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OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

Oxfam’s Women’s Economic Empowerment and Care (WE-Care) programme recognizes that the ‘heavy’ and ‘unequal’ responsibility for providing unpaid care and domestic work (UCDW) limits women’s choices and their ability to engage in other aspects of life, such as education, livelihoods, politics and leisure. International and national institutions have increasingly recognized the significance of UCDW to human and economic development, and the importance of care provision in overcoming poverty and inequality i.e. indicator 5.4 under the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, the Philippines Commission on Women.1 Over the past five years, WE-Care research has underlined the extent to which such work is invisible to men and women, and to government authorities: it is widely held to be of little value and importance, and to require few skills. Accordingly, WE-Care programmatic activity seeks to increase recognition of care work, and to reduce and redistribute responsibility for care work – between women and men, and between poor families, their employers and the state. This emphasis is now finding broader resonance, notably within the deliberations of the international community. Goal 5.4 of the Sustainable Development Goals, adopted in 2015, focused explicitly on recognizing and valuing UCDW.

‘Norms’ refer to the shared expectations of a given community, i.e. what is considered socially accepted behaviour or ways of doing things; these are often held in place by social approval or rewards for conformity and by disapproval or sanctions for transgressions. Understanding how and why such norms hold sway can provide a powerful means for understanding the gendered division of work that prevails in many communities and inform strategies aimed at promoting change.

WE-Care activity to date has affirmed that social norms are powerful drivers of the current (unequal) patterns of providing care. This understanding is also supported by a growing body of academic work which has sought to interrogate gendered social norms and their purpose across contexts, and to seek to shift those norms which result in harmful practices. According to Mackie et al., if a ‘harmful practice is social in nature,’ programmes ‘may be more effective if they support the revision of social expectations of people throughout the entire community of interest’, rather than focusing on individuals.2

This report draws on research that has sought to develop a methodology to understand norms underpinning UCDW and associated behaviours in a given context, to observe where some norms might be undergoing a process of change, and to identify compelling ways to communicate about and promote such change. The aim of the research is to inform WE-Care programming and create more effective local activities, public communications and policy proposals that might address the inequitable distribution of UCDW.

In particular, this report analyses discussions that took place across 27 focus groups in five areas of the Philippines in 2017 where the WE-Care ‘Work Your Dreams’ project, a result of the partnership between Oxfam, Unilever and the laundry brand SURF, operates. The report is organized into three parts. The first part describes shared understandings underlying the gendered division of work and factors explaining how and why they are so firmly held. The second describes evidence of some loosening gender roles, the perceived adverse consequences of heavy workloads, and some aspirations for change in the future. The third part outlines participant perspectives on how messages could be communicated effectively and what other steps could be taken to advance processes of change.

Gendered division of labour and the ‘stickiness’ of norms Analysis of the discussions affirmed the following shared understandings, to which participants refer when explaining how work is distributed within communities. On this basis, we can infer several gendered social norms that shape male and female activity in productive and reproductive work.

- Women should have overall responsibility for UCDW and, where possible, should also participate in productive or income-generating activity.

Across the focus group discussions (FGDs), participants reported almost unanimously that women had overall responsibility for all household chores. Where sharing of these chores was mentioned, this typically referred to children – often girls and boys alike, though in some discussions girls received particular mention. This expectation was often expressed in terms of responsibility and obligation, and also found expression in the most commonly identified saying, ‘The woman is the light of the home while the man is the pillar.’ Alongside their household responsibilities, women also ‘helped’ their husbands and participated in many forms of paid or productive work, including migrating abroad to earn money for their families, many times on paid care work jobs. The extent to which women’s emphasis on housework was a result of a lack of income-generating opportunities was not clear.

- Children, especially girls, should participate actively in UCDW.

There was also an expectation that children would participate actively in household work to help their mothers, to become responsible and to ensure family harmony. The need for training of girls from a young age was stressed, for when they became mothers. The division of labour between girls and boys was often gendered. In most cases, it was felt that boys should participate in chores too, though often they took on a mix of household and productive work (e.g. tasks...
like water and fuel collection, and looking after farm animals. Their participation in household work was described as ‘occasional’, and in some cases, it was stipulated that it would cease when they married and obtained paid work of their own. The discussions around the activities that children and young people were carrying out suggests that norms around age as well as gender were influential in shaping the distribution of tasks within households.

- Men should be responsible for engaging in productive and income-generating activity to provide for their family’s needs. Across the FGDs, participants universally concurred that the main role of men was to provide for their families either through farming or other paid work. Again, notions of responsibility and obligation were often invoked.

- It is unacceptable for women to forego involvement in UCDW. Women who did not fulfill care responsibilities were generally perceived in a very negative light – language used to describe such women included ‘lazy’, ‘untrustworthy’, ‘irresponsible’ and ‘negligent’, and their lack of involvement in UCDW was said to lead to a messy or chaotic home and to provoke friction in their relationships with their husbands. At the same time, across the FGDs, participants rejected the notion of criticizing or sanctioning such women, reporting that it was better to help, encourage and advise them.

The gendered division of labour was justified with reference to perceived biological differences, tradition and religious belief, and understandings of obligation and responsibility, with the latter framed at times in heavily patriarchal terms. Such beliefs were reinforced by perceptions that ‘female’ activities required fewer skills than those primarily undertaken by males; however, conversely, some care-related tasks were considered valuable – notably meal preparation but also childcare. Participants assigned skill to activities primarily based on the perceived need for formal schooling or training, while value was assigned primarily on the perceived centrality of an activity in everyday life and its contribution to survival.

Acceptability of changes in gender roles, and perceptions of change
Norms around the gendered division of work appeared to be loosening, with growing acceptance of female involvement in paid and productive work, and some acceptance of male involvement in unpaid care. This revision of gendered roles was seen as particularly acceptable under certain circumstances – where it was evidently to the good of the family (e.g. if the wife had a better-paying job than her husband), if the husband continued to do some paid or productive work, or if the wife had migrated overseas for work. Some care tasks were felt to be more acceptable for men than others – e.g. childcare was often less acceptable – though this varied greatly across the FGDs. For women, more acceptable tasks were described as ‘light and easy’ and relatively unskilled; these typically included planting/harvesting, selling/trading and caring for farm animals. Participants in many communities pointed to processes of change in the division of labour within households – triggered largely by greater female involvement in paid and productive work – and cited many circumstances that could provoke temporary changes in how household work was distributed.

Steps to influence change
The discussions also uncovered information that could inform future processes of change. Many participants recognized adverse consequences of prevailing workloads, particularly citing concerns over health. Across several FGDs, participants favoured a less gendered division of work among the young people in their communities once they formed families of their own.

Participants also reflected on trusted messengers in their communities and ways of communicating messages, highlighting the role of TV and radio in particular, as well as social media – with the latter felt to be particularly important to youth. In the majority of groups, participants recalled a TV advert for Ariel soap powder featuring a man who worked from home who did the household laundry when his wife was at work, and described it in favourable terms – suggesting the potential influence of this form of communication.

In terms of specific support needed to foster the more equitable sharing of work, participants focused on: the need for parents to train their children so that boys and girls alike would know how to do care work; the importance of role models, particularly fathers taking on household chores in front of their boys; and encouraging children to pursue an education and, in two FGDs, not to marry too young.

Implications
Finally, the report outlines some preliminary implications of this research, outlining several potential objectives of future activity, including building on positive perceptions of UCDW, challenging commonly held perceptions regarding the gendered division of work, making use of trusted messengers and sources of information, and further investigating specific questions that were raised in the analysis of focus group results.
INTRODUCTION

Research objective

For several years, Oxfam GB has made increased efforts to address heavy and unequal care work and to raise the profile of unnecessarily heavy/arduous domestic work as a cross-cutting development issue. Building on these efforts, the WE-Care initiative started in 2013, aiming to produce new methodologies and context-specific evidence about care work to influence the design of development initiatives and policy. Its ultimate objective is to secure a reduction of arduous domestic tasks and the redistribution of responsibility for care and domestic work – between women and men, and between poor families, their employers and the state.

Research by WE-Care has found that the extent and significance of UCDW is not visible to men and women in families, nor to government authorities. Care work is perceived to be of low value and little importance, and to require few skills. The need to revisit this perception is gathering greater traction more broadly. This is evident in the international community’s adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals, where Goal 5.4 seeks to ‘recognize and value unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of public services, infrastructure and social protection policies, and the promotion of shared responsibility within the household and the family as nationally appropriate’.

The WE-Care programme has understood that social norms are powerful drivers of the current (unequal patterns of providing care. This understanding is also supported by a growing body of academic work which has sought to interrogate gendered social norms and their hold across contexts, and to seek to shift those norms which result in harmful practices.

The purpose of the current research was to develop a methodology to understand the social norms that shape care-related behaviours, to identify where gendered norms are shifting, and to identify compelling ways to communicate about change. This information is intended to inform WE-Care programming (to create more effective local activities), other development actors, public communications and policy proposals related to social norms around UCDW.

This report synthesizes the findings of 27 focus group discussions (FGDs) conducted in five areas in the Philippines. Building on earlier Rapid Care Analyses (RCAs) and other Oxfam activities under the WE-Care programme, these discussions sought to understand the social norms underlying the persistent highly gendered division of labour in these communities – to inform Oxfam programming, to raise awareness among communities on the challenges of UCDW, and to create a more accurate tool for use in future FGD exercises. Finally, this report aims to recognize and galvanize women’s and men’s groups that are taking forward important influencing work on UCDW on the ground.

What are norms and why do they matter?

The Align platform [https://www.alignplatform.org] provides a useful definition of norms as: ‘the often implicit, informal rules that most people accept and abide by. They are influenced by belief systems, perceptions of what others expect and do, and sometimes by perceived rewards and sanctions. Norms are embedded in formal and informal institutions and produced and reproduced through social interaction. They change when sufficient people choose or are compelled to act in a different way and a new norm is established.’ As this definition attests, norms cannot be inferred directly from what people in a community do (and do not do). Rather, their prescriptive quality requires a deeper understanding of reference groups, underlying motivations and beliefs (how people explain and justify patterns of behaviour), and the penalties communities impose on members who deviate from accepted behaviours.

By focusing on how community beliefs and actions condition outcomes beyond those of individuals, the study of norms has made a crucial contribution to our understanding of how inequitable practices and outcomes are established and maintained, and correspondingly, how to influence processes of change. Mackie et al. state that if a ‘harmful practice is social in nature’, programmes focused on changing behaviours at the individual level are unlikely to be successful; programmes ‘may be more effective if they support the revision of social expectations of people throughout the entire community of interest’. According to Heise, through a better understanding of which norms are shaping outcomes and how, it is possible to ‘suggest how important a norms-based component may be as part of an overall change strategy’.

Researchers have found that social norms are useful in understanding the persistent inequitable division of UCDW in most societies. Studies have shown that this division persists, in part, owing to norms which prescribe the roles and behaviours considered to be appropriate for males and females within a given society, and the acceptable sanctions if these roles are transgressed. Norms can be changed – this is the explicit intention of several interventions focused on UCDW – though this is not without the risk of backlash, which can range from ridicule and scorn to physical violence against those who are seen to be deviating from social norms.

A focus on shifting norms around care is a fundamental premise underlying the WE-Care initiative. For WE-Care, ‘lasting change’ requires ‘a shift in social norms so that care work is not seen as “women’s work” but as everyone’s responsibility. This leads to a redistribution of care tasks from women and girls to men and boys, and creates new, positive norms that encourage men to care for their families and children. We also need to change norms which undervalue care, so that care work is understood as being critical to social and economic development. Attitudes need to change at every level – from individual to community to
government – to ensure that care work is recognized, equally distributed, and invested in.\(^1\) While redistribution from women to men is a fundamental component of WE-Care, so too is the shifting of some of the responsibility and costs of care provision to the state and the private sector.

In what follows, we aim to identify and explain the social norms that appear to be shaping the behaviours of women and men in the communities where the FGDs were conducted. We rely on discussions in which all-female and mixed-sex groups gave their insights into the gendered patterns of UCDW in their communities, the beliefs underpinning these patterns and ways in which they are enforced, the desire for and experiences of change, and compelling ways of communicating about change.

