minuchin, 1974 in the USA). Both Skynner and Minuchin had themselves had analytic training and despite coming from widely different cultural backgrounds (Minuchin Argentinian Jewish and Skynner from Cornwall in South West England), both firmly positioned the father as "head of the family". In doing this they were not necessarily men of the decade within which they were teaching, but were more of their own father's time, and had not accommodated wider social and gender changes in their outlook. Concomitantly, if unintentionally, they underplayed recognition of, and questioning around, male control and spousal and family violence, which so easily accompanied family life whose successful functioning was modelled on a "dominant' male" . As Goldner (1991) described in a later critique of structural approaches to family work in the 1970s, the notion that motherhood and fatherhood were socially constructed notions and not "biological givens" barely entered the thinking, let alone the discourse, of family therapists at that time. Fatherhood as authority was justified within a contemporary "recommended" performance of masculinity "for the good of the family". The dangers of this preference could be seen within some contemporary recordings of family sessions, which often did not integrate or value the different and divergent thinking expressed during interviews by women and mothers. Their views and opinions in family sessions were normally placed second to those of men, or could not be "heard" unless expressed again by a man. This was not the whole story in relation to fatherhood and family therapy in the 1970s, but, in retrospect, it was a surprisingly powerful force at a time when women's thinking had progressed more widely in other social domains.

*Pattern and mutual influence: the development
of systemic approaches to family work within
a psychodynamic frame in the 1970s*

In the earliest days of family therapy in the UK, systems theory was eagerly welcomed by some therapeutic practitioners as a way to free

the prevailing field of ideas from psychoanalysis, with its assumptions about position and role in the family, and its dominant discourse about the inner workings of the individual mind. Systems thinking developed around the concept of mutual influence and of the interrelationship of “parts” within a given framework; proposing that problems could most usefully be thought about in context, as part of a network of mutually influencing interrelated events within a defined boundary. Different clinicians championed different aspects of a systemic approach as being of most importance, some focusing on hierarchy and some on information and feedback (Gorell Barnes, 1985).¹

For me, systemic thinking allowed an integration of social and psychological factors as an overall framework for considering family difficulties, with each family managing aspects of both in different proportions at different times. These included developmental strengths and difficulties within individuals, and the ways family patterns influenced and, in turn, were shaped by these over time. Later, genetics and epigenetics (factors concerned with the transitions of genetic specificities) could be additionally brought into systemic thinking. A widely shared approach to family disturbance centred around error-controlled systems and “runaways”, resulting from the increased stress created by divergence from the system’s central properties, and much clinical practice included studying such processes in families. (This is discussed in more detail in [Chapter Twelve](#).) However, other early thinkers preferred propositions drawn from anthropology, biology, and ethology. These looked for the more general principles that could be used to explain those aspects of biological processes that led to increasing complexity of organisation within living, as distinct from mechanical systems (von Bertalanffy, 1950). Within these alternative stances for considering the processes of living in families, social influences which related to increasing gender struggles in family life and ways in which these were diverging from gendered “norms”, as discussed above, was given little attention.

Pattern recognition forms a key dimension of understanding life in a family. This fundamental aspect of living together over time was described early in systemic theory as a key issue in human problem solving:

that elusive sense for patterns which we humans inherit from our genes . . . involves all the mechanisms of representations of knowledge,

'nested contexts, skeleton conceptualisation, and mapping: the replicated ways in which ideas slip or become fuzzy; as well as the ways in which shared descriptions, metadescriptions, symbols and different dimensions of description are shared'. (Hofstadter, 1979, p. 674)

This poetic attempt to capture and define the core of idiosyncrasy in family functioning that constitutes a particular family has been an ongoing quest in family therapy theorising. Dunn, whose professional research lifetime has paralleled my clinical work lifetime, came to name this as the "core coherence" in families in her epidemiological studies of the development of children within varying family contexts. She described them as patterns of finely tuned anticipation and response known to, and constitutive of, core aspects of "family" which she unpacked through research projects into children and family life (Dunn, 2004). Hill and colleagues (2003, 2014) have conceptualised these patterns within different domains of family function and behaviours around love and attachment, and authority and discipline, making it more possible for therapists to observe and consider where conflicts are arising in family communications between misclassified sequences and domains.

The failure to recognise patterns: dilemmas for estranged fathers

The concept of shared patterns in family life and the failure to recognise these is particularly problematic for fathers living separately from, or estranged from, their children. Following parental separation, the development of differing living patterns with their "loops" and "tangled hierarchies", as well as "stories" about these, develop rapidly. Either partner might increasingly fail to understand the new patterns and rules (epistemologies) of the other parent (see [Chapters Five and Six](#)). Whereas in separating couples there is often an attempt to re-establish the system as it was before (usually by fathers), mothers more often aim to establish new patterns of behaviour, new structures, and the development of new problem-solving abilities within these.

A new focus on fathers in clinical practice

In the 1980s, more focused attention began to be given to differences in family structure through the study of reconstituted families and

their differences from first time intact marriages and, therefore, to the differences in the position, tensions, and behaviours of fathers (Gorell Barnes et al., 1998). In the 1990s, more serious attention was given to families going through separation and divorce (Dowling & Gorell Barnes, 1999). More attention was now given to “two family systems” that, through conflicts of interest and the earlier dissolution of couple ties, would necessarily have to incorporate new learning and develop significant differences with the family system as formerly defined. More recently, I have continued conversations with fathers about their own changes throughout their life transitions. Do they see themselves as being intrinsically the same? What have they learnt along the way? Is fatherhood always work in progress as the transitions of life continue?

