



Miracles and home births: the importance of media representations of birth

Molly Wiant Cummins

To cite this article: Molly Wiant Cummins (2020) Miracles and home births: the importance of media representations of birth, *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 37:1, 85-96, DOI: [10.1080/15295036.2019.1704037](https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2019.1704037)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2019.1704037>



Published online: 27 Dec 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 673



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 3 View citing articles [↗](#)



Miracles and home births: the importance of media representations of birth

Molly Wiant Cummins

Department of Communication, University of Texas Arlington, Arlington, Texas, USA

ABSTRACT

Since most women do not experience birth firsthand before giving birth themselves, many U.S. American birthing women draw knowledge from media representations for understanding what to expect during delivery. Most media representations of birth uphold a medical model, presenting many women with limited options for birth and reducing the agency available to women in their healthcare choices. Lack of choice and agency play into some of the issues surrounding the high rate of maternal mortality in the U.S., compared to other developed nations. This paper analyzes “The Miracle of Birth” scene from *Crazy Ex-Girlfriend* and Darci’s home birth on *Jane the Virgin* from a feminist rhetorical lens to explore the possibilities and limitations in media representations of birth.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 23 July 2019
Accepted 9 December 2019

KEYWORDS

Media representations of birth; childbirth on TV; medical model of birth; social model of birth

Introduction

Feasey (2012) writes, “Women have always given birth, and although this physical reality has remained unchanged since time immemorial, the social norms, mores and medical interventions associated with the experience have altered and shifted” (p. 147). One shift is from where pregnant people learn about pregnancy and childbirth. Although friends and family were previously prime sources of information regarding pregnancy and birth and/or assisted in home births, most women now do not have firsthand experience unless they give birth themselves (Bak, 2004). Most women instead gather information from a “wide array of medical professionals, books, magazines, TV programs, and most recently, the Internet” (Song, West, Lundy, & Dahmen, 2012, p. 774). In fact, visual media representations are the only birth that many of us witness (Luce et al., 2016; Morris & McInerney, 2010; West, 2011). It should be no surprise, then, that much of U.S. American cultural understanding of pregnancy and birth comes from media representations.

The stories we tell in our cultural media artifacts set expectations for birth and pregnancy experiences (Hurt, 2011). Our cultural artifacts do not act as a mirror reflecting our everyday experiences; rather, “they are considered and calculated constructions of motherhood that must be understood in concert with lived maternal experiences” (Feasey, 2017, p. 3). Still, the cultural scripts and stories we see (re)produced in the

media necessarily color our understandings of how life *should* proceed. Feasey (2015) elaborates that

examining the depiction of pregnancy and childbirth in factual and fictional programming is an important part of both media and motherhood studies because the medium has the power and scope to inform and educate alongside its ability to entertain a contemporary audience.

This is partially why “The Miracle of Birth” song from the third season of The CW’s *Crazy Ex-Girlfriend* and Darci’s home birth from the fourth season of The CW’s *Jane the Virgin* stood out as possible breaks with common birth portrayals. Created by women (Rachel Bloom and Aline Brosh McKenna for *Crazy Ex-Girlfriend* and Jennie Snyder Urman for *Jane the Virgin*), as well as being arguably feminist (Fallon, 2015; Piwowarski, 2015), these primetime shows offer viewers possible places for speaking back to hegemonic discourses surrounding women’s health. I begin by looking at two major U.S. American models of birth. Then, I turn to how visual media representations currently portray birth before using feminist rhetorical criticism for a close reading of each scene individually.

Building Background

Two models

While various approaches to childbirth exist, I focus on the medical model and the social model as being on opposite ends of a spectrum (van Teijlingen, 2017). Naming the differences, West (2011) succinctly explains,

The basic difference [between the medical model and the social model] is that the former sees all pregnancies in terms of the potential risks and dangers and therefore favors systematized medical control to manage those dangers; the latter contends that for most women, birth is a healthy and widely varied process, and that women should be free agents to determine the setting, position, and coping mechanisms that best work for their bodies, rather than being confined to a standardized set of procedures and expectations. (p. 107)

Thus, the medical model sees pregnancy as inherently risky (i.e. women are classified either low-risk or high-risk) where the social model sees pregnancy as a natural part of what the human body can do.