**Focus group discussions**

This exercise builds upon Oxfam’s previous RCAs and experiences in the WE-Care programme. The RCAs involved FGDs that sought to enable practitioners to understand care work in particular contexts and find practical solutions to problematic tasks and patterns of care\(^2\) by exploring: care relationships; patterns of time use; factors prompting changes in unpaid care – including external shocks and social norms around care; the most problematic care tasks; and priority options moving forward. The present exercise involved FGDs that aimed to explore social norms around care in greater depth, given that in the RCAs these appeared to be an important underlying influence and potential lever for change. The FGD was structured to incorporate RCA results and to invite participants to reflect on what the results suggested about gendered norms within their communities (see Annex 1 for the focus group script).

Overall, 27 FGDs were conducted across five areas. These FGDs cover separate parts of the country and very diverse populations. Mindanao and Eastern Visayas are two of the three main geographical divisions in the Philippines, both with diverse populations. In Mindanao, the FGDs took place in the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM), an area with a high concentration of Muslim communities, and North Cotabato, an area of Christian majority. The majority of communities in the areas covered in Eastern Visayas (Leyte and Eastern Samar) are Christian. Indigenous populations are present in both regions.

Of the FGDs, ten were all-female, seven were all-male and ten were mixed-sex (Table 1). Unsurprisingly, this resulted in a higher share of female participants overall – 62% were female, with the share ranging from 51% in the Maguindanao FGDs to 82% in Tacloban City. For more details about the individual focus groups, please see Annex 2.

In the reporting that follows, some views are reported as the consensus of the discussion. These are indicated with the code of the focus group in brackets and the sex composition of that group. Where a particular participant expressed certain views, the gender and age (where available) of that participant is given.

**TABLE 1 LOCATION, AND NUMBER OF GROUPS AND PARTICIPANTS ACROSS THE FGDs IN THE PHILIPPINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location, and Number of groups</th>
<th>Number of groups</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe Heights, Tacloban City</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guian and Tagbacan, Eastern Samar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperanza, Sultan Kudurat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datu Abdullah Sangki, Maguindanao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piggawayan and Libungan, North Cotobato</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Just one male was present in each of these mixed-sex groups.*
PART 1: THE GENDERED DIVISION OF LABOUR AND THE ‘STICKINESS’ OF NORMS

Shared understandings shaping the gendered division of labour

The FGDs pointed to an entrenched gendered division of labour in which women were expected to stay at home and be responsible for all household chores, while men were responsible for providing for their families through productive/paid work outside the home. Children were expected to participate actively in the household’s work, with a gendered division of work also in evidence among children.

From the findings, we can infer several gendered social norms that shape male and female activity in productive and reproductive work. Each norm identified is presented by the bullet points below, followed by a brief analysis of findings.

• Women should have overall responsibility for UCDW and, where possible, should also participate in productive or income-generating activity.

‘The woman is the light of the home while the man is the pillar’ (Ang babae ay ilaw ng tahanan habang ang lalaki ay ang haligi) [ES1, ES3, SK1, NC1]. This was the most commonly identified saying across the FGDs. According to participants in one discussion, this means that mothers should guide household members and take good care of them – including carrying out household chores to ensure their comfort [NC1].

FGD participants described a highly gendered division of labour in ‘typical’ families within their communities, in which women were responsible for all household chores [all locations]. Where sharing of these chores was mentioned, this typically referred to children. This was often to boys and girls alike, though in some discussions girls received particular mention [ES1, ES2, GH4, SK1, NC5, M1, M2, M4].

This same sentiment was expressed in various ways across the groups. For example, one all-female group concurred that household chores were the province of women ‘most of the time’ [NC1, all-female], while another agreed that ‘it is the obligation of the mother to do the care work’ [GH1, all-female]. In a similar vein, in two mixed-sex discussions participants agreed that the father’s duty was to work for the family to provide for their needs while the mother remained in the house to do all the household chores together with her daughter, who helped sometimes after school, while the son would help only with farm work and heavy jobs [M2 and M4, mixed-sex]. Across the groups, this view was affirmed:

‘All girls and women should know how to do care work.’ [GH3, all-female; GH2, mixed-sex]

‘It is the obligation of women to do household chores because it is a natural thing for a woman to do. It is innate.’ [GH5, all-male]

“You are a woman, you must know how to do housework.’ [M3, all-male]

‘As a mother, it’s my obligation to do the housework and to teach or train my children to do care activities. If I get sick, my daughter takes on my responsibilities. As for my husband, he can only do household chores occasionally because he’s at work every day and when he gets home, he’s tired, because he’s the one providing for the needs of our family.’ [Female, 29, GH2]

‘Care work is the obligation of women or mothers, we need to take this responsibility to have a happy family.’ [Female, 35, GH4]

‘Women should do the household chores because they stay at home and it is their obligation as women.’ [Male, GHS]

‘Even if we are not mothers, it is a must for us to learn care work.’ [Female, GH5]

“The mother has no choice but to do household tasks, because she’s always at home.’ [Female, SK1]

‘Most of the time, it is the mother who does household chores and care work.’ [Female, 41, NC1]

“The mother in the community is the one who does the household tasks in their entirety because the children are studying.’ [Female, M1]

The extent to which women’s emphasis on housework was a result of a lack of income-generating opportunities was not clear. This is an area that could benefit from further study (See Implications section).

• Children, especially girls, should be trained to participate actively in UCDW

In many typical households, girls and boys assumed household chores – be they care-related or productive – from the age of seven or eight. The focus groups revealed a perception that children, particularly girls, should be actively involved in UCDW in order to help their mothers, to become responsible and to ensure family harmony. The need for training of girls from a young age was stressed.

“The mother will teach her daughter household chores since it is their task.” [Participants, NCS]

“When my daughter turned 18, she already knew how to wash her clothes because I trained her.” [Female, M1]

“My daughter started to help me when she was 11 years old; she helped me in cooking and some household tasks.’” [Female, M1]

The training of girls was often framed in terms of teaching them the skills they would need to become mothers.

‘Girls are obligated to learn care activities at a young age for training to become a mother.’ [Female, GH4]
The division of labour between girls and boys was often gendered – with older girls taking on tasks like caring for their younger siblings and washing dishes, with boys taking on water and wood collection, and contributing to the care of farm animals [SK1, SK2, M1, M2].

‘My daughter helps me sometimes after school [with household chores], while my son helps only in farm work and heavy work.’ [M2, M4, both mixed-sex]

However, in other focus groups, participants described a more even division of household tasks between boys and girls, though often the participation of boys was described as ‘occasional’ and in some cases, it was stipulated that such participation would cease when they married and obtained paid work of their own.

‘It will not be all his life that kuya [older male relative or friend] will be doing housework.’ [GH1, all-female]

‘Care work is not forever for men – because once men get married, they will start looking for income-generating work.’ [Male, 38, GH1]

The discussions around the activities that children and young people were carrying out suggests that norms around age as well as gender were influential in shaping the distribution of tasks within households.

- Men should be responsible for engaging in productive and income-generating activity to provide for their family’s needs.
- Across the groups, participants universally concurred that the main role of men was to provide for their families either through farming or other paid work [all locations]. Participants of both sexes across the focus groups expressed this view using very similar language.

‘As long as the father is a good provider, he is a good man/father.’ [Female, 45, GH1]

‘My husband is the head of the family and it is his duty to find a way to have a good job to provide for the needs of the family.’ [Female, 35, GH4]

‘As head of the family, it is my responsibility to find a way to have a good job to provide for the needs of my family.’ [Male, 35, GH5]

‘Men should seek work to earn a living. It is their duty to work and raise their families.’ [NC3, mixed-sex]

‘The man is only responsible for finding income for the needs of the family.’ [ES3, all-male]

- It is unacceptable for women to forego involvement in UCDW. Women who did not fulfil care responsibilities were generally
perceived in a very negative light – language used to describe women included ‘lazy’, ‘untrustworthy’, ‘irresponsible’, ‘negligent’ [GH1, GH2, GH3, GH4, GH6, GH7, ES1, MS] – and their lack of involvement in UCDW was said to lead to a messy or chaotic home [ES2, ES4 M4, NC1, NC2, NC3, NC5] and to provoke friction in their relationships with their husbands [NC1, NC3, NC4, M4, ES3].

‘The wife is just too lazy.’ [GH1, all-female]

‘Those women who do not do care work, they are lazy and irresponsible, they cannot be trusted at home.’ [Female, 27, GH2; Female, 35, GH4]

‘The community would think that she is lazy.’ [GH3, all-female]

‘If the wife does not do her household tasks, she will always be in conflict with her husband.’ [NC2 and NC3, mixed-sex]

‘They will always quarrel and be in conflict.’ [NC1, all-female; NC4, all-male]

‘It may cause a bad relationship with her husband and especially her children, because she is supposed to be a role model for them.’ [ES3, all-male]

‘If a woman does not do care work, the house will be messy and they [husband and wife] will always fight.’ [M4, mixed-sex]

‘It is not good to see a wife who does not help or do household chores – it seems she just relies on him all the time or she overpowers her husband, or she is just too loved by her husband.’ [Male, 45, NC4]

One participant said: ‘It is not right to see women who do not do care work because they are responsible for doing that’ [Male, 41, M3]. He went on to report that his wife was not good at doing care work and they did not have a good relationship. Yet in one discussion, men opined that if a woman was working outside the home, it was acceptable that a man take responsibility for UCDW [NC3, male participants in mixed-sex group].

Across the discussions, participants rejected the notion of criticizing or sanctioning such women, reporting that it was better to help, encourage and advise one another [M3, all-male], and similar views arose in other discussions [SK2, SK3, M2, M4]. For example, in another all-male group, although the participants expressed negative sentiments towards women who did not partake in care work, they did not mention any criticism of such women [SK3, all-male]. Indeed, one participant expressed the view that loving and helping one another would be the best way of preventing such a situation [male, 64, SK3]. And in another mixed-sex group, participants agreed that ‘If there’s ever a woman who does not do care work, the community will be advised, and will encourage her to do care work because as women we are responsible to care for our family and do household chores, so our children will grow up to be responsible and not lazy’ [M4, mixed-sex]. In several FGDs, participants felt the parents were most responsible for such a situation, as they must not have trained their children well [GH2, GH3, GH6].

‘Somehow it is the fault of the parents too; if the woman had been trained at a young age to be responsible in doing everything then none of this would happen and surely she would grow up to be a responsible person.’ [Female, 25, GH2; Female, 33, GH4]

Only one participant took a less supportive view:

‘If a woman does not do household chores, it is better for her to be left by her husband.’ [Male, GH5]

Beliefs underlying the distribution of work

Beliefs play a powerful role in shaping and perpetuating shared expectations regarding the traditional roles assigned to females and males in the selected communities, and how work was divided among adults and their children. Accordingly, participants were asked to explain the reasons for the prevailing gendered and age-based division of labour.

Participants attributed the prevailing distribution to perceptions of biological difference, their tradition or religion (notably Islam), and conceptions of obligation and responsibility (at times expressed in heavily patriarchal terms). There was also a belief that the prevailing distribution of work made for a harmonious home life, to which each person could contribute.

A key explanation that participants gave for the gendered division of work focused on perceived biological differences, often expressed in terms of what they described as the ‘lightness’ of household chores relative to ‘men’s work’ [GH2, GH3, SK2, SK3, NC1, M3]. According to participants in one all-female group, a mother’s tasks ‘are perceived as easy and light work’ [GH3, all-female], while another all-female group agreed that ‘The father does care work that requires strength and heavy lifting’ [NC1, all-female]. In yet another all-female group, the women agreed that ‘Women have natural abilities’ in care work, while paid/productive work was ‘difficult, heavy and requires male strength’ [SK2, all-female]; similarly, in an all-male group, participants concurred that ‘Women do the household work while men do the heavy work’ [M3, all-male].

‘Light activities/housework are for women and heavy activities are for men.’ [Female, 25, GH2, and agreed with by other participants in the all-female group]

‘Women should fulfill their role and responsibility in terms of housework and men should do… heavy work.’ [Male, SK3]

‘There’s work for women only and for men only. This is because many works are not fit for women, like carrying heavy things. I don’t like to see my wife doing the things that I’m better at doing.’ [Male, S4, M3]

‘Water collection from the water tanks to the house is the one job that males should be obliged to do because of the heaviness of the workload. But [because men are at work] the women do not have any choice but to fetch water.’ [GH5, all-male]
A second explanation involved tradition and, in some cases, religion, particularly among Islamic households. Women’s performance of care work was described as ‘a family tradition’, reflecting practices inherited from parents [SK2, all-female] and great-grandparents [GH1, all-female].