In the chapters that follow, some of these questions will be addressed by fathers, mothers, and children themselves in a variety of different contexts.

References

- Adie, K. (2013). *Fighting on the Home Front: The Legacy of Women in World War One*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Arnold, E. (2012). *Working with Families of African Caribbean Origin: Understanding Issues around Immigration and Attachment*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Ayres, G. (2014). Recognising and working with parental alienation (PowerPoint presentation shared by the presenter at the Association of Family Therapy, Jersey).
- Barnes, J. , Belsky, J. , Broomfield, K. A. , Dave, S. , Frost, M. , Melhuish, E. , & The National Evaluation of Sure Start Research Team: Harper, G. , Leyland, A. , & McLeod, A. (2005). Disadvantaged but different: variations among deprived communities in relation to child and family well-being. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46(9): 952–962.
- Bateson, G. (1973a). Morale and national character. In: *Steps to an Ecology of Mind* (pp. 62–88). St Albans: Paladin.
- Bateson, G. (1973b). Style, grace and information in primitive art. In: *Steps to an Ecology of Mind* (pp. 101–125). St Albans: Paladin.
- Bateson, G. (1973c). The effects of human purpose on conscious adaptation. In: *Steps to Ecology of Mind* (pp. 415–422). St Albans: Paladin.
- Bateson, P. P. G. (1976). Rules and reciprocity in behavioural development. In: P. P. G. Bateson & R. Hinde (Eds.), *Growing Points in Ethology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BBC (2015). Debate on International Women's Day, 'Can Porn Empower Women', 8 March.
- Beauchaine, T. P. , Neuhaus, E. , Zalewski, M. , Crowell, S. E. , & Potapova, N. (2011). The effects of allostatic load on neural systems subserving motivation, mood regulation, and social affiliation. In: *Development and Psychopathology*, 23: 975–999. Cambridge University Press.
- Bifulco, A. , & Thomas, G. (2013). *Understanding Adult Attachment in Family Relationships*. London: Routledge.
- Blow, K. , & Daniel, G. (2002). Post-divorce processes and contact disputes. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 24(1): 85–103.
- Bowlby, J. (1951). *Maternal Care and Mental Health*. Geneva: World Health Organisation, Series 2.
- Bowlby, J. (1953). *Child Care and the Growth of Maternal Love*. London: Penguin.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss* (Vol. 1: Attachment). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and Loss* (Vol. 2: Separation anxiety and Anger). London: Hogarth Press.
- Bowlby, J. (1981). *Attachment and Loss* (Vol. 3: Loss, Sadness and Depression). London: Hogarth Press.
- Bowlby, J. (1984). Violence in the family as a disorder of the attachment and caregiving systems. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 44: 9–27.
- Bradshaw, J. (1999). *Absent Fathers*. London: Routledge.
- Brannen, J. , & O'Brien, M. (1996). *Children in Families: Research and Policy*. London: Falmer Press.
- Brannen, J. , Moss, P. , Owen, C. , & Skinner, C. (1997). *Mothers, Fathers and Employment: Parents and the Labour Market in Britain 1984–1994*. London: Department for Education & Employment.
- Bream, V. , & Buchanan, A. (2003). Distress among children whose separated or divorced parents cannot agree arrangements for them. *British Journal of Social Work*, 33: 227–238.
- Bugental, D. B. (2000). Acquisition of the algorithms of social life: a domain based approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126: 187–219.
- Burck, C. , & Daniel, G. (1995). *Gender and Family Therapy*. London: Karnac.
- Burghes, L. , Clarke, L. , & Cronin, N. (1997). Fathers and fatherhood in Britain. *Occasional Paper*, 23: 1–93.
- Byrne, J. G. , O'Connor, T. G. , Marvin, R. S. , & Whelan, W. F. (2005). Practitioner review: the contribution of attachment theory to child custody assessments. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46(2): 115–127.

Cabrera, N. J. , Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. , Bradley, R. H. , Hofferth, S. , & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Fatherhood in the twenty-first century. *Child Development*, 71: 127–136.

CAP (Child Arrangements Programme) (2014). Guiding Legislation for Private Law. London: Child and Family Court Advisory Service.

Carlson, M. J. , McLanahan, S. S. , & Brooks Gunn, J. (2008). Co-parenting and non-resident fathers' involvement with young children after a non-marital birth. *Demography*, 45: 461–488.

Child, N. (2016). Climbing the Mountain.<http://thealienationexperience.org>. United Kingdom.

Children Act (1989). Welfare checklist and 16A of the act—duty to risk assess. Practice Direction—Domestic Violence and Harm. London: Child and Family Court Advisory Service.

Cicchetti, D. (2011). Allostatic Load. In: *Development and Psychopathology*, 23: 723–724. Cambridge University Press.

Collier, R. , & Sheldon, S. (2008). *Fragmenting Fatherhood: A Socio-legal Study*. Oxford: Hart.

Cooke, R. , (2013). *Her Brilliant Career: Ten Extraordinary Women of the Fifties*. London: Virago.