The medical model assures the birthing person that medical technology can “help reduce the perceived risks and fears associated with giving birth” (Luce et al., 2016, p. 7). Indeed, the medical model has encouraged women to see their own bodies as in need of surveillance and monitoring which means women’s individual pregnancies and births are subsumed into a “one-size-fits-all biological explanation” of those experiences (Hurt, 2011, p. 379). The medical model has remained squarely intact partially due to its hegemonic power of “ritualistic repetition” (Russell, 2012, p. 255) of birth scenes in popular culture.

The social model, by contrast, centers the birthing person, allowing them to take the lead. MacKenzie Bryers and van Teijlingen (2010) explain,

The social model is founded on the idea that childbirth is a natural physiological event: that is, the majority of pregnant women will have a normal and safe childbirth with little or no medical intervention and that those women who are not expected to have a normal childbirth can be predicted and selected (p. 490).

Although it is easy to align the social model strictly with midwives, MacKenzie Bryers and van Teijlingen (2010) stress that there should not be a rigid distinction as not all “midwives adhere to the social model and not all doctors to the medical model” (p. 491). Moreover, Ireland and van Teijlingen (2013) point out that this polarization is damaging not only for the pregnant person but also for healthcare professionals. Most births fall somewhere between these two models. Yet, the medical model continues to dominate due in part to U.S. American media representations of birth.

Media representations

There is no doubt that women learn from media representations, even if they’re not used as informative sources about birth (Bessett & Murawsky, 2018). If nothing else, “women learn and develop expectations from the television and movies they consume” (Hall, 2013, p. 47). Das (2018) explains the effects of media on birthing women are twofold: either the portrayal is hypermedicalized or it creates unrealistic expectations for women to do birth the “right” way. Sears and Godderis (2011) find that even when viewers understand that they are not “an accurate picture of reality,” the representations still provide “information about ways of acting in the world” (p. 184). Even when women may be critical of mediated representations, they recognize they are still affected by these images (Liechty, Coyne, Collier, & Sharp, 2018).

Regrettably, it is almost solely the medical model portrayed in the media. Feminist media studies looking at media representations of birth in reality TV (Bull, 2016; De Benedictis, Johnson, Roberts, & Spiby, 2019; Russell, 2012; Sears & Godderis, 2011), sitcoms (Feasey, 2017), and movies (West, 2011) all reify the medical model of birth—one criticized by feminist scholars “as a patriarchal practice that objectifies women” (Takeshita, 2017, p. 343). By showing almost exclusively the medical model, representations of birth demonstrate that “having a baby is a dangerous process to be feared, one over which institutional medicine should be given complete control” (West, 2011, p. 107).

Perhaps the most common way birth is portrayed in these representations is as painful and risky, with pain medication being the only way to cope (Morris & McInerney, 2010). Mack (2016) notes, “In technocratic or biomedical discourses, the pain of childbirth is often framed as something to minimize, eliminate, or destroy through medical or pharmaceutical intervention” (p. 57). By focusing on this pain, media representations of birth create a fear and anxiety about the birth process (Luce et al., 2016; Takeshita, 2017; West, 2011). Horeck (2016) explains in her study of both the U.S. and U.K. versions of *One Born Every Minute* that the U.S. version shows women who choose pain medication at ease or peace, while those who choose to labor without pain medication “are shown to be in agony,” and the voice-over reminds viewers that these women are to blame when their labors “stall out” (p. 171). As Tyler and Baraitser (2013) observe, “What this research suggests is that childbirth TV not only distorts women’s perceptions of birth but creates a significant amount of fear about giving birth, which in turn shapes women’s experience, behaviour and ‘choices’ about childbirth” (p. 8).

When alternative choices like a midwife-attended home birth are presented in the media, they often ultimately uphold the superiority of the medical model (Takeshita, 2017). Kline (2007) found that choosing a midwife for birth was often reduced to “capricious decisions” (p. 27) wrapped up with “unpleasant and vulgar practices” (p. 24). In the

end, to have a midwife attend the birth was “an irrational choice,” where the midwife was often portrayed as a “controlling bitch” (Kline, 2007, p. 22). Even in reality TV or YouTube videos of home birth, birth becomes another cultural expectation for women to meet, performing birth in particular ways—such as enduring the pain of childbirth in serenity – in order to get it “right” (Das, 2018; De Benedictis et al., 2019; Mack, 2016).