‘Our mothers always told us that we should take care of our family – you should cook for your husband so that after he has been at the farm there is food for him to eat.’ [SK2, all-female]

‘In Islam, all household tasks are the responsibility of a mother, while the father is the provider.’ [Female, M1]

‘Based on the Qur’an, women in Islam are not allowed to do productive work, unless there is no way out of it.’ [Female, M2]

‘It’s good that at a young age, people learn all chores are done.’ [Male, 38, GH1]

It was generally held that a division of responsibilities [which participants seemed to take as meaning a mother’s involvement in reproductive work, a father’s involvement in productive or paid work and children’s support for their parents] was conducive to family harmony.

‘There is peace between family members if they help each other and if each of them has their own task.’ [ES4]

However, some women framed this concept of their obligation to do care work in heavily patriarchal terms:

Nanah [the mother in the ‘typical’ family the group discussed] ‘doesn’t have choice [over the division of labour], because her husband says so’ [GH1, all-female].

‘i don’t have a choice because that’s what my husband told me, so i follow his decision as it’s for the good of our family.’ [Female, 25, GH4]

‘My husband doesn’t know how to do care-work activities. He said to me that his parents didn’t teach him these, so that as his wife, I’m responsible for care-work activities and my husband is responsible for income-generating activities.’ [Female, GH4]

Third, participants often evoked concepts of obligation or responsibility and the idea that each household member fulfilling a prescribed role contributed to family harmony and unity.

The importance of involving children in household work was often described from this perspective. For example, in one mixed-sex discussion, participants cited the following consequences of the way household work was divided:

• It means there are no differences among family members, with everyone playing their part.
• It teaches children to be responsible in doing household chores (‘Children will know from a young age how household chores are done’).
• It makes the care work easily done.
• It helps other household members ‘to see the responsibilities of the mother’, preventing family quarrels [ES1].

Other groups also highlighted the importance of training children or children’s involvement in household chores, so they would become responsible.

‘It is a training ground for my kids and teaches them to be responsible.’ [Male, 38, GH1]

‘Care work will be done a lot more easily if there is a division of work, and at the same time, it will be their sons’ and daughters’ training ground for them to know how to do care work.’ [GH3, all-female]

In one FGD, a male participant expressed the view that men did not need to learn care work when they were young [male, GH4], while a female participant disagreed, expressing the view that ‘It’s good that at a young age, people learn all care-work activities because if they don’t, they will grow to be lazy and irresponsible’ [female, GH4].

According to participants in one mixed-sex FGD, the division of work among household members ‘sped up and eased the work, prepared children for the future and ensured they would not grow up lazy, and gave the mother time to herself, to relax’ [M2].

It is widely held that a division of responsibilities [which participants seemed to take as meaning a mother’s involvement in reproductive work, a father’s involvement in productive or paid work and children’s support for their parents] was conducive to family harmony.

‘There is peace between family members if they help each other and if each of them has their own task.’ [ES4]

However, some women framed this concept of their obligation to do care work in heavily patriarchal terms:

Nanah [the mother in the ‘typical’ family the group discussed] ‘doesn’t have choice [over the division of labour], because her husband says so’ [GH1, all-female].

‘I don’t have a choice because that’s what my husband told me, so I follow his decision as it’s for the good of our family.’ [Female, 25, GH4]

‘My husband doesn’t know how to do care-work activities. He said to me that his parents didn’t teach him these, so that as his wife, I’m responsible for care-work activities and my husband is responsible for income-generating activities.’ [Female, GH4]

Summary

The persistence of gendered patterns of distributing work was ascribed to: perceived biological differences, notably the need for women to engage in ‘lighter’ forms of work; tradition and religious beliefs; and participants’ understandings of their responsibilities and obligations, along with the belief that the division of labour fostered family unity. At times, these understandings of responsibility and obligation were framed in heavily patriarchal terms.

‘Economic norms’ underlying productive and reproductive work

In one exercise, participants discussed perceptions of the ‘skills’ and ‘value’ attributed to care work and productive or income-generating activities. This revealed that UCDW is generally perceived to require relatively fewer skills than productive activities and to be of relatively less value, although meal preparation was valued highly.

Perceptions of skill

As it is possible to see from Figures 1 and 2, across the FGDs, the tasks that were identified as requiring the most skill were:

• House construction/repair (15 mentions)
• Carpentry/furniture making (12 mentions)
• Driving (11 mentions).

In contrast, those identified as requiring the least skill included:

• Meal preparation (18 mentions)
• Washing, ironing or mending clothes (17 mentions)
• Cleaning the house or compound (15 mentions).
**FIGURE 1** ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED AS REQUIRING THE MOST SKILL ACROSS THE FGDS

- House construction/repair 18%
- Carpentry/furniture making 15%
- Driving 13%
- Planting crops 11%
- Selling products/trading 10%
- Other 33%

*Note:* % is the share of FGDs in which the task was identified as ‘most skilled’. The ‘other’ category comprises all tasks which were identified in one-quarter or fewer FGDs.

**FIGURE 2** ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED AS REQUIRING THE LEAST SKILL ACROSS THE FGDS

- Meal preparation 23%
- Washing, ironing, mending clothes 21%
- Cleaning the house 19%
- Caring for children 10%
- Fuel/water collection 13%
- Other 14%

*Note:* % is the share of FGDs in which the task was identified as ‘least skilled’. The ‘other’ category comprises all tasks which were identified in one-quarter or fewer FGDs.
It is immediately striking that none of the ‘most skilled tasks’ involved care (Figure 1), whereas all of the ‘least skilled tasks’ involved care (Figure 2). Meal preparation and childcare were the care tasks identified as requiring the most skill – and these were cited only in four and three of 27† FGDs, respectively.

Participants drew on the following criteria to explain why some tasks required relatively more skill:

- The task’s association with formal training.
- The strength required to carry out the task.
- The task’s contribution to people’s safety and survival.

Participants assessed the skills required for tasks based on the type of knowledge or training needed to carry them out (e.g. ‘advanced’ training or learning). For example, in one all-male group that identified house construction and carpentry/furniture making as the most skilled tasks, a participant commented that skills are needed to ensure that these activities are done properly, whereas with other care-related activities, he said, there is ‘no need to have skills to do it right’ [male, S4, M3].

‘Carpentry and construction work must be learned in a process through training and study, not just acquired in an instant.’ [Male, 40, NC3]

‘Construction and carpentry [are the most skilled tasks], since these tasks need enough knowledge on how to do them step by step for the job to be well done – layout, computation, measure and projection.’ [Male, 69, NC4]

In another group which identified planting/harvesting crops as requiring the most skill, a participant explained that this was because ‘we need to go on more trainings to know the steps in planting crops to become expert in it’ [Female, 27, GH2].

‘Planting/harvesting crops requires more skill since measurements and techniques should be followed, and if you fail to follow these procedures, the yield will be low.’ [NC1, all-female]

Skills that were acquired from a young age by watching others were discounted, including many care-related tasks that were part of participants’ daily routine [SK1, SK2, GH1, GH4, GH5, GH6, NC1, NC2, NC5 M2]. This is underscored by the fact that across the FGDs, participants voiced very similar sentiments.

† In the Guadalupe Heights FGDs, facilitators asked participants to vote on tasks rather than reach a consensus; so here the tasks included were those which received the most votes (and the number varies between groups). This also generated some seemingly paradoxical results – for example, meal preparation was ranked both among the most and least skilled tasks in GH1 and GH4.

†† The report from SK4 was not used in the quantitative assessment of tasks identified, as a long list of tasks was identified in most categories, not 2-3, and there was no way to assess those that were felt to be relatively more important.
The gendered aspects of which tasks were considered more and less skilled was not explicitly touched upon in many discussions – however, in a couple of FGDs, participants were divided by sex to discuss the different tasks. In one such discussion, the female sub-group commented that all the activities identified as more skilled (house construction/repair, carpentry, driving) were “only for men”, while the tasks identified as least skilled (all care-related) were “for women” (NC2). The ‘male’ tasks were described as difficult to learn and requiring strength, while the female tasks were described as ‘easy and light’ and learnt while still young. The male sub-group in turn identified the same tasks as requiring the most skill – arguing that they required constant practice, training and study – but identified planting/harvesting, caring for farm animals and cleaning the house or compound as the least skilled activities, commenting that since most of them were farmers and had mastered the associated skills when young, they did not consider farming to require skill (NC2).

### Perceptions of value

Across the FGDs, the tasks that were identified as having the most value (Figure 3) were:
- Meal preparation (15 mentions)
- Planting/harvesting crops (11 mentions)
- Caring for children (11 mentions).

By contrast, those identified as having the least value (Figure 4) included:
- Cleaning the house or compound (10 mentions)
- Washing, ironing or mending clothes (9 mentions)
- Drying or processing an agricultural product (9 mentions)
- Furniture making/carpentry (7 mentions).

It is immediately apparent that two care-related tasks – meal preparation and childcare – were considered valuable even though they were widely held to require relatively few skills. Conversely, furniture making/carpentry was generally perceived to be a skilled activity, but of little value. The very large ‘other’ category with respect to least valued activities reflects the diversity of tasks that were cited; there did not appear to be a strong consensus across the FGDs, perhaps in part because some participants ranked some tasks as not valuable because they were not relevant to their areas. For example, in Guadalupe Heights, the care of animals was not valued owing to a prohibition on keeping animals, whereas in several FGDs, participants commented that they did not have elderly people living with them and therefore did not place value upon their care. Similarly, in areas where participants sold their produce directly after harvesting, drying and processing was not valued.

---

Cooking has been part of our daily routine since we were young, and we’ve already mastered it.’ [NC1, all-female] ‘Household chores do not require skills because it is our natural ability to do the tasks and it is our daily routine.’ [Female, 23, GH2] ‘Cleaning the house and washing clothes do not necessarily require skills, because they are done by observing elders inside the house.’ [SK1, all-female; SKS, mixed-sex] ‘Cleaning the house is the easiest task, as there is no need for training.’ [Female, GH1] ‘Meal preparation and cleaning the house are just easy tasks. There is no need for massive training or learning. We have been doing these tasks ever since we were young.’ [GH1, all-female; GH6, mixed-sex] In three mixed-sex groups (M2, M4, M5, all mixed-sex), it was agreed that tasks like meal preparation, washing clothes and caring for children did not need much skill because participants were capable of doing these tasks and had known how to do them since they were young. ‘Less skilled tasks like washing, ironing, mending clothes, meal preparation and caring for children have been our responsibility ever since we were young. We don’t need to attend training to learn this, because we know it already.’ [Participants, SK2, all-female] ‘We learnt household chores/activities when we were still young, so we almost mastered all of them.’ [Participants, NC2, mixed-sex] ‘Cleaning the house requires less skill because it’s a natural ability that we don’t need to learn.’ [Female, 33, GH4] ‘Water/fuel collection requires less skill because it’s a natural ability that we don’t need to learn.’ [Female, 23, GH2] ‘Household chores do not require skills because it is our daily routine.’ [NC1, all-female]

A second characteristic of skilled activities, according to participants, is that they require strength [ES1, ES2, M3, NC2, NC3]. In one mixed-sex FGD, participants described the least skilled activities as ‘easy and light’ [NC2, mixed-sex], whereas in another mixed-sex discussion, the facilitator commented that the women in the group described skilled tasks as those which needed strength to complete, as opposed to the usual chores they did daily [NC3, mixed-sex]. ‘Some activities are more skilled than others because some of the activities require strength.’ [ES1, mixed-sex] A third key reason for designating tasks as skilled was that it was important to do them well for health [GH1] or for safety [M2, M3, M4]. One participant said, ‘We need to make sure that we are cooking healthy food for our family’ [Female, GH1], in a group in which meal preparation was identified as a skilled activity. In other FGDs, participants highlighted driving and carpentry as activities requiring skill; in the first case, not to collide with others, and in the second so as not to hammer their hands [M2, M4].

It is immediately apparent that two care-related tasks – meal preparation and childcare – were considered valuable even though they were widely held to require relatively few skills. Conversely, furniture making/carpentry was generally perceived to be a skilled activity, but of little value. The very large ‘other’ category with respect to least valued activities reflects the diversity of tasks that were cited; there did not appear to be a strong consensus across the FGDs, perhaps in part because some participants ranked some tasks as not valuable because they were not relevant to their areas. For example, in Guadalupe Heights, the care of animals was not valued owing to a prohibition on keeping animals, whereas in several FGDs, participants commented that they did not have elderly people living with them and therefore did not place value upon their care. Similarly, in areas where participants sold their produce directly after harvesting, drying and processing was not valued.