Cooklin, A. (2004). *Being Seen and Heard. The Needs of Children of Parents with Mental Health Illness*. DVD and Training Pack. London: Royal College of Psychiatrists.

Cooklin, A. (2006). Children as carers of parents with mental illness. *Psychiatry*, 5(1): 32–35.

Cooklin, A. (2010). Living upside down: being a young carer of a parent with mental illness. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*, 16(2): 141–146.

Cooklin, A. (2013). Children's resilience to parental mental illness: engaging the child's thinking. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*, 19: 229–240.

Cooklin, A. , & Njoku, C. (2009). *When a Parent Has a Mental Illness*. London: Royal College of Psychiatrists.

Cooklin, A. , Bishop, P. , Francis, D. , Fagin, L. , & Asen, E. (2012). *The Kidtime Workshops: A Multi-Family Social Intervention for the Effects of Parental Mental Illness*. London: CAMHS Press.

Cooklin, C. , & Hyde, A. (2014). *Developing Private Law Skills*. London: Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service.

Cox, M. J. , Mills- Koonce, R. , Propper, C. , & Gariépy, J. L. (2010). Systems theory and cascades in developmental psychology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 22: 497–506.

Cummings, E. M. , & Davies, P. (2002). Effects of marital conflict on children: recent advances and emerging themes in process oriented research. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 243: 31–63.

Cummings, E. M. , Merrilees, C. E. , & George, M. W. (2010). Fathers, marriages and families: re-visiting and updating the framework for fathering. In: M. Lamb (Ed.), *The Role of the Father in Child Development* (5th edn) (pp. 154–176). Cambridge: John Wiley.

Cummings, E. M. , Simpson, K. S. , & Wilson, A. (1993). Children's responses to inter-adult anger as a function of information about resolution. *Developmental Psychology*, 29(6): 978–985.

Davis, K. , & Andra, M. (2000). Stalking perpetrators and psychological maltreatment on partners, anger jealousy, attachment insecurity, need of control and break up context. *Violence and Victims*, 15: 407–425.

Denborough, D. (2016). Coming to reasonable terms with our histories. In: S. McNab & K. Partridge (Eds.), *Creative Positions in Adult Mental Health* (pp. 67–86). London: Karnac.

Dermott, E. (2008). *Intimate Fatherhood: A Sociological Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Doucet, A. (2006). *Do Men Mother? Fathering, Care, and Domestic Responsibility*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dowling, E. , & Gorell Barnes, G. (1999). *Working with Children and Parents through Separation and Divorce*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Duffell, N. (2000). *The Making of Them: The British Attitude to Children and the Boarding School System*. London: Lone Arrow Press.

Dunn, J. (2002). The adjustment of children in step-families: lessons from community studies. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 7(4): 154–161.

Dunn, J. (2004). Understanding children's family worlds: family transitions and children's outcome. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 50(3): 224–235.

- Dunn, J. , & Deater Deckard, K. (2001). *Children's Views of Their Changing Families*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Dunn, J. , Brown, J. R. , & Beardsall, L. (1991). Family talk about feeling states and children's later understanding of other emotions. *Developmental Psychology*, 27: 448–453.
- Dunn, J. , Cheng, H. , O'Connor, T. G. , & Bridges, L. (2004). Children's perspectives on their relationships with their non-resident fathers: influences, outcomes and implications. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45(3): 553–566.
- Dunn, J. , Davies, L. C. , & O'Connor, T. (2000). Parents and partners life course and family experiences: links with parent-child relationship in different family settings. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 41(8): 955–968.
- Emde, R. N. (1988). The effect of relationships on relationships: developmental approach to clinical intervention. In: R. A. Hinde & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *Relationships Within Families: Mutual Influences* (pp. 354–367). Oxford: Oxford Scientific.
- Fabricius, W. V. , Braver, S. L. , Diaz, P. , & Velez, C. E. (2010). Custody and parenting time: links to family relationships and well-being after divorce. In: M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The Role of the Father in Child Development* (pp. 201–240). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fakhry Davids, M. (2002). Fathers in the internal world: from boy to man to father. In: J. Trowell & A. Etchegoyen (Eds), *The Importance of Fathers: A Psychoanalytic Re-evaluation* (pp. 67–92). London: New Library of Psychoanalysis, Kakhry Davids.
- Fatherhood Institute (2012). *The United Kingdom's fatherhood think and do tank*. www.fatherhoodinstitute.org.
- Fearon, P. , Schmueli-Goetz, Y. , Viding, E. , Fonagy, P. , & Plomin, R. (2014a). Genetic and environmental influences on adolescent attachment. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 55(9): 1033–1041.
- Fearon, P. , Schmueli-Goetz, Y. , Viding, E. , Fonagy, P. & Plomin, R. (2014b). Genetic and influences on adolescent attachment security: an empirical reminder of biology and the complexities of development – a reply to Rutter. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 55(9): 1043–1046.
- Featherstone, B. (2009). *Contemporary Fathering: Theory, Policy and Practice*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Feldman, R. (2007). Parent-infant synchrony and the construction of shared timing: physiological precursors, developmental outcomes and risk conditions. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 48(3–4): 329–354.
- Fletcher, R. (1962). *The Family and Marriage*. London: Penguin Special.
- Flouri, E. (2005). *Fathering and Child Outcomes*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Flouri, E. (2008). Fathering and adolescents' adjustment: the role of father's involvement; residence and biology status. *Childcare, Health and Development*, 34: 152–161.
- Flouri, E. , & Buchanan, A. (2004). Early father's and mother's involvement and children's later educational outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74: 14–153.
- Fonagy, P. (1999). Male perpetrators of violence against women: an attachment theory perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 1(1): 7–27.
- Fonagy, P. , Gergely, G. , Jurist, E. L. , & Target, M. (2004). *Affect Regulation, Mentalization and the Development of the Self*. New York: Analytic Press.
- Fonagy, P. , Moran, G. S. , & Target, M. (1993). Aggression and the psychological self. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 74: 471–485.
- Frosh, S. (1997). Fathers' ambivalence (too). In: B. Featherstone & W. Hollway (Eds.), *Mothering and Ambivalence* (pp. 37–53). London: Routledge.
- Gabb, J. (2010). *Researching Intimacy in Families*. Basingstoke, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gallese, V. (2009). Motor abstraction: a neuroscientific account of how actions, goals and intentions are mapped and understood. *Psychological Research PRPF*, 73(4): 486–498.
- Ganzel, B. L. , & Morris, P. A. (2011). Allostasis and the developing human brain: explicit consideration of implicit models. *Development and Psychopathology*, 23: 955–974.
- Gavron, H. (1966). *The Captive Wife: Conflicts of Housebound Mothers*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Gavron, J. (2015). *A Woman on the Edge of Time*. London: Scribe.

