

# Managing boundaries between family and work in family daycare



ESFR Conference 2016  
WS19: Work and family life III - employment patterns, working  
conditions and family relations 1  
02.09.2016

Mareike Tudor, M.A.  
Institute of Social Sciences  
Osnabrück University  
[mareike.tudor@uos.de](mailto:mareike.tudor@uos.de)

# Structure



- Characteristics of family daycare in Germany
- Questions and research results
  - Areas of tension in family daycare
  - Boundary management strategies
- Conclusion

# Characteristics of family daycare in Germany

---



- Paid childcare in the private household of the family daycare provider
- Permission for 5 children maximum (plus own children)
- Children participate in the daily routine of the care provider's family
- Governmental funding
- Registration of daycare providers at the local youth welfare service
- Official permission required
- 160-180 hour qualification program

(Hillmann-Stadtfeld 2009; Kerl-Wienecke et al. 2013)

# Characteristics of family daycare in Germany

---



- In 2015: 44.100 registered daycare providers, 97% female  
(Statistisches Bundesamt 2015: 77)
  - 101.600 children, largest age-set under the age of 3 (Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder 2014: 7)
  - Intersection of family life, privacy and paid work
  - Boundaries must be (re-)arranged by the daycare provider
  - Creation of patterns of interconnection or demarcation
- *Positioning of my research in the practical family sociology approach* (Jurczyk 2014; Morgan 2013)
- *Key concept: Boundary management* (Jurczyk et al. 2009; Jurczyk 2014: 124)

# Questions



- 1. In which respect becomes managing boundaries between family and work important in the context of family daycare?**
  
- 2. How do family daycare providers cope with doing care as an activity of work and family at the same time?**

# **1. In which respect becomes managing boundaries between family and work important in the context of family daycare?**



Areas of tension:

- (1) Public vs. private sphere
- (2) Formal vs. informal relationship
- (3) Intimacy and attachment vs. distance

# (1) Public vs. private sphere



- |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ‘Family likeness’</li><li>• Located in the private sphere</li><li>• Inclusion of the care children in a family context</li><li>• ‘Mother like’ caregiver</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Embedded in an institutional framework</li><li>• Qualification requirements</li><li>• Legal equality with public daycare<br/>(Kerl-Wienecke et al. 2013: 52f.)</li><li>• Logic of ‘offer and demand’/market mechanisms<br/>(Jurczyk 2005: 22)</li></ul> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

(Jurczyk 2005: 23)

## (2) Formal vs. informal relationship

---



- Formal service relationship or personal friendship?
- Varying expectations of reciprocity between parents and daycare providers (Nelson 1990)
- Contractual agreements and regulations vs. favours
- ‘Picking up in time’ as a critical aspect

## (3) Intimacy and attachment vs. distance



- ‘Emotional management’ relevant in personal services (Hochschild 1979; 2005; Geissler 2006)
- Emotional work is necessary to find the right balance between intimacy, attachment and distance (Dunkel 1988; Nelson 1990)
- Level of intimacy as a relevant indicator for the integration of the care child in the caregiver’s family

## **2. How do family daycare providers cope with doing care as an activity of work and family at the same time?**



Boundary management strategies on three levels:

- (1) Spatial boundaries
- (2) Personal boundaries
- (3) Emotional boundaries

# Sample and Method

---



- Qualitative reconstructive approach
- Semi-structured interviews with 10 family daycare providers and 10 parents
- Interpretation follows the approach of objective hermeneutics (sequence analysis)

## (1) Spatial boundaries



*"[...] it is already like a second home for them, they spend so much time here. And when I would say you are just allowed to stay on this carpet - I wouldn't do that to my own children either."*

*(translation M.T., I#4, l. 281-283)*

---

*"There they have their own area; it's a carpet where they can pick the toys."* *(translation M.T., I#1, l. 134-136)*

## (2) Personal boundaries



"For me it's very import that [...] I get the feeling we **are on good terms** and we **can talk to each other**, even if **times are getting critical.**" (translation M.T., I#1, l. 350-352)

"[...] and I **explain**, well it's this or that phase in development, that's normal and I react like this. I **explain it to the parents** and I find it important that we **can talk openly to each other.**" (translation M.T., I#1, line 364-368)

---

"Yes, the fact is that I actually also **meet some parents privately.**"  
(translation M.T., I#5, line 835-836)

"[...] um well certainly **there is a mix up with work** and so on, but I **don't mind**, because at the moment **work is really fun** and so I **don't need a sharp distinction** so to say, I won't say this is private and now we can't talk about anything else." (translation M.T., I#5, line 843-849)

## (3) Emotional boundaries

---



"I want to **satisfy their emotional needs**, I like to cuddle with them and I find **body contact** important." (translation M.T., I#1, l. 323-325)

"[...] I have **no inner distance** or something, basically every child is wonderful." (translation M.T., I#1, l. 341-342)