---

Perceptions of value

Across the FGDs, the tasks that were identified as having the most value (Figure 3) were:
- Meal preparation (15 mentions)
- Planting/harvesting crops (11 mentions)
- Caring for children (11 mentions).

By contrast, those identified as having the least value (Figure 4) included:
- Cleaning the house or compound (10 mentions)
- Washing, ironing or mending clothes (9 mentions)
- Drying or processing an agricultural product (9 mentions)
- Furniture making/carpentry (7 mentions).

It is immediately apparent that two care-related tasks – meal preparation and childcare – were considered valuable even though they were widely held to require relatively few skills. Conversely, furniture making/carpentry was generally perceived to be a skilled activity, but of little value. The very large ‘other’ category with respect to least valued activities reflects the diversity of tasks that were cited; there did not appear to be a strong consensus across the FGDs, perhaps in part because some participants ranked some tasks as not valuable because they were not relevant to their areas. For example, in Guadalupe Heights, the care of animals was not valued owing to a prohibition on keeping animals, whereas in several FGDs, participants commented that they did not have elderly people living with them and therefore did not place value upon their care. Similarly, in areas where participants sold their produce directly after harvesting, drying and processing was not valued.

---
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**FIGURE 3** ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED AS HAVING THE MOST VALUE ACROSS THE FGDS

- Meal preparation: 21%
- Planting/harvesting crops: 15%
- Caring for children: 15%
- Taking care of animals: 14%
- Selling products/trading: 11%
- Other: 24%

Note: % is share of FGDs in which the task was mentioned as ‘most valued’. The ‘Other’ category comprises all tasks which were identified in one-quarter or fewer FGDs.

**FIGURE 4** ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED AS HAVING THE LEAST VALUE ACROSS THE FGDS

- Cleaning the house or compound: 14%
- Washing, ironing or mending clothes: 12%
- Drying/processing agricultural product: 13%
- Furniture making/carpentry: 10%
- Other: 51%

Note: % is share of FGDs in which the task was mentioned as ‘least valued’. The ‘Other’ category comprises all tasks which were identified in one-quarter or fewer FGDs.
Participants explained that the value they assigned to tasks was based:
• Firstly, on the task’s centrality in daily life, especially in fulfilling survival needs.
• Secondly, on its importance to income generation.
• Thirdly, on its frequency or routine nature.

A first reason that participants cited for the value they assigned to tasks was its perceived importance in fulfilling daily needs, especially those connected to survival [GH1, GH2, both all-female]. This explains why meal preparation and planting/harvesting featured so highly.

One group identified meal preparation and the planting/harvesting of crops as equally valuable: ‘They are equally important to us. If we do not cook, we have nothing to eat and might get sick and we could not work in the farm. But if we do not plant and harvest crops, we will have no income to buy food, so we can’t eat.’ [NC3, mixed-sex, NC4, all-male]

‘Planting is the most valuable activity since it is the primary source of our income to buy food and basic needs.’ [Male, 25, NC5]

‘Selling belongs to the most valuable [category] because this is one way of earning money in this community.’ [Female, M1]

A second reason that participants identified some activities as relatively more valuable was their importance in income generation [M1, M2, ES1, ES2, ES4, NC1, NC3, NC4, NC5, SK2].

‘Planting and harvesting crops plays a major role in my living – this is where I get money for my children’s school needs.’ [Female, M1]

In another FGD, participants commented that taking care of farm animals was valued because it earned money, while cleaning the house was not valued because it was not a source of income [ES1, mixed-sex].

A third reason that participants gave for ascribing particular value to some activities was their frequency – some activities, such as meal preparation, were considered to be important because they were a routine part of their day [M3, NCS]. This was in contrast to many discussions of skills, where some participants considered daily activities to require less skill.

Tasks that women typically carried out were often considered valuable, even though they were held to be unskilled. There were some differences across FGDs, but these were not always associated with the gender of the participants.

In one mixed-sex FGD, the facilitator pointed to a strong gender divide: ‘The participants all agreed that while men valued most the tasks that will help them earn an income to provide the daily needs of their family, the women also valued most of the tasks in the household to keep their family healthy and do what they should be doing daily – going to the farm, going to school, etc.’ [NC3, mixed-sex]. However, in an all-male FGD, the participants valued three care-related tasks relatively more because of their importance to their lives: meal preparation, childcare and fuel/water collection [M3, all-male]. And in some discussions, both men and women expressed very similar views:

‘Washing clothes is the usual work of the mother, which for me is not so important.’ [Female 37, NC1]

‘Washing, ironing and mending clothes is least valuable because it is my wife’s responsibility and it is a woman’s activity.’ [Male, 27, GHS]

Summary
Skill was assigned primarily based on the perceived need for formal training. This resulted in a denigration of the skills required for care activities traditionally taken on by women, many of which were acquired through informal forms of education and training in the home, often from an early age. The remarks reflect assumptions that women ‘naturally’ and ‘normally’ have skills for care activities, undervaluing the effort required to obtain these skills. Value was assigned in large part based on the perceived contribution of tasks to survival needs – participants felt that meal preparation was particularly valuable on this basis, as well as the planting and harvesting of crops. The potential for income generation was also an important indication of value.
PART 2: THE ACCEPTABILITY OF CHANGES IN GENDER ROLES, AND PERCEPTIONS OF CHANGE

This section of the report describes evidence pointing to a less gendered division of labour in the FGD communities, and the circumstances that appear to make it more acceptable. It also summarizes participants’ views of the changes that have occurred in their communities – some of which are long-lasting – as well as the circumstances prompting temporary change. Finally, it conveys participants’ perspectives on the consequences of the existing division of care work, their views on the desirability of an alternative division of UCW among the young generation, and concrete steps that could be taken to realize this.

Norms in flux? Exploring male involvement in care and female involvement in paid and productive work

Notwithstanding starkly gendered understandings that women should be responsible for UCW and men for providing for their families, the FGD results pointed to some male involvement in care work and widespread female involvement in paid or productive work. A majority of participants were supportive of men who took on care work, particularly if they did so alongside productive/paid activity, though some had reservations about this. Participants showed widespread acceptance of female involvement in paid/productive work as a necessary reality.

In several FGDs, participants observed that some men already participated in care work within their communities.

‘In my experience as a father, I’m always helping my wife to do household work like washing dishes and clothes, taking care of our children; in that way, my wife can save time.’ [Male, SK4]

‘In my family we have already divided care activities, so we still have time to bond.’ [Male, SK4]

‘Some of us [men] in our community are doing care work.’ [Male, M6]

‘The saying “women must do household tasks” is no longer applicable in our community because some of the men here are doing some household tasks.’ [Participant, SK5]

‘Some of the men are doing care work, but not all of them.’ [SK2, M2, M4]

‘My husband and I have an agreement that after his work at the farm, he will help me if I’m not finished with the household chores.’ [Female, SK2]

‘Since we got married, I started helping my wife with housework, like fetching water and fetching firewood, though sometimes I’m working full-time at the farm.’ [Male, M6]

‘The father helps the mother, depending on the situation of the family.’ [Male, 21, NC5]

‘Sometimes if the father doesn’t have any work outside, he helps with household work.’ [M3, all-male]

‘The father can also help the mother to do household chores.’ [M2, mixed-sex]

‘We have seen men in the community who do household chores, like meal preparation, washing clothes, taking care of the dishes – all the tasks in the household are done by men. We say these are good examples of men. We are happy to see a man like him do household chores and hope our husbands are like him.’ [M4, mixed-sex]

‘In our household, I sometimes cook food if my wife is still busy doing something, especially washing clothes. It will take her half a day to finish all the laundry.’ [Male, 29, NC4]

‘Any husband will do the household chores when his wife is away or busy. We must do it because it is necessary and already acceptable in our community that men/boys do household chores.’ [Male, 69, NC4]

However, male involvement in care was not universal. In some FGDs, notably several in North Cotabato, participants reported that men ‘rarely’ or ‘occasionally’ helped in some tasks like cooking, laundry and childcare [NC1, NC3, NC4] or with laundry and meal preparation [NC5]; whereas in an Eastern Samar FGD, participants commented that, ‘We don’t have men in our community that take on household work’ [ES1, all-female].

There was relatively little evidence of male involvement in UCW being associated with stigma, with participants in several FGDs regarding it as acceptable [GH2, GH3, SK3, M4, NC4, ES2].

‘Men who help in care work are responsible men too.’ [ES2, all-female]

‘It will be a plus factor to us if we help in some of the household chores. Some members in the community will look to us also as a good husband who helped their partners in their work, even if we just came back from the farm.’ [NC4, all-male]

‘One percent of men in the community are doing the care work typically done by women, and they are respected in the community.’ [Male, 51, SK3]

‘Men can now do some care work. Nowadays it is acceptable for men to stay at home and do the housework while their wife is out at work.’ [GH3, all-female]

‘If a man takes on more care responsibilities, we will respect that kind of man because there are only a few men who do that… It’s not easy to do care work. One needs patience and determination.’ [ES1, mixed-sex]

‘In this new generation, it is acceptable that women do the income-generating activities while men do care work; it depends on the situation and a proper distribution of activities.’ [GH2, all-female; similar sentiment voiced by GH3, all-female]
‘Of course we respect them [men who do care work], because there is nothing wrong with a man helping a woman with chores.’ [Male, SK4, Male, M6]

‘Participants respect those men that have taken on household tasks or care activities because it’s not easy doing care work typically done by women in the household.’ [ES4, mixed-sex]

‘It is already accepted in the community that sometimes men and boys do the tasks that are usually assigned to women and girls, especially when they need to do it in the absence of wives or daughters.’ [NC1; similar statements made in NC3, NC5]

‘Nowadays, whether you are a man or a woman, you can do either household or productive work.’ [Female, M1]

‘It was said before that if a man or husband did the washing of clothes, he was “gay”’. But for some time, it has been accepted that the husband can also do the laundry – it is already practised by most men in the community.’ [Female, 34, NC2; male 21, NC4; also NC3, NC4]

‘Some people in the community joke to others when they see men doing the laundry – that maybe their wife has recently had a baby. But that joke indicates that men really do laundry occasionally, in reality.’ [NC2, NC3, NC5; similar comment made by female, 37, NC1]

Supportive attitudes are also in evidence in the following exchange [SK1, all-female]:

Facilitator: ‘Do you know of any household in this community where men take on more care work?’

Lorna: ‘Yes, but his wife is working abroad, sometimes selling at the market; the husband is the one who takes on some of the care work.’

Facilitator: ‘What do people think about this? Why?’

Lorna: ‘They think it’s a normal situation for a parent to do care work, because they are family. There’s nothing negative to say about it.’

In several FGDs, participants commented that men who took part in household chores were ‘good men’ and said that they would still garner respect as the head of the family [NC2, GH2, GH3, SK3, M4]. In one discussion, a participant commented that if a man took on more care work within a community, ‘We just let him be, because that may be his personality’ [Male, S1, SK3]. In an all-male focus group, the participants concurred that it was acceptable for men to take on responsibilities for household work while a woman took an outside job [M3, all-male]. One participant reported that he stayed at home to do housework while his wife worked as a teacher, and this did not cause any problem for his family [male, S4, M3].

In another Mindanao all-male group, participants identified a man in their community who helped his wife with household chores, and commented that they admired him – ‘He is a nice man and good to his family’ – and that they considered him influential in their community [SK4]. Referring to a man who does care activities full-time because his wife is a government employee, participants commented, ‘He is a good husband and father; he is doing care work because he wants to help his wife care for his family’ [male, M6].

Asked what they would say about a household in which there was a reversal of care/productive roles, participants often expressed positive views:

‘He is a responsible husband and he really loves his wife and his family – that’s why he is doing care work instead of the woman. Maybe he realizes his wife is exhausted so he will take over. We cannot say anything [negative] because if the wife is exhausted, she needs some rest – we understand the situation.’ [SK2]

If there is a man who takes on care work, ‘We will definitely respect that man because he’s one in a million’ [ES1, all-female].

Along similar lines, participants often described limited male involvement in household work in terms of practical constraints and tiredness resulting from productive/paid work responsibilities rather than the unacceptability of UCDW.