- Geertz, C. (1983). *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- George, J. , & Stith, S. M. (2014). An updated feminist view of intimate partner violence. *Family Process*, 53: 179–193.
- Goldman, R. N. , & Greenberg, L. (2013). Working with identity and selfsoothing in emotion focused therapy for couples. *Family Process*, 52: 62–82.
- Goldner, V. (1991). Feminism and systemic practice: two critical traditions in transition. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 13: 95–115.
- Goldner, V. (1998). The treatment of violence and victimisation in intimate relationships. *Family Process*, 37(3): 263–286.
- Goldner, V. , Penn, P. , Sheinberg, M. , & Walker, G. (1990). Love and violence: gender paradoxes in volatile attachments. *Family Process*, 29: 343–364.
- Golombok, S. , & Tasker, F. (2010). Gay fathers. In: M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The Role of the Father in Child Development* (pp. 319–340). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Golombok, S. , & Tasker, F. (2015). Socio-emotional development in changing family contexts. In: R. M. Lerner & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology and Developmental Science*, Vol. 3 (7th edn) (pp. 419–463). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Gorell Barnes, G. (1985). Systems theory and family theory. In: M. Rutter & L. Hersov (Eds.), *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry: Modern Approaches* (2nd edn) (pp. 216–232). Oxford: Blackwell Scientific.
- Gorell Barnes, G. (1990). The “little woman” and the world of work. In: A. Miller & R. Perelberg (Eds.), *Gender and Power* (pp. 221–244). London: Routledge.
- Gorell Barnes, G. (1995). The intersubjective mind. In: M. Yelloly (Ed.), *Learning and Teaching in Social Work: Towards Reflective Practice* (pp. 85–102). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Gorell Barnes, G. (2002). Getting it right and getting it wrong (confronting racism in personal experience). In: B. Mason , & A. Sawyer (Eds.), *Exploring the Unsaid, Creativity, Risks, and Dilemmas in Working Crossculturally* (pp. 133–147). London: Karnac.
- Gorell Barnes, G. (2005). Narratives of attachment in post-divorce contact disputes: developing an intersubjective understanding. In: A. Vetere & E. Dowling (Eds.), *Narrative Therapies with Children and Their Families* (pp. 188–204). London: Routledge.
- Gorell Barnes, G. (2011). Early family therapy in London in the 1960s: the Welfare State, Woodberry Down and Robin Skynner. *Context*, 115: 21–24.
- Gorell Barnes, G. (2015). Narratives of attachment and processes of alienation in post divorce parenting disputes. In: A. Vetere & E. Dowling (Eds.), *Narrative Therapies with Children and Their Families: a Practitioners Guide to Concepts and Approaches* (pp. 182–198). London: Routledge.
- Gorell Barnes, G. , & Bratley, M. (2000). Fathers and their children: what holds them together? Unpublished manuscript, Tavistock Clinic, London.
- Gorell Barnes, G. , Thompson, P. , Daniel, G. , & Burchardt, N. (1998). *Growing Up in Step-families*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Greenberg, M. , & Morris, N. (1974). Engrossment: the new-born's impact on the new father. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 44: 520–531.
- Grossman, K. , Grossman, K. E. , Fremmer Bombik, E. , Kindler, H. , Sheurere Englisch, H. , & Zimmerman, P. (2002). The uniqueness of the child father attachment relationship: Fathers sensitive and challenging play: a 16 year-long study. *Social Development*, 11: 307–331.
- Harold, G. T. , Leve, L. D. , Elam, K. , Thapar, A. , Neiderhiser, J. , Natsuaki, M. , Shaw, D. , & Reiss, D. (2013). The nature of nurture: disentangling passive genotype-environment correlation from family relationship influences on children's externalising problems. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(1): 12–21.
- Hawkins, A. L. , & Haskett, M. E. (2014). Internal working models and adjustment of physically abused children: the mediating role of selfregulatory abilities. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 135–143.
- Hendrick Harris, J. , Black, D. , & Kaplan, T. (2000). *Father Kills Mother: Guiding Children through Trauma and Grief*. London: Routledge.
- Hetherington, E. M. (1989). Coping with family transitions: winners, losers and survivors. *Child Development*, 60: 1–7.