Offering more alternative representations of birth highlights women’s options for choice and agency in the birth process, thus alleviating some of the fear associated with birth (Bak, 2004). These choices are often tied to control as Kitlinger (2006) explains, that “the concept of control needs to extend to being able to opt between alternatives, rather than being faced with obstetric ultimatums, and to having control of the environment in which birth takes place” (p. 12). Sears and Godderis (2011) suggest other examples of women having choice to resist the complete control the medical model has over birth. These examples include walking during labor, choosing birth positions, and even electing a cesarean section for non-medical reasons. Furthermore, De Benedictis et al. (2019) posit that the media representation of birth with which we’re familiar is most insidious in the ways it normalizes interventions into birth. For example, they say the common trope of the woman laboring and birthing in a recumbent position is about the convenience of the medical staff and carries risks for the woman and baby alike. Yet, this is the most common way we see birth portrayed in the media, part of the *mise-en-scène* that Bull (2016) argues constitutes U.S. American reality birthing shows.

Because most representations of birth in visual media uphold the medical model, it is important to look at representations that may present resistance to this model. I turn now to feminist rhetorical criticism before looking at *Crazy Ex-Girlfriend*’s “The Miracle of Birth” song and Darci’s midwife-attended homebirth on *Jane the Virgin* for individual analysis.

Rhetorical criticism

Hart, Daughton, and LaVally (2018) suggest that critiquing even “unserious” texts highlights that “rhetoric is most powerful when it is not noticed,” especially when it is broadcasted to millions of viewers who are looking to be entertained (p. 208). Media is meant to please the masses without alienating many viewers (Hart et al., 2018). Popular culture “provides a rich field” for analysis because “critically aware consumers” are able to “extricate the implicit” messages regardless of the ways popular culture is produced for “unreflective acceptance” (Japp, Meister, & Japp, 2005, p. 8).

Hart et al. (2018) offer “critical probes” for the rhetorical critic to use in their analysis of a text. I’m focusing on critical probes about analyzing media and combining them with critical probes from feminist criticism. In analyzing media, Hart et al. (2018) recommend critics consider what tensions exist in the artifact and how they are represented. They also suggest the critic relate the tensions within the artifact to what else is happening in the culture at large. Drawing on what the authors offer, I use the following critical probes to address “The Miracle of Birth” and Darci’s home birth.

CPI: What is going on in this scene? What are the tensions in the scene, and how are they represented?

CP2: How do the tensions in these scenes relate to a larger cultural story about how women should “look, think, feel, behave” (Hart et al., 2018, p. 212) and/or how do they affect the ways women are dis/advantaged culturally?

A critical reading

Crazy Ex-Girlfriend

Premiering on The CW in 2015, *Crazy Ex-Girlfriend* follows the story of New York lawyer Rebecca Bunch who spontaneously moves to West Covina, California, after running into a crush from her teenage years, Josh Chan. As a combination of comedy, drama, and musical, *Crazy Ex-Girlfriend* is hailed as a feminist show though it’s unlike most shows on television (Fallon, 2015; Leon, 2016; Rosenberg, 2017). Newman (2016) describes the show as “feminist song-and-dance carnivalesque” that tells “uncomfortable truths in outrageous fashion,” using catchy and envelope-pushing musical numbers in each episode. For example, in the very first episode of season 1, Rebecca sings “Sexy Getting Ready Song.” Aja Romano, writing for *Vox*, explains this song as a “*Bridget Jones*-esque torturous date night prep juxtaposed against a breathy R&B number” which demonstrates to the audience “the show’s winking participation in patriarchal bullshit” (Grady, Koski, Romano, & Framke, 2018).