‘It isn’t all the time that women do all the household activities – us men can do all these activities, but our main priority is to find a good job.’ [Male, GHS]

‘If I am not tired from work, I voluntarily clean the house.’ [Male, GH6]

‘I cannot take on household chores when I get home from work because I’m so tired that I need to take a rest.’ [Male, 38, GH4]

‘My husband can only do household tasks occasionally because he’s at work every day, and when he gets home, he’s so tired.’ [Female, 29, GH2]

Some caveats surfaced as to the acceptability of male involvement in care. In two FGDs, participants distinguished between men who were sick or did not have enough confidence to get a job – who some felt would be worthy of respect – and those who were too ‘lazy’ or ‘irresponsible’ to do so [GH2 and GH3, all-female]. More generally, participants argued that the circumstances of a particular household would need to be taken into account in determining how to judge such a situation.

‘It’s OK, especially if we don’t know the reason it happened.’ [ES3, all-male]

‘Before we judge, we should first know the story behind it.’ [Female, 67, GH1]

‘Some understand this kind of situation when they know the reasons for it.’ [SKS]

There was also some discussion of what made involvement in care work more and less acceptable. It was much more acceptable for a man to do care work if he did it alongside...
paid work rather than in place of productive or paid work – there was a general feeling that men who just did care work were ‘lazy’, except when they were sick, or in cases where his wife has a respected or well-paid job (e.g. teacher or government employee) or has migrated overseas for work. ‘It is the duty of the woman to do household chores and not the man. But a man can help if he wants to, especially after work.’ [GH5, all-male, author’s emphasis]

In one all-male discussion, participants felt male engagement in care work was more acceptable if it was temporary [SK3, all-male]. They also felt that men ought to look for additional income-generating work to help their wives, rather than engaging in care work [SK3, all-male]. Disability was also cited as an acceptable reason for a change in the division of work [female, 33, GH4].

‘For me, if it is temporary when we see men take on more household or care responsibilities in our community, it is normal; but if it is long-lasting, it is not good to see men take on more household or care responsibilities.’ [Male, 51, SK3]

A minority of participants expressed stronger resistance to male involvement in UCDW. In two FGDs, participants reported that people in their community might think that men who did more care work were ‘under-de saya’ [‘under the skirt’ or dominated by their wives] [ES2, all-female; SK5, mixed-sex]. In one all-male FGD, a participant commented that, ‘Some men experience humiliation or become the subject of jokes from other men if they perform household tasks. This mocking or humiliation is normal in our community.’ [Male, 45, NC4]. In yet another all-male group, a participant commented that it would be embarrassing for men to do housework because it was not appropriate [male, M3]. Other participants made similar statements:

‘My husband and I agreed that he will do care work while I do income-generating activities for a temporary period, but the community think that my husband is lazy and an irresponsible father/husband.’ [Female, GH2]

‘A man should find work so he can help his wife in providing the needs of their family, not by taking on more household work.’ [Male, 51, SK3]

‘Even though times and lifestyles are changing, we would like to stick to tradition wherein the man is the one working for the family.’ [Participants, GH6, mixed-sex]

Commenting on doing UCDW, one man said, ‘It is as if I don’t have respect for myself’ [male, 27, GH5]. This sentiment was echoed by another participant: ‘My respect for myself is nowhere to be found’ [male, 40, GH5].

‘People think we are afraid of our wives.’ [GH5, all-male]

The type of task was also important, with some care tasks being cited as more acceptable for men to do than others. However, the tasks that were deemed more and less acceptable varied greatly across the FGDs. Often, childcare was felt to be relatively less acceptable than other care tasks – for example in three FGDs, male participants expressed an openness to adopting new care roles with the exception of childcare, citing a lack of knowledge, experience and patience [NC2, NC3, NC4], though in two FGDs it was felt to be relatively more acceptable [SK5, NC5]. Factors governing acceptability included the need for strength. In one all-male FGD, participants ranked firewood collection as the most acceptable care activity for men because, ‘you also need power and strength to cut wood.’ Another participant added that this strength was also important for water collection [participant, SK4]. Other reasons were more diverse, and included: ‘Cooking is more acceptable because we need to eat every day’ [male, 45, NC5].

Women’s engagement in productive and paid work

In some of the FGDs, participants reported that in addition to doing housework, women farmed alongside their husbands and/or took part in other income-generating activities [GH4, NC1, NC2, NC3, NC4, NC5, M2, ES1, ES3, M1, SK4]. Participants’ comments revealed that women often ‘helped’ their husbands with farming and also pointed to their involvement in simultaneous activity. For instance, in one FGD, women reported that while doing household chores they also prepared food and vegetables to sell [NC1, all-female]. This additional activity also was explained in normative terms – in two mixed-sex FGDs, participants supported the RCA finding that a good woman ‘helps her husband in some farm activities’ [NC2 and NC3, mixed-sex] and ‘knows how to find ways to have extra income for the family’ [NC2 and NC3; NC4, all-male; NC5, mixed-sex].

‘The husband focuses only on paid work, which is usually farming, since it is the only work available in our community. The wife will always do household chores or care work since they have no other work to do that they can get extra income for the family from, except for taking care of our farm animals.’ [Male, 59, NC3]

‘It is more effective for us women to have a small business, because these days life is difficult. We need to have extra income – that is why we are engaging in farm activities, so that our husbands don’t need to work by themselves anymore.’ [M4, mixed-sex]

‘Women are doing all the care activities and now, in this generation, women also do an income-generating activity.’ [Female, 33, GH4]

‘These days, the wife must also do some income-generating activities to help her husband earn money for their living.’ [ES1, mixed-sex]

‘Here in our community, we women are accustomed to working in the fields to help our husband and family to provide for our needs. We are able to do a husband’s work like ploughing, weeding, farming and fuel and water collection.’ [M2, mixed-sex]

‘Most women in the community also do the tasks of men – taking care of farm animals, water and fuel collection, and farm activity such as planting.’ [NC2, mixed-sex]
In one Mindanao FGD, the all-female participants designated selling products/trading as the most acceptable productive activity for women, ‘because it is the lightest work done by men’, and charcoal-making as the least acceptable, ‘because it is the heaviest kind of productive work and it needs a lot of time and strength, and requires a lot of processing’ [SK1]. In a mixed-sex FGD, participants cited house-cleaning and laundry (‘especially the white T-shirt’) as tasks men could not do well, while they identified tasks such as collecting firewood as unacceptable for women, ‘because it requires skills, strength and stamina’ [SK5]. In yet another FGD, the all-female participants cited planting/harvesting and caring for farm animals as the most acceptable tasks for women ‘because they are the easiest tasks that don’t need much strength’, whereas the least acceptable tasks [carpentry, house construction] ‘require strength and training’ [M1, all-female]. As noted above, this view that acceptable work for women was ‘easy or light’ while men should take on heavy tasks was widespread, as was the notion that the work that women could do was relatively unskilled.
’All the tasks women can do are easy or light tasks only, and the remaining tasks are less acceptable for them.’
[SK2, all-female]

’The least acceptable tasks require more knowledge and skills to perform well. They also require strength.’
[Female, 37, NC1]

’Driving, carpentry and house construction are the least acceptable, since they require skills and expertise to perform the tasks well.’
[Female, 22, NC1; similar statement made in NCS]

’We know how to farm, but only to engage in selected farm activities that do not need heavy lifting or more strength compared to the usual tasks of men.’
[Female, 30, NC3]

’It is not good for us in some circumstances to do all the work of our husbands, since it needs strength and the work is very heavy for us women.’
[Females, 25 and 45, NC3]

’These days, what a man can do, so can we – but it depends on the woman if she can handle heavy tasks.’
[SK2, all-female]

In urban areas, this distinction between lighter and heavier activities remained – and more acceptable activities for women often centred on selling and trading. For example, in one all-female focus group, the majority of participants felt that the most acceptable activity was selling fish.

’Selling fish is the easiest and most accepted activity, because all you have to do is sit and wait for your buyers.’
[Female, 32, GH1]

The least accepted activity in this FGD was collecting coconut milk.

’Climbing the coconut tree is hard itself, and collecting the milk is even harder.’
[Female, 67, GH1]

Other FGDs identified other tasks requiring strength as relatively unacceptable for women to carry out.

’Even men, who are much stronger than women, would not choose to be a porter, so this is even more the case for women.’
[Male, 40, GH5]

Summary
Norms around the gendered division of work appeared to be loosening, with growing acceptance of female involvement in paid and productive work and male involvement in unpaid care work. Participants described this role reversal as particularly acceptable under certain circumstances – where it evidently benefited the family (e.g. if the wife had a better-paying job than her husband), if the husband continued to do some paid or productive work (as opposed to devoting himself entirely to care work), or if the wife had migrated overseas for work. Some care tasks were felt to be more acceptable for men to do than others, though this varied greatly across the FGDs. For women, more acceptable tasks were described as ‘light and easy’ and relatively unskilled; these typically included planting/harvesting, selling/trading and caring for farm animals.

Change over time
Participants were asked to identify and discuss any changes in the household division of labour – both temporary and permanent – which had taken place; what led to these changes; and what were the effects.† Their reflections suggested that in most communities, participants reported processes of long-term change, mainly owing to women’s increasing involvement in paid or productive work. Though participants’ views on this were mixed, there was some evidence of growing acceptability. A number of short-term circumstances were said to trigger temporary changes in the division of work, with most participants reporting that the status quo resumed after the circumstance had passed.

Long-lasting change
In several FGDs, some participants reported no long-lasting changes in patterns of distribution of unpaid care work within their communities [NC1, NC3, NC4, M4, SK2, MS] in the last decades.

‘For us, there are no changes happening because we are still the ones who are doing the tasks in the household – like when we are working in the farm, and when we get home there is no cooked food to eat and still we are the ones who [have to] cook. We argue sometimes, like “What kind of life is this?”.’
[MS, all-female]

In one FGD, the lack of change in communities was attributed to the demanding and inflexible nature of farm work, which prescribed gendered roles and responsibilities [NC3].

‘The routine of men and husbands in our community might change if we had other sources of extra income, because then we could pay others to do some farm activities (planting, harvesting, spraying etc.), and we could save time which might be allocated to care work and to help our wives in household chores, because we would not be so exhausted from farm activities.’
[Male, 39, NC3]

’We women and wives understand that our husbands cannot help or do household chores because they’re already tired from doing work on the farm.’
[Female, 34, NC3]

Other discussions hinted at some changes in the gendered division of work, with more male involvement in UCDW and greater female involvement in paid and productive work [ES1, ES2, GH3, GH5, GH6, SK1, SK4, SK5, M2, M4].

‘Historically, women were not allowed to do men’s work, but in this day and age it is accepted, because it can help their family.’
[GH1]

† In certain FGDs [SK1], the facilitator asked the participants to comment on potential changes to family life if men and women helped each other with their chores. These comments are included in the section on beliefs underpinning the gendered division of labour.
In the time of my grandparents, my grandfather was the one outside doing productive work while my grandmother was in the house, but now it is different. The woman is now the breadwinner and the man is in the house’ [male 35, GH5]. This was attributed to the spread of computers and social media, ‘which makes women opinionated’.

‘In previous times, men did not help their wives with household tasks, and only men did productive tasks. Nowadays, men and women help each other with household tasks and women help their husbands do productive work.’ [SK1, all-female]

‘According to the elders, most of the men did not bother with household chores before. Nowadays, both husband and wife help each other so as to avoid arguing.’ [Participant, SK4]

‘These days, women do more productive work while men do household work because they already know about the division of labour – maybe also because of their love for each other as a couple or family.’ [Participant, SK5]

‘The culture is different for today’s generation because previously the woman remained at home and the man worked to provide for family needs, whereas nowadays young couples work together.’ [M2, M4, both mixed-sex]

In four focus groups, participants reported a change in gendered roles which occurred when a woman was not fit to do care work or qualified for a much higher-paying job than the man and/or the man’s earnings were not sufficient to meet the family needs [ES1, ES2, ES3, ES4, GH1, GH5]; in some FGDs, participants remarked that the man would have difficulty doing care work since he was not used to it, but eventually he would adjust. Further, participants agreed that at times, women found ways to earn extra income when money was short, especially when they had children in high school or college – and that women sometimes found jobs outside the community to provide for their children’s studies or contribute to household income [NC1, NC2, NC3, NC4].

‘Why follow the tradition if your family is not doing well financially? If she has more opportunity than the man, let it be – if that is the way to improve the lives of her family.’ [Female, 32, GH1]

In one FGD, female participants commented that it had been common ‘for a long time’ for women to help their husbands in farming activities, and that this was now a habit [M2].

Economic necessity was another driver – in one FGD, participants described changes as being due to poverty and the need for women to engage in productive work to support their families [SK1, all-female].

Among the lasting consequences of changes in the distribution of labour, participants cited greater appreciation by men of what ‘women’s work’ entails, and men’s greater ability to do care work.