---

"Well this is where one can **draw a clear line**. It's good to give them a cuddle and **that's it.**" (translation M.T., I#4, line 833-834)

"Certain things we have **clearly defined as a family**, only mum and dad get kisses on the mouth, **there are definite bounds.**" (translation M.T., I#4, line 820-822)

"[...] one mother told me [...] that I occupy **one of the first places** after her for her child. Even **before grandma grandpa**, this is where I sometimes think um **that's awkward.**" (translation M.T., I#4, l. 719-723)

# Conclusion



- Family daycare represents a specific interconnection between work and family
  - The content of the work is family life
- Institutional regulations interfere in the private sphere
  - Areas of tension
- Different boundary management strategies
  - Individual patterns of intersection and demarcation
- Further research required to fully understand the dynamics of social relationships in the context of family daycare



Thank you very much for your attention!

# References



- Diller, Angelika/ Jurczyk, Karin/ Rauschenbach, Thomas (Hg.) (2005): Tagespflege zwischen Markt und Familie. Neue Herausforderungen und Perspektiven. München: DJI Verlag Deutsches Jugendinstitut.
- Dunkel, Wolfgang (1988): Wenn Gefühle zum Arbeitsgegenstand werden: Gefühlsarbeit im Rahmen personenbezogener Dienstleistungstätigkeiten 39 (1), S. 66-85.
- Geissler, Birgit (2006): Haushalts-Dienstleistungen als informelle Erwerbsarbeit: neue Ungleichheit oder Ausdifferenzierung des Arbeitsmarktes. In: Arbeit: Zeitschrift für Arbeitsforschung, Arbeitsgestaltung und Arbeitspolitik 15 (3), S. 194-205.
- Hillmann-Stadtfeld, Anja (2009): Das Recht der Kindertagespflege: allgemeinrechtliche, sozialrechtliche und steuerrechtliche Rahmenbedingungen für Tagespflegepersonen. Köln: Link.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russel (1979): Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure. In: American Journal of Sociology 85 (3), S. 551-575.
- Hochschild, Arlie (2005): "Rent a mom" and other services: markets, meanings and emotions. In: International Journal of Work Organization and Emotion 1 (1), S. 74-86.
- Jurczyk, Karin (2005): Tagespflege - Frauenarbeit, familiennah. Eine Betreuungsform zwischen Familie, Markt und Öffentlichkeit. In: Diller, Angelika/ Jurczyk, Karin/ Rauschenbach, Thomas (Hg.): Tagespflege zwischen Markt und Familie. Neue Herausforderungen und Perspektiven. München: DJI Verlag Deutsches Jugendinstitut, S. 9-28.
- Jurczyk, Karin (2014): Doing Family - der Practical Turn der Familienwissenschaften. In: Steinbach, Anja/ Henning, Marina/ Arránz Becker, Oliver (Hg.): Familie im Fokus der Wissenschaft. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, S. 117-138.

# References



- Jurczyk, Karin/Schier, Michaela/Szymenderski, Peggy/Lange, Andreas/Voß, Günter G. (2009): Entgrenzte Arbeit – Entgrenzte Familie. Grenzmanagement im Alltag als neue Herausforderung. Berlin: Edition Sigma.
- Kerl-Wienecke, Astrid/ Schoyerer, Gabriel/ Schuhegger, Lucia (2013): Kompetenzprofil Kindertagespflege in den ersten drei Lebensjahren. Berlin: Cornelsen Schulverlage GmbH.
- Morgan, David H. G. (2013): Rethinking Family Practices. Hampshire/ New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nelson, Margaret K. (1990): Negotiating Care: The Experience of Family Day Care Providers: Temple University Press.
- Rabe-Kleberg, Ursula (2006): Mütterlichkeit und Profession - oder: Mütterlichkeit, eine Achillisverse der Fachlichkeit? In: Diller, Angelika/ Rauschenbach, Thomas (Hg.): Reform oder Ende der Erzieherinnenausbildung? Beiträge zu einer kontroversen Fachbedatte. München: Verlag Deutsches Jugendinstitut, S. 95-110.
- Statistisches Bundesamt (eds.) (2015): Statistiken der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe. Kinder und tätige Personen in Tageseinrichtungen und in öffentlich geförderter Kindertagespflege am 01.03.2015. Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt.
- Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder (eds.) (2015): Kindertagesbetreuung regional 2014. Ein Vergleich aller 402 Kreise in Deutschland. Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt.
- Wiemert, Heike (2014): Ausdifferenzierung der Kindertagespflege. Ein Professionalisierungspfad? In: Heitkötter, Martina/ Teske, Jana (Hg.): Formenvielfalt in der Kindertagespflege: Standortbestimmung, Qualitätsanforderungen und Gestaltungsbedarfe. München: DJV Verlag Deutsches Jugendinstitut, S. 123-132.