In season 3, episode 13, Paula, a 40-something coworker and eventual best friend of Rebecca’s, sings “The Miracle of Birth.” The song breaks from a prenatal visit for Heather, another friend of Rebecca’s who is the surrogate for a fetus made from Rebecca’s boss, Darryl’s, sperm and Rebecca’s egg. During the folksy song, Paula is dressed in a flowy, pink dress atop a throne of flowers, surrounded by cherub-like young girls dressed in similarly flowy dresses complete with gauzy wings who enter through an opening beneath the throne meant to resemble a vagina. The lightheartedness of the music and the scene is juxtaposed by the almost violent lyrics Paula sings (e.g. “And explosive diarrhea / Means that labor’s drawing nearer”). Moreover, Paula sings about the “realness” of birth, followed by spoken moments about how birth is “really worth it.” For example, she sings, “After hours and hours / Of utter torture / You may poop yourself and / or / Throw up as you bear down” then speaks the words, “Cause you’re a goddess!” When she sings, she’s shown in the folksy atmosphere, a cut-away scene from the actual prenatal visit. When she speaks, she’s shown in-scene with the other characters present at the appointment often holding something medical (e.g. a skeletal set of hips with a plastic baby, demonstrating how the baby would move through hips during birth). In the cut-away, it’s lighthearted, bright, and airy. In the medical room, Heather literally lays on an examining table in a hospital gown, surrounded by medical equipment and posters. These switches in scene also change the context of the song, highlighting, and perhaps even mocking, both models of birth.

In this scene, tension also exists between people of color and those who appear White—the doctor, Beth (another character), Paula, and Darryl (although Darryl claims some Native American heritage). Throughout the scene, the White-appearing people seem intrigued or even happy at Paula’s sometimes violent description of birth. Meanwhile, the people of color, Heather included, seem concerned or even disgusted by the description, with facial expressions replete with paravocal “no” and head shaking.

“The Miracle of Birth” speaks truths about the physiological experience of birth often hidden in other representations of birth, such as explaining, “Well, your cervix has been closed / And plugged with mucous / But soon that viscous plug / Will be discharged / [spoken] It’s called the bloody show.” Though references like these to the abject body resist dominant discourses of socially appropriate discussion, the song also works to reify the medical model of birth. Paula informs the viewer that once contractions begin, they will race to the hospital for the “hell ride of your life,” before saying plainly, “It’s what your body’s made for!” This monolithic understanding of the birthing woman also creates divisions around what it means to birth correctly. If or when birth does not proceed according to the cultural narrative portrayed in the song, audience members may worry what they did to affect “what their bodies were made for” (West, 2011).

While *Crazy Ex-Girlfriend* does employ comedy in its unique genre, I had hoped that a show that plays with the nuance of words and touchy subjects (Newman, 2016) might also demonstrate more complexity with its representation of birth. While Horeck (2016) argues that humor is “a distancing mechanism that takes viewers away from that horrible, unrepresentable pain” (p. 172) of childbirth, this representation of birth once again robs women of the agency of choice and reinforces cultural jokes of birth as disgusting, leaky (MacDonald, 2007), abject, and nausea-inducing as evidenced by Heather’s doctor shown vomiting into a trash can when the song is over—a reminder of the “cultural squeamishness around women’s reproductive bodily processes” (West, 2011, p. 115).

Jane the Virgin

Jane the Virgin debuted in 2014 as an American adaptation of a Venezuelan telenovela (Nussbaum, 2018). The show is centered around Jane, a young Latina saving her virginity for marriage, when she is accidentally inseminated at a routine gynecological exam. What follows is a love triangle with Jane, her boyfriend, Michael, and the biological producer of the semen with which Jane is inseminated, Rafael, who happens to be a crush from Jane’s past. Because the storyline focuses on Jane and her family, namely her relationship with her mother and grandmother, the show has been lauded as feminist (Piwowarski, 2015; Strauss, 2014).

After a dizzying number of twists and turns, as any true telenovela might offer, viewers arrive at “Chapter Sixty-Seven” (season 4, episode 3) in which Jane’s father, Rogelio and his ex, Darci, are about to have a baby. Darci has chosen, along with her current partner and Rogelio’s arch-nemesis, Esteban, to have a home birth. Rogelio’s wife, Xiomara, who is also Jane’s mother, tells him to educate himself about home births before he begins “freaking out” over Darci’s decision. Rogelio begrudgingly decides to do internet research saying, “Fine. I will look into this ridiculous home birth business.” After researching, Rogelio wants to forbid Darci from having a home birth, although he offers no immediate justification for this decision. We learn his justification is about Darci’s age when Rogelio talks to Esteban about trying to convince Darci to have a hospital birth.