‘In the case of women going abroad, the men are doing care work in their households. It will be a new area for them… at first it will be challenging, but if a man learns how to do it and keeps on practising, he will be able to do care work by himself.’ [SK2, all-female]

Temporary or seasonal change

Across the discussions, participants identified a common set of circumstances which led to temporary changes in the division of caring responsibilities. Table 2 shows the particular circumstances where men took on care work for women.

**TABLE 2 CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE MEN TOOK ON CARE WORK FOR WOMEN PER FGD LOCALITY**

| M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | NC1 | NC2 | NC3 | NC4 | NC5 | ES1 | ES2 | ES3 | ES4 | GH1 | GH2 | GH3 | GH4 | GH5 | GH6 | GH7 | SK1 | SK2 | SK3 | SK4 | SK5 |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Woman is pregnant or had just given birth | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Woman is ill | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Woman is working abroad | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Woman is away for a few days | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Woman is studying | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Family faced an emergency, ‘calamity’ or disaster situation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
Participants in one FGD (SK3) commented that this was changes in the division of caring responsibilities due to women working abroad were ‘becoming normal in our community’.

‘If the mother is pregnant or sick, the father himself will do the mother’s job, also with the help of the children.’ [M4, mixed-sex]

‘Once when my wife got sick, I took on her responsibility for household work.’ [Male, 64, SK3]

‘If they [men] do not do the household chores, they will be the ones to suffer – no food to eat, no water for washing, clothes will be dirty, etc.’ [NC4, all-male]

‘When our husbands wash our clothes, the white clothes are colourful afterwards.’ [Female, 29, NC5]

However, a small minority of participants disagreed that men would step in to take on household work under exceptional circumstances.

‘It is not true that men or husbands do the laundry or help in household chores if their wife has just had a baby. Some do not tend to do it even in that kind of situation.’ [Male, 59, NC2]

‘Based on my experiences, even if I’m pregnant, I’m the one who will take care of my family and do the household chores, because it is my obligation and my husband doesn’t know how to do the household chores.’ [Female, 27, GH2, with the same sentiment expressed by female, 28, GH3]

Participants concurred that once the temporary event that had provoked a change in care roles had passed, the status quo typically resumed [ES2, NC1, NC3, NC4, SK2, SK5, M4, GH2, GH3, GH4, GH5, GH6].

‘It will go back to the old practice – that women usually do the household chores – when the condition of the wife is back to normal [after sickness or labour] or after her contract for domestic or overseas work ends.’ [NC2, NC3, both mixed-sex; NC4, all-male]

‘It is already a family practice that we help each other in all the activities of the household – either care or paid work. If the father is in need of help on the farm, then we all work on the farm and do our part. If the mother needs help with household chores, then all of us are ready to help. That’s how we live here in rural areas.’ [NC1, all-female; NC4, all-male]
In some FGDs, participants also reflected on other circumstances that led women to take on more paid or productive work on a temporary basis, identifying the illness of her husband [GH3, all-female; NC1, all-female; NC5, all-female], as well as his acquiring a disability, losing a job, going elsewhere for work, or going to prison [NC1, NC5].

“When I was laid off from work my wife had to be the breadwinner, but when I eventually got a job she immediately had to be at home and I had to work.’ [Male, 48, GHS]

“My wife had to be the one to work because the government offered [her] a cash-for-work programme while I was the one doing house repairs, but when my house was ready I was the one doing productive work and my wife was in the house.’ [Male, 36, GHS]

Becoming widowed was also raised as a circumstance that could affect men and women alike [ES3, NC1, NC5]. Finally, in one FGD, participants spoke of the effects of men’s absence as a result of armed conflict (‘Bakwet’) and evacuation on women’s workloads, saying that, ‘our care has been doubled because you have been gone for a long time and now all the care tasks are waiting for you’ [MS, all-female].

Summary
The discussion pointed to processes of change in many communities, with greater female involvement in paid and productive work – including migrating abroad for this – and some greater male involvement in UCDW. Participants cited many circumstances that could provoke temporary changes in the gendered division of work, but agreed that in most cases the status quo would resume once the circumstances had passed.

Consequences of the division of UCDW
Participants perceived a host of negative potential consequences of their current heavy workloads, both for women and for men.† Table 3 presents the negative potential consequences identified for women.

In one all-female group, participants agreed that as mothers, they were always exhausted and could not even take care of themselves – even to put on makeup or make themselves presentable. According to one participant, ‘Because a lot of care work needs to be done, mothers don’t have time for that stuff.’ [female, GH1]. In Table 4 we can see the negative potential consequences participants identified for men.

---

TABLE 3 NEGATIVE POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES OF HEAVY WORKLOADS IDENTIFIED FOR WOMEN PER FGD LOCALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NC1</th>
<th>NC2</th>
<th>NC4</th>
<th>NC5</th>
<th>ES1</th>
<th>ES2</th>
<th>ES3</th>
<th>ES4</th>
<th>GH1</th>
<th>GH2</th>
<th>GH3</th>
<th>GH4</th>
<th>GH5</th>
<th>GH6</th>
<th>NC1</th>
<th>NC2</th>
<th>NC3</th>
<th>NC4</th>
<th>NC5</th>
<th>ES1</th>
<th>ES2</th>
<th>ES3</th>
<th>ES4</th>
<th>GH1</th>
<th>GH2</th>
<th>GH3</th>
<th>GH4</th>
<th>GH5</th>
<th>GH6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body pain or strain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited time for rest, chest pain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiredness, high blood pressure, getting sick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premature aging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having no time for recreation or rest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An inability to manage lifestyle or social life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

† Some FGD results are not reported here – in Eastern Samur (ES1, ES2, ES3, ES4), in two Sultan Kudarat FGDs (SK2, SK3), and in Maguindanao (M2, M3, M4) and in Guadalupe Heights (GH4), the question appears to have been interpreted differently; the consequences participants cite relate to family unity and harmony, and are discussed in the section on beliefs underlying care work. In Guadalupe Heights (GH2, GH6), the responses did not refer to the consequences of the division of labour.
‘An Ate [older sister] has no time to take care of herself since she is busy doing household chores.’ [Female, 28, NC1]

In all FGDs for North Cotabato (NC1 to NC5), some participants felt that young men might learn bad ways if they were to earn income from a young age.

Regarding negative consequences of children’s workload, Table 5 presents the two results participants cited.

FGDs NC1 and NC5 mentioned early marriage as being one potential consequence of schooling being curtailed.

In all FGDs for North Cotabato (NC1 to NC5), some participants felt that young men might learn bad ways if they were to earn income from a young age.

### TABLE 4 NEGATIVE POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES OF HEAVY WORKLOADS IDENTIFIED FOR MEN PER FGD LOCALITY

| Condition                          | NC1 | NC2 | NC3 | NC4 | NC5 | ES1 | ES2 | ES3 | ES4 | GH1 | GH2 | GH3 | GH4 | GH5 | GH6 | GH7 | SK1 | SK2 | SK3 | SK4 | SK5 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 |
|------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Tiredness                          |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Body aches and pains               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| ‘Pasma’ (exposure to heat and cold)|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| High blood pressure                |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Premature aging                    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Being angry and grumpy             |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Inattention to health              |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Having no time for rest or recreation |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Getting sick                       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

### TABLE 5 NEGATIVE POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES OF HEAVY WORKLOAD IDENTIFIED FOR CHILDREN PER FGD LOCALITY

| Condition                                      | NC1 | NC2 | NC3 | NC4 | NC5 | ES1 | ES2 | ES3 | ES4 | GH1 | GH2 | GH3 | GH4 | GH5 | GH6 | GH7 | SK1 | SK2 | SK3 | SK4 | SK5 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 |
|------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| The possibility of their schooling being curtailed |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Less time for play                           |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

UNDERSTANDING NORMS AROUND THE GENDERED DIVISION OF LABOUR: RESULTS FROM FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES
Looking to the future

To approach preferences over the division of labour from another angle, participants were also asked about their aspirations for the young men and women in their communities once they formed their own families. Participants were invited to reflect on future scenarios with different divisions of workload between the family members based on a fictional couple named according to each region.

In several FGDs, participants hoped for a shared division of work [ES1, ES2, ES4, NC1, NC2, NC3, NC4, NC5, NCS, GHS, GH6]. For example, in the Eastern Samar FGDs, participants agreed that David and Diana should share responsibilities of care work and paid work [ES1, ES2, ES4] so it will not be difficult for them [ES4] and they will have a better future life [ES2, all-female]. Similarly, in North Cotabato, participants held the view that Nonoy will help Lynlyn in household chores, while Lynlyn will also help Nonoy in farm activities. ‘If they do that, they will understand and know how to do care and paid work’ [NC1, all-female; NC4, mixed-sex; NC5, mixed-sex] and in Guadalupe Heights [GHS, GH6].

‘If our young men are taught there is no such thing as man’s work and woman’s work – that all work is equal and can be done by both – the time will come if they ever have their own children, that they can pass on the teachings.’ [Male, 38, GH5]

‘No work is intended for man or for woman, as long as it is able to be handled by both.’ [Participant, GH5]

However, in some cases, participants did not aspire to a different division of work for children in their community, specifying that females should continue to take on care work and men to fulfill their typical roles [SK3, all-male] – and adding that if men and women knew their roles and responsibilities, this would make for ‘a good relationship’. Participants in other groups expressed similar views.

‘It is important for both women and men to know their roles in their family. The role of women is to care for their children, and the role of men is to support the needs of their family.’ [M3, all-male]

‘We would like to maintain the tradition where the man works for the family and the woman takes care of the house and kids.’ [GH1, all-female]

‘Older participants would like a division of work where the woman stays at home to do care work and the men are the ones working for the needs of the family.’ [GH2, all-female, GH4, mixed-sex]

‘It will always be better if the women are at home and the men are working for the family.’ [GH3, all-female]

Where participants aspired to a different division of labour among their children’s generation, they cited a need for the following support:

- **Parental training of their children** – this was highlighted throughout the discussions, for example:
  - Lynlyn and Nonoy should teach children that care work is not just for women and girls but for all household members. All household members should be trained in their roles and responsibilities for when they marry [NC3] and be taught that household chores should be done by all household members [NC2].
  - ‘When they are still young, parents should train their children in some of the lightest household work in their house so that when they get older, they already know and have skills to do it.’ [SK1, all-female; SK5, mixed-sex]
  - Nonoy should be taught how to wash clothes before he marries [NC2, NC3].
  - Parents should impart qualities such as good morals, clean living, not to become lazy, sharing of work, being responsible for family, studying, and being understanding [NC1, NC3, NC4, NC5].
  - David and Diana should practice care work to become ready for when they have their own families [ES4, mixed-sex].
  - ‘From a young age, we need to teach our kids... so that they learn different kinds of work and grow up with a mindset that these tasks are not only for girls or for boys.’ [GH1, all-female]
  - ‘Young men should be trained as children to know how to work inside and outside the house, so they know how care work is done and can master such tasks.’ [Male, 31, GHS]
  - ‘Teach them while they are still young so they will know what to do in the future.’ [GHS, all-male]
  - ‘I know that we can train and teach our young women so that when the time comes, they will be independent.’ [GHS, all-male]
  - Young boys and girls must be trained in basic household tasks [GH6, mixed-sex].

- **Fathers should take on household care activities** to be a role model to their sons [NC1, NC2, NC3, NC4].

- **Parents should encourage children to pursue an education** [M2, M4, MS, SK2, ES1, ES2, ES3, ES4] and not to marry too early [M2, M4].

Participants also identified actions they would take on the basis of having participated in the focus group discussion – being a role model for children [male, 39, NC3], sharing with their spouse what they learnt in the course of the discussion [female, 28, NC3], and for men, taking part in more household chores [NC3].
Summary

Participants cited several negative consequences of the current division of labour for women, men and children – with an emphasis on health concerns for adults and schooling for children. In several (but not all) FGDs, participants supported a redistribution of work such that women were taking on more paid work and men more care work. Participants widely endorsed the importance of parental training of children so that they would be able to undertake both care and paid / productive work, and modelling desirable behaviours – including the sharing of chores – for their children. They also emphasized the importance of boys and girls alike gaining an education; in two FGDs, they stressed the need to avoid early marriage.