Hill, J. (2002). Parental psychiatric disorder and the attachment relationship. In: M. Göpfert, J. Webster, & M. V. Seeman (Eds.), *Parental Psychiatric Disorder: Distressed Parents and Their Families* (pp. 50–61). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, J., Fonagy, P., Safier, E., & Sargent, J. (2003). The ecology of attachment in the family. *Family Process*, 42(2): 205–221.

Hill, J., Wren, B., Alderton, J., Burck, C., Kennedy, E., Senior, R., Aslam, N., & Browden, N. (2014). The applications of a domains based analysis to family processes: implications for assessment and therapy. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 36: 62–80.

Hinde, R. A. (1979). *Towards Understanding Relationships*. London: Academic Press.

Hinde, R. A., & Stevenson-Hinde, J. (Eds.) (1988). *Relationships Within Families: Mutual Influences*. Oxford: Oxford Scientific.

Hofstadter, D. R. (1979). *Godel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid*. New York: Basic Books.

Howell, B. R., & Sanchez, M. M. (2011). Understanding behavioural effects of early life stress using the reactive scope and allostatic load models. *Development and Psychopathology*, 23: 1001–1016.

Hrdy, S. B. (2009). *Mothers and Others*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Humphreys, C. (2006). Thinking the unthinkable: the implications of research on women and children in relation to domestic violence. In: The Rt. Hon Lord Justice Thorpe & R. Budden (Eds.), *Durable Solutions* (pp. 159–169). Bristol: Family Law/Jordans.

Imperial War Museum London Blitz Archives (accessed at: www.iwm.org.uk/history/the-blitz).

Jacobs, E. (2016). Shared parental leave: the fathers bringing up baby. *Financial Times*, 13 March.

Jenkins, J. M. (2003). Mechanisms in the development of emotional organisation. In: J. Davies (Ed.), *Child Emotional Security and Interpersonal Conflict*. Monographs of the Society for Research No. 270. *Child Development*, 67: 116–127.

Jenkins, J. M., & Curwen, T. (2008). The longitudinal impact of child gender, maternal depression, and parental hostility on child emotional difficulties. *Journal of American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 47: 399–405.

Jenkins, J. M., Dunn, J., Rasbash, J., O'Connor, T. G., & Simpson, A. (2005). Mutual influence of marital conflict and children's behaviour problems: shared and non-shared family risks. *Child Development*, 76: 24–39.

Joyce, A. (2014). Maternal perinatal mental illness: the baby's unexperienced breakdown. In: M. Boyle & F. Thomson Salo (Eds.), *The Winnicott Tradition: Lines of Development* (pp. 221–236). London: Karnac.

Keaveny, F., Midgely, N., Asen, E., Beavington, D., Fonagy, P., Jennings-Hobbs, R. (2012). Minding the family mind: the development and initial evaluation of mentalisation based treatment. In: N. Midgely & F. Vrouva (Eds.), *Minding the Child* (pp. 90–113). Hove: Routledge.

Keller, P. S., Cummings, E. M., & Davies, P. (2005). The role of marital discord and parenting in relations between parental problem drinking and child adjustment. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46(9): 943–951.

Kiernan, K., & Smith, K. (2003). Unmarried parenthood: new insights from the Millennium Cohort Study 114. *Population Trends*, 26: 26–33.

Kraemer, S. (2000). The fragile male. *British Medical Journal*, 32(321): 1609–1612.

Kraemer, S. (2017). Narratives of fathers and sons: 'There is no such thing as a father'. In: A. Vetere & E. Dowling (Eds.), *Narrative Therapies with Children and Their Families: A Practitioners Guide to Concepts and Approaches* (2nd edn) (pp. 115–132). London: Brunner-Routledge.

Krause, B. (1998). *Therapy Across Cultures*. London: Sage.

Laing, R. D. (1960). *The Divided Self*. London: Tavistock.

Laing, R. D., & Esterson, A. (1964). *Sanity, Madness and the Family*. London: Tavistock.

Lamb, M. E. (Ed.) (1999). *Parenting and Child Development in "Nontraditional" Families*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lamb, M. E. (2013). The changing faces of fatherhood and father child relationships: from fatherhood as status to father as dad. In: M. Fine & F. D. Fincham (Eds.), *Handbook of*

Family Theories (pp. 87–104). London: Routledge.

LeDoux, J. (1996). *The Emotional Brain: The Mysterious Underpinnings of Emotional Life*. New York: Touchstone.

Lenzenweger, M. F. (2010). A source, a cascade, a schizoid: a heuristic proposal from the Longitudinal Study of Personality Disorders. *Development and Psychopathology*, 22: 867–881.

Lewis, C. , & Lamb, M. E. (2005). Father–child relationships and children's development: a key to durable solutions? The Rt. Hon Lord Justice Thorpe and R. Budden President's Interdisciplinary Conference, Dartington Hall, 30 September–2 October.