When it is time for Darci to give birth at Rogelio and Xiomara’s home, Esteban climbs in the birthing tub with her while Xiomara, Rogelio, and Sequoia, the midwife, look on. The scene is bright, and the room is open. We see the midwife busying herself around the tub, but no one seems to be particularly concerned or in a hurry. Still, after a few screams, and the narrator wishing, with distaste, we could rush through the birth, Darci

yells, “I can’t do this anymore. I quit. I want to go to the hospital. I need a frickin’ epidural.” Esteban assures her she can do it while Rogelio also climbs into the birthing tub. He also assures her, passionately, that she can do it, “You wanted to be in control of the birth, then take control, damn it. You said you wanted to feel the magic of a natural childbirth because you’ve been waiting for this for your whole life.” Rogelio gives her this encouragement while the two men yell at her to push the baby out. As the baby is laid on Darci’s chest, Rogelio yells, “We did it.”

Jane the Virgin offers viewers so much by showing a home birth in primetime, a rare event. Moreover, the fact that this show follows mainly Latinx characters in primetime is an important part of the story. This scene seems uplifting, and even exciting, in demonstrating some of the choices a woman has when giving birth. It has a feminist edge in Darci choosing the home birth for herself, even at the reluctance of the baby’s father. Indeed, VanArendonk (2017) views this scene as keeping with the ethos of the show saying, “It’s clear that home birth can be a hazardous idea, and then the show also lets Darci have her home birth because that’s the choice she made for herself.” The issue, however, is the way the scene plays out. For instance, Rogelio’s biased assumptions about home birth from the outset of his research downplay home birth as ridiculous and capricious, and the show does not offer caveats about for whom and why it might be a choice. Although the conversation between Rogelio and Esteban does not lead to Darci changing her mind, the scene between the men reinforces the idea that the medical model is the only safe and logical way for women to give birth. In this moment, not only is the social model being used to “sanction the medical model as superior” (Takeshita, 2017, p. 334), but that the conversation happens between two men demonstrates that women who choose home births are irrational and dangerous at worst and “silly” at best (Kline, 2007, p. 24).

Returning to VanArendonk (2017), home birth by no means must be a “hazardous idea,” especially when one has done their research, and it is wonderful that the producers of the show chose to have Darci birth at home regardless of Rogelio’s research. It is equally frustrating, however, that the producers do not allow Darci to continue to be strong. Instead, in her moment of self-doubt, it takes two men to not just remind her of the decision she made, but to yell encouragement at her, then yell at her to push—a common trope even in reality television (Morris & McInerney, 2010). So, in trying to demonstrate a woman’s agency over her birthing experience, *Jane the Virgin* unfortunately also reifies the medical model as superior and safer because the medical model can offer medicinal pain relief that the far end of the social model cannot (Kline, 2007). It also, probably inadvertently, strips Darci of some of her power in the moment by putting the encouragement to finish laboring in the mouths and bodies of men. While it is her body that has done most of the work, Rogelio takes credit with his invocation of “we did it.”

Conclusion

In this section, I address the second part of the last critical probe identifying how the implications of these messages affect how women are dis/advantaged culturally. Regardless of the intent of viewers to consume media to gain information, we know that media and popular culture certainly influence how we interact with one another as the repetition of behavior normalizes and codifies that behavior into social convention (Morris &

McInerney, 2010). Thus, the importance of a variety of media representations of birth is not only necessary; it is imperative as a necessary part of women's bodily autonomy.

Currently, Takeshita (2017) finds media representations of birth fall along five criteria. Representations

(1) incite fear of childbirth by emphasizing the risks; (2) solidify the idea that hospitals are the only rational place to give birth; (3) normalize reliance on technology and trivialize women's capacity to give birth; (4) present pregnant women as passive actors without agency; and (5) ignore or disparage midwifery. (pp. 334–335)

“The Miracle of Birth” song from *Crazy Ex-Girlfriend* and Darci's home birth from *Jane the Virgin* unfortunately fulfill these same criteria. Although they demonstrate places of possibility in representing choice, they fall short of speaking back to the medical model in effective ways.