A desire for change emerged in the all-female FGDs when participants were asked what they would do if they had an additional hour each day. In the majority of FGDs, most participants opted for rest and recreation [GH1, SK1, M1, M2, SK2, GH4, ES2]. Specific activities mentioned included watching TV [GH1, SK1, M1]; spending time with their family to regain strength, rest and bond with family [GH1]; sleep and rest [SK1]; rest and relaxation [M1, M2, SK2]; and reading the Qur’an [M1].

‘I would watch TV and, in the afternoon, talk (‘tsismis’) with my neighbours, to relax.’ [Participant, GH4]

In some FGDs, some participants said they would use the extra time to engage in productive or income-generating activity [SK2, NC1, GH3, ES2]. For example, in one group, participants reported that if they finished their household tasks early, they would look for ways of generating extra income such as selling food and vegetables, offering massages, helping husbands in their paid work [NC1, all-female] and weaving baskets [SK2]. In one FGD, participants said they would make time for personal care, like bathing [SK2].
PART 3: STEPS TO INFLUENCE CHANGE

The third part of this report looks at how changes can be taken forward, drawing on participants’ suggestions and ideas for compelling ways of sharing messages within their communities, and concrete implications for ways that this information could be used to engender a more equitable division of labour in the future.

Compelling ways of sharing messages

The sharing of information that fosters different values and attitudes is an important component of interventions aimed at changing norms; in other settings, field research has found that a combination of factual information and broader messaging on gender equality – through mass media as well as popular entertainment programmes – has contributed to changes in gender norms.\(^{13}\) With this in mind, participants were asked to identify effective messengers and role models within their communities, and the most trusted sources of information.

Who people listen to and follow

When asked who people in the community listen to and follow, participants cited a wide range of sources, which can be categorized as follows:

- Government leaders
- Religious leaders
- Local leaders and community professionals
- Other government representatives
- Other community figures

Under the category government leaders, participants cited the public figures listed on Table 6.

#### TABLE 6 GOVERNMENT LEADERS PARTICIPANTS CITED AS PEOPLE THEY LISTEN TO AND FOLLOW PER FGD LOCALITY

| Government leaders                  | NC1 | NC2 | NC3 | NC4 | NC5 | NC6 | ES1 | ES2 | ES3 | ES4 | GH1 | GH2 | GH3 | GH4 | GH5 | GH6 | GH7 | SK1 | SK2 | SK3 | SK4 | SK5 | M1  | M2  | M3  | M4  | M5  | M6  | M7  | M8  |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Mayor                               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Barangay chair/captain             |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Barangay councillors (Kagawad)     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Purok or cluster and block leader  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Sitio leader                       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Local government unit leaders      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Indigenous leader (Datu/Bai)       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Sultan                             |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

**Purok leaders** were mostly trusted to relay messages and information from the Barangay, especially official messages. Cluster and block leaders were reported to be particularly admired by youth in one community [GH5]. As for Sitio leaders, one community gave the example of ‘Willy Tumbao’ who was followed and respected based on his luck, knowledge, decision-making and skill [SK3].

For the category religious leaders, participants’ references are listed on Table 7.

For religious leaders, participants mentioned that if they live by what they preach, they will become models for the community [NC3].

On Table 8 we present other government representatives cited by participant.
Participants added that Indigenous People Mandatory Representatives (IPMR) were respected because they take people’s problems to government [SK2].

Table 9 presents community leaders and professions participants referenced.
Teachers were perceived to have knowledge and be professional, while midwives were recognized for advice related to health. Youth leaders were mentioned for implementing sports programmes, Barangay fiesta/festivals, etc. The example was given of the Sangguniang Kabataan Chair.

Other people listed include mothers, who were described as the ‘light of family’, always providing guidance [NC1, NC4, NC5], guards [GH1, GH2], advisers [M2], land owners [M5], traditional healer (albolaryo) [SK2], sister of Sultan [SK5].

Overall, the most listened to and respected members of the community were government leaders, followed by religious leaders. Among political leaders, the most influential were Barangay captains (in the case of resettled communities, participants cited their old captains) along with Barangay councillors, and in Sultan Kudarat and Maguindanao, tribal leaders or Datu/Bai. Other government representatives were also agreed to be influential – notably Tanod/Barangay police in North Cotabato and the National Housing Authority in Guadalupe Heights, where participants also identified teachers as influential.

There was some discussion around why these particular individuals were singled out. Some participants argued that religious leaders were more trustworthy than political leaders, and participants in some FGDs expressed the view that their local leaders – typically block/cluster leaders – were not worthy of respect. In three FGDs, participants took the view that the authority an individual possessed was not enough for people to believe in or follow them – for this, they required proof that what they say is legitimate and correct [NC1, NC3, NC4].

When asked about role models, the FGD participants typically spoke of people within their communities, mostly in very general terms – most were able to cite examples of households where either a man took on more care work or a woman took on productive and/or paid work. The exception to this is that in most focus groups, participants identified a TV advertisement for Ariel soap powder [ES1, ES2, ES4, GH1, GH3, GH5, GH6, GH7, SK2, SK3 M2, M4, M5] featuring a man who was portrayed as good husband because even though he has a stable job as a mechanic, working at home, he still helps with the household chores if his wife works overtime or is out of town for work. He is reported as saying that his wife’s work is more demanding than his, so he helps with the laundry when he is free. Across the FGDs, participants responded positively to this advert; in one all-male group, participants said that they wanted to emulate this man [GH5, all-male]. ‘We see many advertisements of men doing care work, so it is normal for us to see men doing care work.’ [Male, 51, SK3]

**TABLE 9 COMMUNITY LEADERS AND PROFESSIONALS PARTICIPANTS CITED AS PEOPLE THEY LISTEN AND FOLLOW PER FGD LOCALITY**

| Community leaders and professionals | NC1 | NC2 | NC3 | NC4 | NC5 | ES1 | ES2 | ES3 | ES4 | GH1 | GH2 | GH3 | GH4 | GH5 | GH6 | GH7 | SK1 | SK2 | SK3 | SK4 | SK5 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 |
|------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Elders [and their councils]        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Teachers                          |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Midwives                          |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Daycare workers                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Youth leaders                     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Leaders of organizations          |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Chieftains (informal leaders)     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

**Trusted sources of information**

Across the FGDs, participants overwhelmingly identified TV, radio and social media as the most effective ways of communicating information, as we can see on Table 10. Mobile phones and Icom two-way radios were important in North Cotabato and Maguindanao, newspapers in North Cotabato and Guadalupe Heights, while the Barangay Hall bulletin board and magazines were also said to be an important information source in North Cotabato. Some participants cited ‘tsismis’ or rumours as an important information source in Eastern Samar and Maguindanao, as well as community news (hearsay) in North Cotabato.

Other information sources that participants cited across the FGDs were diverse: internet [NC1, NC4, NC5, SK1], books [NC1,
NC4, NC5], Bandilyo Broadcaster [ES1, ES2, ES3, ES4], posters [ES2, ES3, ES4], Barangay Assembly or meetings [ES1, ES2, ES4], house-to-house information dissemination by Sitio leader [NC2, NC3], block leaders [GH2, GH4], NHA/City Hall Staff [GH2, GH4], Department of Social Welfare and Development [GH3, GH4], Family Development Sections [GH3], the Gabriella Women’s Party [GH3], focus group discussions [GH3], N60s [GH4], tribal chieftain [SK3], megaphone [SK5].

Participants sometimes made distinctions between those sources of information that were most trusted – among these, the most universally trusted were TV and radio. ‘Tsismis’ tended not to be trusted, and opinions on social media (namely Facebook) were mixed – while some participants cited it as a useful and accessible source of information, others felt it could not necessarily be trusted.

For young people, participants cited many of the same information sources as for the community as a whole, although they tended to emphasize the role of social media (Facebook).

Summary
FGD participants identified a wide variety of trusted messengers in their communities – notably elders, Barangay leaders and officials, religious leaders and teachers – and many influential means of communicating messages, though TV and radio were felt to be most trustworthy. For youth, participants felt that mobile phones and social media were particularly influential sources of information. In 13 FGDs, participants cited an advert for Ariel soap powder as an example of male involvement in UCDW in the media – and participants responded strongly to the positive portrayal of a man doing the household laundry while his wife worked.

Implications
As stated from the outset, the objective of this study is to inform Oxfam and our WE-Care partners’ strategy aimed at redistributing the heavy and unequal care work of women and girls in selected areas of the Philippines through a focus on gendered social norms. WE-Care’s programmatic work aims to identify those norms which appear to be most malleable and activities that appear to have the greatest potential to promote positive change, as well as identifying sensitive issues, drawing on the rich information that the focus group discussions elicited. Here, we make some preliminary proposals for potential future programmatic activity.

• Building on positive perceptions of UCDW
  - Focus first on situations in which it is considered more acceptable for men to do care work and women to do paid work. The FGD participants remarked often that it was important to understand the circumstances of households in which women did more paid work and men did more care work, before judging the situation. Their comments revealed some situations under which a less stringent division of labour was seen as acceptable. In particular, it was more acceptable for a man to do care work if he was already

---

**TABLE 10 MOST EFFECTIVE WAYS OF COMMUNICATING INFORMATION PER FGD LOCALITY**

| FGD  | NC1 | NC2 | NC3 | NC4 | NC5 | ES1 | ES2 | ES3 | ES4 | GH1 | GH2 | GH3 | GH4 | GH5 | GH6 | GH7 | SK1 | SK2 | SK3 | SK4 | SK5 | SK6 | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 |
|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| TV   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Radio|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Social media |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Mobile phones |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Icom two-way radios |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Newspapers |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Bulletin board |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Magazines |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Rumours (Tsismis) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Community news (hearsay) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
providing for the family, and for a woman to do paid work (and a man to do more care work) if she were able to get a better job than he could. Participants valued working for the good of the family and recognized that this may imply different arrangements in terms of the division of work. This stands in contrast to perceptions about households where a woman worked and the man stayed at home; such men were sometimes viewed as lazy and irresponsible. This was reinforced by participants’ very positive reaction to the Ariel washing powder advertisement discussed above. Advocacy strategies might try to leverage these perceptions of what is acceptable – by depicting responsible men who are providing for their family while also engaging in care, and doing so because their wives were able to obtain jobs that contributed more to the family.

- Highlight the value that participants already attribute to care activities. In the discussion of “economic norms”, it emerged that while participants consider care-related activities to require very little skill, they nonetheless valued them relatively highly. Specifically, participants assigned a high value to meal preparation and childcare, and in some FGDs, to the collection of water and fuel. Programming might build on this perception that these tasks are important because of their contribution to survival. This could be a way of encouraging greater recognition of UCDW – highlighting that the work that women typically carry out merits greater respect, and that men who take on this work should be regarded as taking on important work, rather than being considered lazy or irresponsible.

- Affirm participants’ perceptions of obligation and family unity. Across the focus groups, participants felt it was important to fulfill their responsibilities and to train their children to do so too. They often stated that this was necessary for family unity and harmony. For example, in three FGDs, the facilitator asked the group to reflect on the benefits of helping one another with chores. Participants cited harmonious family relationships; it would show that family members cared, respected and supported one another; the parents would be good role models to the children and the family would be successful [SK1, all-female; SK4, all-male; M6, all-male]. Campaigns to promote the redistribution of care work might frame the consequences in ways that draw on these positive perceptions.

- Challenging commonly held perceptions of the roles of women and men
  - Challenge perceptions of ‘light’ and ‘heavy’ work. It emerged in the focus groups that participants perceive that the work women do (or should do) is ‘light’ – including most forms of household work – while the role of men is to undertake ‘heavy’ work. These stereotypes serve to reinforce a gendered division of labour, but they do not fit with the realities of the work that women and men do. Bringing this mismatch to light could serve to change perceptions. For example, communication materials could affirm agricultural (or other productive or paid work) as ‘heavy’ while also being clear that many forms of care work are equally taxing.

Similarly, advocates could contrast the image of ‘light’ activities with the reality that many care tasks, such as washing clothes and carrying children, are in fact very demanding. Another approach might be to emphasize the time it takes to do supposedly ‘light’ activities – making it clear that these are in fact difficult activities that are worthy of being respected and shared. As noted above, one expression that women and men across several focus groups invoked was: ‘What men can do, women can do also’ [M2, M3, M4, SK1] – variously expressed as ‘Kaya ni mister, kaya ni misis’ and ‘Hibaro hit lalaki, ibaro hit babaye’. Such expressions could be useful in this respect.