Lewis, C. , & O'Brien, M. (1987). *Re-Assessing Fatherhood: New Observations on Fathers and the Modern Family*. London: Sage.

Lewis, C. , Papacosta, A. , & Warin, J. (2002). *Cohabitation Separation and Fatherhood*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Lewis, J. M. , Beavers, R. , Gossett, J. T. , & Phillips, V. A. (1976). *No Single Thread: Psychological Health in Family Systems*. New York: Brunner Mazel.

Lieberman, A. F. , Chu, A. , Van Horn, P. , & Harris, W. W. (2011). Trauma in early childhood: empirical evidence and clinical implications. *Development and Psychopathology*, 23: 397–410.

Lieberman, A. F. , Van Horn, P. J. , & Ghosh Ippen, C. (2005). Towards evidence based treatment: child parent psychotherapy with pre-schoolers exposed to marital violence. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 44: 1241–1248.

Lorenz, K. (1952). *King Solomon's Ring* (reprinted 1973). London: Routledge.

Luijk, M. P. C. M. , Roisman, G. I. , Haltigan, J. D. , Tiemeier, H. , Booth-LaForce, C. , Van IJzendoorn, M. H. , Belsky, J. , Uitterlinden, A. G. , Jaddoe, V. W. V. , Hofman, A. , Verhulst, F. C. , Tharner, A. , & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. (2011). Dopaminergic, serotonergic, and oxytonergic candidate genes associated with infant attachment security and disorganization? In search of main and interaction effect. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 52(12): 1295–1307.

Lummis, T. (1982). The historical dimension of fatherhood: a case study 890–1914. In: L. McGee & M. O'Brien (Eds.), *The Father Figure* (pp. 43–56). London: Tavistock.

Main, M. , & Hesse, E. D. (1990). Parents' unresolved traumatic experiences are related to infant disorganized attachment status: is frightened and/or frightening parental behaviour the linking mechanism? In: M. Greenberg , D. Cicchetti , & M. Cummings (Eds.), *Attachment in the Preschool Years* (pp. 161–182). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Main, M. , Kaplan, N. , & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood and adulthood: a move to the level of representation. In: I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing Points in Attachment Theory and Research. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, Serial No. 209, 50(1–2): 66–104.

Maitra, B. , & Krause, I. B. (2015). *Culture and Madness*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Masten, A. S. , & Cicchetti, D. (2012). Risk and resilience in development and psychopathology: the legacy of Norman Garmzy. *Development and Psychopathology*, 24: 333–334.

Matta, D. S. , & Knudson-Martin, C. (2006). Father responsiveness: couple processes and the coconstruction of fatherhood. *Family Process*, 45: 19–37.

McCrory, E. , De Brito, S. A. , & Viding, E. (2011). The impact of childhood maltreatment: a review of neurobiological and genetic factors. *Frontiers in Psychiatry/Child & Neurodevelopmental Psychiatry*, 2(48): 1–14.

McFarlane, W. R. , & Cook, W. L. (2007). Family expressed emotion prior to onset of psychosis. *Family Process*, 47: 185–197.

McHale, J. , Waller, M. R. , & Pearson, J. (2012). Co-parenting interventions for fragile families: what do we know and where do we need to go next? *Family Process*, 51: 284–306.

McIntosh, J. E. (2001). Thought in the face of violence: a child's need. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26: 229–241.

McLean, D. , Hearle, J. , & McGrath, J. (2002). Are services for families with a mentally ill parent adequate? In: M. Göpfert , J. Webster , & M. V. Seeman (Eds.), *Parental Psychiatric Disorder: Distressed Parents and their Families* (pp. 333–344). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Minuchin, P. (1988). Relationships within the family: a systems perspective on development. In: R. A. Hinde , & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *Relationships within Families: Mutual Influences* (pp. 7–27). Oxford: Oxford Scientific.

Minuchin, S. (1974). *Families and Family Therapy*. London: Tavistock.

Mogey, J. M. (1956). *Family and Neighbourhood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Montagu, R. (2014). *A Humour of Loving*. London: Quartet.

Moutsiana, C. , Johnstone, T. , Murray, L. , Fearon, P. , Cooper, P. , Pliatsikas, C. , Goodyer, I. , & Music, G. (2011). *Nurturing Natures: Attachment and Children's Emotional, Sociocultural, and Brain Development*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Music, G. (2014). *The Good Life: Wellbeing and the New Science of Altruism, Selfishness and Immorality*. London: Routledge.

Newson, J. , & Newson, E. (1963). *Patterns of Infant Care in An Urban Community*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Ngu, L. , & Florsheim, P. (2011). The development of relational competence among young high risk fathers across the transition to parenthood. *Family Process*, 50(2): 184–202.

Oakley, A. (2014). *Father and Daughter Patriarchy: Gender and Social Science*. London: Policy Press.

Ochs, E. , & Taylor, C. (1992). Family narrative as political activity. *Discourse and Society*, 3: 301–340.

Orwell, G. (1941). The art of Donald McGill. In: S. Orwell , & I. Angus (Eds.), *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, Vol. 2: *My Country Right or Left 1940–1943* (pp. 155–165). London: Secker and Warburg.

Panther Brick, C. , & Leckman, J. F. (2013). Editorial commentary: resilience in child development—interconnected pathways to wellbeing. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 54(4): 333–336.