Demonstrating births that range on the spectrum, especially showing those closer to the social model, as an alternative to a strict medical model may once again put control and choice back in the hands of birthing women, thereby reducing some of the fear associated with birth (Bak, 2004). Of course, not every woman who has had a medicalized birth has felt disempowered and/or alienated (Sears & Godderis, 2011); nor is there no room for resistance within the medical model. It is certainly possible that the medical and social models might be able to work together (Bull, 2016; Takeshita, 2017). The “Miracle of Birth” and Darci's home birth demonstrate that creating empowering birth narratives is complicated. Representing a variety of birth stories in visual media should be exposing narratives that are rarely seen in popular culture to “trouble” the ideological dominance of the medical model (West, 2011, p. 107). Representing choice is also about investigating privilege, especially as it relates to class privilege where consumer choice often equates with financial consequences (Song et al., 2012). As Mack (2016) explains, “The United States falls behind every other industrialized country when it comes to maternal health, yet giving birth in the United States costs more than anywhere else in the world” (p. 49). More depictions of a variety of births begin to normalize these choices as well so that a routine hospital birth isn't the only option available to those with limited financial resources or other mitigating factors.

Media representations that show routine birth in a variety of settings, not only as a highly dramatized medical emergency (Bull, 2016), may contribute to the lowering of the maternal mortality rate in the U.S. as well. Our increased medicalization of childbirth means the U.S. “still falls behind its industrialized peers on most measures of maternal and infant health” (West, 2011, p. 106) with the mortality rate being a prime example. MacDorman, Declercq, Cabral, and Morton (2016) found the maternal mortality rate increased 26.6% from 2000 to 2014. An NPR and ProPublica joint investigation found that more women die in the U.S. of complications related to pregnancy than in any other developed nation, and that it's only the U.S. rate that is rising (Martin & Montagne, 2017). For example, for the period of 2011–2014, there were 12.4 deaths (of the mother) per 100,000 live births for White women, but 40.0 deaths for Black women and 17.8 for women of other races (CDC, 2018) and roughly 60% of pregnancy-related deaths in the U.S. (maternal deaths during pregnancy, birth, or somewhere during the first year postpartum) could have been prevented (Pearson, 2019). Maternal mortality has risen, in part, because access to prenatal care is inconsistent, there are underlying health factors

(e.g. heart disease), and there are racial disparities in the healthcare system (Sifferlin, 2016). Moreover, Slomski (2019) writing for the *Journal of the American Medical Association* Network, reports that “medical errors, ineffective treatments, and lack of care coordination by clinicians and hospitals are major causes of preventable deaths” (p. 1240). Because unnecessary interventions are related to increased maternal mortality (Luce et al., 2016)—with one example being that a higher rate of c-sections leads to more “life-threatening complications” (Martin & Montagne, 2017)—many scholars suggest a more thorough reliance on evidence-based practice regardless of the model used to lessen possibly dangerous or even fatal unnecessary interventions (Kitzinger, 2005; Morris & McInerney, 2010). Moving toward the social end of the spectrum in our media representations of birth, toward a model that focuses on the “social, socio-economic, cultural and environmental aspects of health” (van Teijlingen, 2017, p. 81), provides a necessary critique and reconsideration of our cultural media artifacts to address the issues birthing women face without access to birthing agency.