- Challenge perceptions of ‘skill’ and of ‘value’. The FGD findings point to widespread perceptions that care work, usually done by women, requires few skills; this suggests an opportunity for advocacy material to make clear how much time and effort is required to learn to do care-related activities well, and to shift perceptions of what constitutes training and skill acquisition to extend beyond formal methods of learning. One way to do this could be to highlight the varied range of tasks and skills required to run a household. Participants in one all-male FGD commented that the FGD exercises made them realize that women have a lot of tasks, while for men the only priority is to find a good job to support the family [GH5, all-male], with one participant saying, ‘Even if a women/mother stays at home, they have a lot of responsibilities and obligations that they do every day’ [M6, all-male]. In another mixed-sex FGD, participants felt that a man should ‘at least experience doing care work to understand the hardships of being a housewife’ [ES4].

- Making use of trusted messengers and sources of information
  - Build capacity of trusted messengers and involve them in campaigns. Participants were very consistent in their identification of a trusted set of messengers within their communities – notably elders, Barangay leaders and officials, religious leaders and teachers. This hints at the importance of ensuring that these influential messengers are sensitized to the WE-Care programme and its aims, and are involved in communicating messages to their local communities.

- Disseminate national and local messages through TV, radio, and social media. Participants overwhelmingly identified TV and radio as the most influential means of spreading messages within their community, with social media ranked third. Participants had varied views about the extent to which social media was trustworthy, though many participants felt it was particularly important for youth. This suggests that these media are effective means of influencing public opinion nationally, as well as in specific settings. Moreover, participants’ ability to recall the Ariel advert featuring a man doing laundry in more than half (13) of the focus groups, and their uniformly positive response to it, suggests that advertising may be a particularly effective means of communicating progressive messages around care. It is notable that across the FGDs, several
participants commented particularly on what they saw as men’s inability to do laundry – ‘When our husbands wash our clothes, the white clothes are colourful afterwards’ – and the potential that sharing the task offered for bonding (‘Doing laundry is more acceptable, since we could bond as a couple while washing our clothes’). Such imagery could translate well to creative forms of messaging.

• Further investigating specific questions that the analysis raised
  - Do further research on factors influencing the gendered division of care. In many FGDs, participants observed that care work was the province of a woman/mother ‘because she is always at home’ [female, SK1]. This begs the question of whether women are staying at home and engaging in care work owing to an absence of opportunities for paid work. The question is an important one, because it suggests that norms assigning women to care work may arise within the family or household and/or within the wider community, including the job market. Addressing these avenues for norms transmission, e.g. women’s participation in the job market, focus on communities, would obviously require different programming approaches than those adopted by WE-Care alone.
  - Address the actual and potential implications of women’s changed roles. The FGDs hinted at ways in which the role of women is changing or at what could happen if women were to spend less time on care and therefore had more time to engage in other activities. One key aspect that emerged is women’s migration to take on paid work. Given the scale of such migration, it is important to investigate more fully how care work is (re)distributed within such households – in particular, whether it is reallocated to other females in the family, notably grandmothers but also daughters, as opposed to males. Relatedly, some female participants hinted that if they had more time available, they might use it to generate income through animal rearing. It may be worth investigating the extent to which animal distribution might be part of an integrated care-work package, alongside the distribution of time- and labour-saving equipment.
CONCLUSIONS

This report has focused on gendered norms underlying the division of labour in selected communities of the Philippines, and has sought to ascertain to what extent these may be pliable and subject to change. The first part focused on shared understandings governing the division of productive and reproductive activity among men and women, and boys and girls. It revealed a general expectation that women are responsible for all household chores and that children – particularly girls – also participate actively in many care-related activities, suggesting that norms around age are also influential. In turn, men are assigned the role of family providers – with perceptions of whether men are providing financially for their family appearing to influence how their engagement in unpaid care is regarded. It is more acceptable if they are providing for their family financially than if they are not (some participants used words like ‘lazy’ and ‘irresponsible’ to describe men who engaged only in household chores, though participants also felt generally that it was important to understand the circumstances of specific households before judging them).

Perceived biological differences featured prominently in participants’ explanations of the distribution of work, as did the importance of tradition and religious beliefs, and notions of responsibility and obligation (the latter sometimes framed in heavily patriarchal terms). The distinctions participants made were also reflected in discussions of ‘economic norms’ – where the majority of participants felt strongly that activities traditionally carried out by women and girls required less skill than those carried out by males; though conversely, at the same time, they viewed several of these activities as valuable. Meal preparation and childcare emerged as particularly valued activities, owing to their centrality in everyday life and the contribution they made to survival.

Norms around the gendered division of work appeared to be loosening, with growing acceptance of female involvement in paid and productive work, and – to a lesser extent – male involvement in unpaid care. This reversal of gendered roles was seen as particularly acceptable under certain circumstances – where it was evidently to the good of the family (e.g. if the wife had a better-paying job than her husband), if the husband continued to do some paid or productive work, or if the wife had migrated overseas for work. Some care tasks were felt to be more acceptable for men than others (in many groups, childcare was relatively less acceptable), though the specifics varied greatly across the FGDs. For women, more acceptable tasks were described as ‘light and easy’ and relatively unskilled; these typically included planting/harvesting, selling/trading and caring for farm animals.

The discussions uncovered some changes in the gendered division of labour that participants perceived in their communities, primarily driven by greater female involvement in paid or productive work outside the home, including overseas migration. This had led to some greater male involvement in UCDW. In other communities, participants reported little long-term change. Participants also identified numerous circumstances prompting temporary changes in gender roles, including illness, pregnancy and women’s work-related migration – in most cases, they reported a return to the status quo once the specific circumstance had passed.

The FGDs prompted discussion that could inform specific strategies focused on change. Participants identified trusted messengers – emphasizing the role of elders, Barangay leaders and officials, religious leaders and teachers. They also outlined the most effective ways of communicating information, highlighting the role of TV and radio in particular, as well as social media – with the latter felt to be particularly important to youth. In the majority of groups, participants recalled a TV advert for Ariel powder featuring a home-based male mechanic who did the household laundry when his wife was away, and described it in favourable terms – suggesting the potential influence of this type of communication (and pointing to useful imagery, e.g. ‘When our husbands wash our clothes, the white clothes are colourful afterwards’).

In terms of specific support needed to foster the more equitable sharing of work, participants focused on: the need for parents to train their children so that boys and girls alike know how to do care work; the importance of role models, particularly fathers taking on household chores in front of their boys; and encouraging children to pursue an education – suggesting the potential influence of this type of communication (and pointing to useful imagery, e.g. ‘Our husbands wash our clothes, the white clothes are colourful afterwards’).

Finally, the report presents some preliminary implications of this research, outlining several potential objectives of future activity, including building on positive perceptions of UCDW, challenging commonly held perceptions regarding the gendered division of work, making use of trusted messengers and sources of information, and investigating further specific questions that were raised in the analysis of focus group results.
Table with codes used to reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Barangay</th>
<th>Number and sex of participants</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCCSKSARGEN</td>
<td>North Cotabato</td>
<td>Piccawayan</td>
<td>Buluan, Annick, New Igbaras</td>
<td>11 Females</td>
<td>NC1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCCSKSARGEN</td>
<td>North Cotabato</td>
<td>Libungan</td>
<td>Nicaan (Sitio Antara)</td>
<td>7 Females, 5 Males</td>
<td>NC2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCCSKSARGEN</td>
<td>North Cotabato</td>
<td>Libungan</td>
<td>Nicaan (Sitio Antara)</td>
<td>7 Females, 5 Males</td>
<td>NC3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCCSKSARGEN</td>
<td>North Cotabato</td>
<td>Piccawayan</td>
<td>Buluan, Annick, New Igbaras</td>
<td>8 Females</td>
<td>NC4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCCSKSARGEN</td>
<td>North Cotabato</td>
<td>Piccawayan</td>
<td>Buluan, Annick, New Igbaras</td>
<td>3 Females, 8 Males</td>
<td>NC5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Maguindanao</td>
<td>Buldon</td>
<td>Kulimpang</td>
<td>15 Females</td>
<td>M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Maguindanao</td>
<td>Datu Abdullah Sangki</td>
<td>Proper Guinibon</td>
<td>7 Females, 5 Males</td>
<td>M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Maguindanao</td>
<td>Datu Abdullah Sangki</td>
<td>Proper Guinibon</td>
<td>12 Males</td>
<td>M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Maguindanao</td>
<td>Datu Abdullah Sangki</td>
<td>Proper Guinibon</td>
<td>5 Females, 7 Males</td>
<td>M4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Maguindanao</td>
<td>Datu Abdullah Sangki</td>
<td>Proper Guinibon</td>
<td>12 Females</td>
<td>M5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Maguindanao</td>
<td>Buldon</td>
<td>Kulimpang</td>
<td>13 Males</td>
<td>M6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Sultan Kudarat</td>
<td>Bagumbayan</td>
<td>Daguma</td>
<td>12 Females</td>
<td>SK1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Sultan Kudarat</td>
<td>Esperanza</td>
<td>Marguez (Sitio Ugis)</td>
<td>13 Females</td>
<td>SK2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Sultan Kudarat</td>
<td>Esperanza</td>
<td>Marguez (Sitio Ugis)</td>
<td>13 Males</td>
<td>SK3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Sultan Kudarat</td>
<td>Bagumbayan</td>
<td>Daguma</td>
<td>13 Males</td>
<td>SK4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Sultan Kudarat</td>
<td>Bagumbayan</td>
<td>Daguma</td>
<td>5 Male, 13 Females</td>
<td>SK5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>Eastern Samar</td>
<td>Guian</td>
<td>Cagdara-o</td>
<td>15 Females, 4 Males</td>
<td>ES1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>Eastern Samar</td>
<td>Guian</td>
<td>Cagdara-o</td>
<td>13 Females</td>
<td>ES2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>Eastern Samar</td>
<td>Guian</td>
<td>Cagdara-o</td>
<td>6 Males</td>
<td>ES3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>Eastern Samar</td>
<td>Salcedo</td>
<td>Tagbacan</td>
<td>5 Males, 7 Females</td>
<td>ES4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A1: Profile of the FGD according to location, number and sex of participants and code for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Barangay</th>
<th>Number and sex of participants</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>Leyte</td>
<td>Tacloban City</td>
<td>Barangay 105, San Isidro</td>
<td>10 Females</td>
<td>GH1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>Leyte</td>
<td>Tacloban City</td>
<td>Guadalupe Heights, Resettlement Site</td>
<td>10 Females</td>
<td>GH2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>Leyte</td>
<td>Tacloban City</td>
<td>Guadalupe Heights, Resettlement Site</td>
<td>4 Females</td>
<td>GH3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>Leyte</td>
<td>Tacloban City</td>
<td>Guadalupe Heights, Resettlement Site</td>
<td>7 Females, 1 Male</td>
<td>GH4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>Leyte</td>
<td>Tacloban City</td>
<td>Guadalupe Heights, Resettlement Site</td>
<td>11 Males</td>
<td>GH5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>Leyte</td>
<td>Tacloban City</td>
<td>Barangay 105, San Isidro</td>
<td>8 Females, 1 Male</td>
<td>GH6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>Leyte</td>
<td>Tacloban City</td>
<td>Guadalupe Heights, Resettlement Site</td>
<td>14 Females</td>
<td>GH7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNEX 1: FOCUS GROUP SCRIPT** *(see separate file)*

**ANNEX 2: PROFILE OF THE FGDs**
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PHOTOS

Front cover: Annabelle Alemania collects water in the Guadalupe Resettlement Site, Tacloban North, Philippines. A mother of seven children, she spends about eight hours a day doing unpaid care work. Photo: Aurelie Marrier d’Unienville/Oxfam

Page 8: Rosalyn Martinez, with her two daughters, does laundry in the Guadalupe Resettlement Site, Tacloban North, Philippines. She says: ’The water situation is difficult and sometimes we’re just dependent on the rain….sometimes the laundry takes the whole day.’ Photo: Aurelie Marrier d’Unienville/Oxfam


Page 26: Elizabeth Gabrinao stands with her family outside their home in the GMA Resettlement Area, Tacloban North, Philippines. Elizabeth says that one day is not enough for all the care work she has. Photo: Aurelie Marrier d’Unienville/Oxfam

Page 32: Maria Socorro with her son Bryan outside her home and next to the beauty and cleaning products she sells locally to earn a small income on Tubabao Island, Guiuan, Eastern Samar, Philippines. Maria says: ’We make a living from the sea but it’s his husband who goes out to sea. If he doesn’t have work he helps me with household chores.’ Photo: Aurelie Marrier d’Unienville/Oxfam
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