Parsons, T. , Bales, R. F. , Olds, J. , Zelditch, M. , & Slater, P. E. (1955). *Families Socialisation and Interaction Process*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Paternity Leave Policy United Kingdom (2015). Pay and leave (available at: www.gov.uk/government/policies/paternity-leave).

Patterson, G. R. (1982). *Coercive Family Process*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.

Patterson, G. R. , & Dishion, T. J. (1988). Multilevel family process models: traits, interactions and relationships. In: R. A. Hinde & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *Relationships Within Families: Mutual Influences* (pp. 283–310). Oxford: Oxford Scientific.

Patterson, J. E. , & Vakili, S. (2014). Relationships, environment, and the brain: how emerging research is changing what we know about the impact of families on human development. *Family Process*, 53: 22–32.

Pedersen, F. A. , Anderson, B. , & Cain, R. (1980). Parent–infant and husband wife interactions observed at 5 months. In: F. A. Pedersen (Ed.), *The Father–Infant Relationship: Observational Studies in a Family Setting* (pp. 71–86). New York: Praeger.

Perry, A. R. , & Langley, C. (2013). Even with the best of intentions: paternal involvement and the theory of planned behavior. *Family Process*, 52: 179–192.

Peskin, M. , Raine, A. , Gao, Y. , Venables, P. H. , & Mednick, S. A. (2011). A developmental increase in allostatic load from ages 3 to 11 years is associated with increased schizotypal personality at age 23 years. *Development and Psychopathology*, 23: 1059–1068.

Place, M. , Reynolds, J. , Cousins, A. , & O'Neill, S. (2002). Developing a resilience package for vulnerable children. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 7(4): 162–167.

Portch, C. (2011). Becoming queer and what I did afterwards. *Context*, 111: 8–11.

Priest, P. (2013). Working with men who have experienced childhood family violence. *Context Association of Family Therapy Newsletter*, October: 12–16.

Prior, V. , & Glaser, D. (2006). *Understanding Attachment and Attachment Disorders: Theory, Evidence and Practice*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Propper, C. , & Moore, G. A. (2006). The influence of parenting on infant emotionality: a multi-level perspective. *Developmental Review*, 26: 427–460.

Pruett, K. D. (1993). The paternal presence. *Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 74(1): 46–50.

Ramchandani, P. , Domoney, J. , Sethna, V. , Psychogiou, L. , Vlachos, H. , & Murray, L. (2013). Do early father–infant interactions predict the onset of externalising behaviours in young children? Findings from a longitudinal cohort study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 54(1): 56–64.

Ramchandani, P. , Stein, A. , & Murray, L. (2009). Effects of parental psychiatric and physical illness on child development. In: M. Gelder , J. J. Lopez-Ibor , N. Andreasen , & J. Geddes (Eds.), *New Oxford Textbook of Psychiatry* (2nd edn) (pp. 1752–1758). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Raphael-Leff, J. (2008). Paternal orientations in the 21st century. *Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy in South Africa*, 16(1): 61–85.

Renn, P. (2012). *The Silent Past and the Invisible Present: Memory, Trauma and Representation in Psychotherapy*. London: Relational Perspectives Book Series.

Reynolds, V. (2010). Fluid and imperfect ally positioning: some gifts of queer theory. *Context* 2011, 111: 3–17.

Rose, S. (2003). *The Making of Memory from Molecules to Mind*. London: Vintage.

Rutter, M. (1966). *Children of Sick Parents: An Environmental and Psychiatric Study*, Maudsley Monograph 16. London: Open University Press.

Rutter, M. (2015). Attachment is a biological concept: a reflection on Fearon et al 2014. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 55(9): 1042–1043.

Sandler, J. , & Sandler, A.-M. (1978). On the development of object relationships and affects. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 59: 285–296.

Scheff, T. J. (1999). *Being Mentally Ill: A Sociological Theory* (3rd edn). Piscataway, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J. , Brown, G. L. , Cannon, E. A. , Mangelsdorf, S. C. , & Sokolowski, M. S. (2008). Maternal gatekeeping, co-parenting quality, and fathering behaviour in families with infants. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(3): 389–398.

Schore, A. N. (2001). The effects of early relational trauma on right brain development: affect regulation and infant mental health. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 22: 201–269.

Scourfield, J. (2006). Gender and child protection. In: B. Featherstone , M. Rivett , & J. Scourfield (Eds.), *Working with Men in Health and Social Care* (pp. 132–148). London: Sage.

Shaw, D. S. (2013). Intervening with challenging families in challenging contexts: making parenting work for children's mental health. Pittsburgh Early Steps Project and Early Steps Multi Site Study (accessed at: www.pitt.edu/rppcc)

Sheldon, S. (2005). Reproductive technologies and the legal determination of fatherhood. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 13(3): 349–362.

Shonkoff, J. P. , & Garner, A. S. (2012). The lifelong effects of early childhood adversity and toxic stress. *Paediatrics*, 129(1): 232–246.

Siegel, J. P. (2013). Breaking the links in intergenerational violence: an emotional regulation perspective. *Family Process*, 52(2): 163–168.

Skygger, R. (1968). Conjoint family therapy. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 10: 81–106.

Skygger, R. (1976). *One Flesh: Separate Persons: Principles of Family and Marital Psychotherapy*. London: Constable.