To change what’s normal, we need to change the narrative. To change the normalcy of the highest maternal mortality rate in the developed world, for instance, and to change women’s lack of agency over their healthcare choices, we need to change the narrative of visual representations of birth in the media. Like Mack (2016), I argue for a feminist politics of birth, one that “must highlight the empowerment of the maternal body as an explicit act of resistance against the dominant medical model of birth that has become a source of anguish for some women [and other birthing people]” (p. 63). Furthermore, a feminist politics of birth would resist at the structural level as well, fighting a neoliberal feminism that produces subjects as “entirely responsible for their own self-care and well-being” (Rottenberg, 2018, p. 7). The normalization of these alternative narratives happens over time. While “The Miracle of Birth” and Darci’s home birth seek to be two such installments, they do not go far enough to battle the deluge of other depictions viewers receive or offer enough systemic resistance about how birth should be done. Admittedly, these shows represent what Banet-Weiser (2018) calls popular feminism; they commodify and make feminism “safe,” thereby resisting structural critique (p. 16). Yet, because they happen in primetime, they could also have been scenes to demonstrate what else is possible outside the mainstream. Changing the representations of birth to include women’s choice and agency from place of birth, movement and positioning during labor, demonstrating women being offered information about possible interventions (i.e. informed consent), viewers being privy to how women make those decisions, and depictions of safe and natural alternative birthing methods (e.g. no pain medication) are some small ways to change reliance on a medical model that is not infallible. With West (2011), I argue that we must be aware of the messages we share in popular culture about what birth is and how it should function if we seek to reform healthcare toward what is best for mothers and babies (p. 121). In this way, perhaps we can find equity in healthcare so that birth can be what each woman wants it to be because she has access to a variety of choices and possibilities.

Acknowledgments

I want to thank Karthiga Devi Veeramani and Dr. Allison Brenneise for reading an early draft of this essay, and the reviewers of the Women’s Caucus of the Central States Communication Association for their feedback. I have no conflicts of interest to report for this manuscript.

References

- Bak, C. (2004). Cultural lack of birth experience empowers media representations, not women. *Midwifery Today*, 72, 44–45. 65.
- Banet-Weiser, S. (2018). *Empowered: Popular feminism and popular misogyny*. Durham, NC: Duke UP.
- Bessett, D., & Murawsky, S. (2018). 'I guess I do have to take back what I said before, about television': Pregnant women's understandings and use of televisual representations of childbearing. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 40(3), 478–493. doi:10.1111/1467-9566.12658
- Bull, S. (2016). Midwives, medicine and natural births: Female agency in Scandinavian birthing shows. *Critical Studies in Television: The International Journal of Television Studies*, 11(2), 177–189. doi:10.1177/1749602016642934
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2018, August 7). *Pregnancy mortality surveillance system*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/reproductivehealth/maternalinfanthealth/pregnancy-mortality-surveillance-system.htm#>
- Das, R. (2018). Mediated subjectivities of the maternal: A critique of childbirth videos on YouTube. *The Communication Review*, 21(1), 66–84. doi:10.1080/10714421.2017.1416807
- De Benedictis, S., Johnson, C., Roberts, J., & Spiby, H. (2019). Quantitative insights into televised birth: A content analysis of *One Born Every Minute*. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 36(1), 1–17. doi:10.1080/15295036.2018.1516046
- Fallon, C. (2015, November 16). "Crazy Ex-Girlfriend" is a bad feminist, just like us. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/crazy-ex-girlfriend-bad-feminist_us_56464b02e4b060377349016b
- Feasey, R. (2012). *From happy homemaker to desperate housewives: Motherhood and popular television*. New York, NY: Anthem.
- Feasey, R. (2015). Maternal readings of pregnancy and childbirth on the small screen [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://mamsie.org/2015/04/14/maternal-reasgins/>
- Feasey, R. (2017). Good, bad, or just good enough: Representations of motherhood and the maternal role on the small screen. *Studies in the Maternal*, 9(1), 1–31. doi:10.16995/sim.234
- Grady, C., Koski, G., Romano, A., & Framke, C. (2018, January 19). A definitive ranking of Crazy Ex-Girlfriend's 101 songs. *Vox*. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/culture/2018/1/19/16885806/crazy-ex-girlfriend-songs-ranked-list>
- Hall, J. G. (2013). As seen on TV: Media influences of pregnancy and birth narratives. In K. M. Ryan, & D. A. Macey (Eds.), *Television and the self: Knowledge, identity, and media representation* (pp. 47–62). Lanham, MD: Lexington.
- Hart, R. P., Daughton, S., & LaVally, R. (2018). *Modern rhetorical criticism* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Horeck, T. (2016). The affective labor of *One Born Every Minute* in its UK and US formats. *Critical Studies in Television: The International Journal of Television Studies*, 11(2), 164–176. doi:10.1177/1749602016642917
- Hurt, N. E. (2011). Legitimizing "baby brain": Tracing a rhetoric of significance through science and the mass media. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 8(4), 376–398. doi:10.1080/14791420.2011.619202
- Ireland, J., & van Teijlingen, E. (2013). Normal birth: Social-medical model. *The Practising Midwife*, 16(11), 17–20.
- Japp, P. M., Meister, M., & Japp, D. K. (2005). Communication ethics, media, and popular culture: An introduction. In P. M. Japp, M. Meister, & D. K. Japp (Eds.), *Communication ethics, media, and popular culture* (pp. 1–12). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Kitzinger, S. (2005). *The politics of birth*. New York, NY: Elsevier.
- Kitzinger, S. (2006). *Birth crisis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kline, K. N. (2007). Midwife attended births in prime-time television: Craziess, controlling bitches, and ultimate capitulation. *Women and Language*, 30(1), 20–29.
- Leon, M. (2016, October 29). "Crazy Ex-Girlfriend" is still the smart, subversively feminist comedy TV needs. *The Daily Beast*. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailybeast.com/crazy-ex-girlfriend-is-still-the-smart-subversively-feminist-comedy-tv-needs>