Sluzki, C. E. (2007). Lyman C Wynne and the transformation of the field of family and schizophrenia. *Family Process*, 46(2): 143–149.

Smith, G. (2011). *How family therapists encounter and respond to hegemonic masculinity in family therapy*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. London: Birkbeck College.

Snarey, J. P. (1993). *How Fathers Care for the Next Generation; A Four Decade Study*. London: Harvard University Press.

Solomon, J. , & George, C. (1999). The development of attachment in separated and divorced families: effects of overnight visitation, parent and couple variables. *Attachment and Human Development*, 1(1): 2–33.

Sroufe, L. A. (2005). Attachment and development: a prospective, longitudinal study from birth to adulthood. *Attachment and Human Development*, 10: 349–367.

Sroufe, L. A. , & Fleeson, J. (1995). The coherence of family relationships. In: R. A. Hinde & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *Relationships Within Families: Mutual Influence* (pp. 27–47). Oxford: Oxford Scientific.

St Aubyn, E. (1992). *Bad News* (in the *Some Hope* trilogy). London: Heinemann.

Steele, H. , & Steele, M. (2005). Understanding and resolving emotional conflict: findings from the London Parent–Child Project. In: K. E. Grossman , K. Grossman , & E. Waters (Eds.), *Attachment from Infancy to Adulthood: The Major Longitudinal Studies* (pp. 137–164). New York: Guilford Press.

Stern, D. (1977). *The First Relationship: The Interpersonal World of the Infant*. New York: Basic Books.

Storey, A. E. , Walsh, C. J. , Quinton, R. L. , & Wynne Edwards, R. E. (2000). Hormonal correlates of paternal responsiveness in new and expectant fathers. *Evolution and Human Behaviour*, 21: 79–95.

Straus, M. A. , Gelles, R. J. , & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Streeter, J. (2015). Who cares? We do. *Journal of School Health*, March: 24–26.

Sturge, C. , & Glaser, D. (2000). Contact and domestic violence – the expert’s Court Report. *Family Law*, September: 615–629.

Szasz, T. (1984). *The Myth of Mental Illness* (revised edn). New York: Harper Perennial.

Target, M. , & Fonagy, P. (2002). Fathers in modern psychoanalysis and in society: the role of the father in child development. In: J. Trowell , & A. Etchegoyen (Eds.), *The Importance of Fathers: A Psychoanalytic Re-evaluation* (pp. 45–66). London: Brunner-Routledge.

Tomm, K. (1993). The courage to protest: a commentary on Michael White’s work. In: S. Gilligan & R. Price (Eds.), *Therapeutic Conversations* (pp. 62–80). New York: W. W. Norton.

Trevarthen, C. (1979). Communication and co-operation in early infancy. A description of primary intersubjectivity. In: A. Bulow (Ed.), *Before Speech: the Beginning of Human Communication* (pp. 321–347). London: Cambridge University Press.

Trinder, L. , Kellet, J. , & Swift, L. (2008). The relationship between contact and child adjustment in high conflict cases after divorce or separation. *Child & Adolescent Mental Health*, 13(4): 181–187.

Trowell, J. , & Etchegoyen, A. (Eds.) (2002). *The Importance of Fathers: A Psychoanalytic Re-evaluation*. London: New Library of Psychoanalysis, Institute of Psychoanalysis Trowell and Etchegoyen.

Van der Kolk, B. (1994). The body keeps the score: memory and the evolving psychobiology of post-traumatic stress. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 1: 253–265.

Van der Kolk, B. , & Fisler, R. (1994). Childhood abuse and neglect and loss of self-regulation. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 58: 145–168.

Van der Kolk, B. , & Fisler, R. (1995). Dissociation and the fragmentary nature of traumatic memories: overview and exploratory study. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 8(4): 505–521.

Vik, K. , & Hafting, M. (2009). The outside view as facilitator of self-reflection and vitality: a phenomenological approach. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*, 27(3): 287–298.

von Bertalanffy, L. (1950). The theory of open systems in physics and biology. *Science*, 3: 25–29.

Walters, A. (2016). Fatherhood is always a work in progress. *Guardian*, 12 November.

Walters, J. (2011). *Working with Fathers*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wetherell, M. , & Potter, J. (1990). Narrative characters and accounting for violence. In: J. Shotter & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *Texts of Identity: Inquiries in Social Construction* (pp. 207–219). London: Sage.

Wilkinson, P. O. , & Goodyer, I. M. (2011). Childhood adversity and tatic overload of the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal axis: a vulnerability model for depressive disorders. *Development and Psychopathology*, 23: 1017–1037.

Woolgar, M. , & Murray, L. (2010). The representation of fathers by children of depressed mothers: refining the meaning of parentification in high-risk samples. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51(5): 621–629.

Wynne, L. (1984). The epigenesis of relational systems. A model for understanding family development. *Family Process*, 23: 297–318.

Yoshikawa, H. , Aber, J. L. , & Beardslee, W. R. (2012). The effects of poverty on the mental emotional and behavioral health of children and youth. *American Psychologist*, 67(4): 272–284.

Young, M. , & Willmot, P. (1957). *Family and Kinship in East London*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Zeanah, C. H. , Berlin, L. J. , & Boris, N. W. (2011). Practitioner review: clinical applications of attachment theory and research for infants and young children. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry*, 52(8): 819–833. Oxford: Blackwell.