- Liechty, T., Coyne, S. M., Collier, K. M., & Sharp, A. D. (2018). "It's just not very realistic": Perceptions of media among pregnant and postpartum women. *Health Communication*, 33(7), 851–859. doi:10.1080/10410236.2017.1315680
- Luce, A., Cash, M., Hundley, V., Cheyne, H., van Teijlingen, E., & Angell, C. (2016). Is it realistic?" The portrayal of pregnancy and childbirth in the media. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 16(40), 1–10. doi:10.1186/s12884-016-0827-x
- MacDonald, S. M. (2007). Leaky performances: The transformative potential of the menstrual leak. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 30(3), 340–357. doi:10.1080/07491409.2007.10162518
- MacDorman, M. F., Declercq, E., Cabral, H., & Morton, C. (2016). Is the United States maternal mortality rate increasing? Disentangling trends from measurement issues. *Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 128(3), 447–455. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000001556
- Mack, A. N. (2016). The self-made mom: Neoliberalism and masochistic motherhood in home-birth videos on YouTube. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 39(1), 47–68. doi:10.1080/07491409.2015.1129519
- MacKenzie Bryers, H., & van Teijlingen, E. (2010). Risk, theory, social and medical models: A critical analysis of the concept of risk in maternity care. *Midwifery*, 26(5), 488–496. doi:10.1016/j.midw.2010.07.003
- Martin, N., & Montagne, R. (2017, May 12). U.S. has the worst rate of maternal deaths in the developed world. *NPR*. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2017/05/12/528098789/u-s-has-the-worst-rate-of-maternal-deaths-in-the-developed-world>
- Morris, T., & McInerney, K. (2010). Media representations of pregnancy and childbirth: An analysis of reality television programs in the United States. *Birth*, 37(2), 134–140. doi:10.1111/j.1523-536X.2010.00393.x
- Newman, M. Z. (2016). Crazy Ex-Girlfriend. *Film Criticism*, 40(3). doi:10.3998/fc.13761232.0040.311
- Nussbaum, E. (2018, March 12). "Jane the Virgin" is not a guilty pleasure. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2018/03/12/jane-the-virgin-is-not-a-guilty-pleasure>
- Pearson, C. (2019, May 7). American women are dying from pregnancy up to a year after they deliver. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.huffpost.com/entry/american-women-dying-pregnancy_1_5cd1a2c4e4b0548b7360689c?fbclid=IwAR2ucxux0HQxQpQEh8Vb6WZMC8b3GREdna_agwH5Ofuh4TWJmQXlPiz-FA
- Piwowarski, A. (2015, February 16). "Jane the Virgin" is one of the most feminist shows on TV for many reasons, but especially these 5. *Bustle*. Retrieved from <https://www.bustle.com/articles/64013-jane-the-virgin-is-one-of-the-most-feminist-shows-on-tv-for-many-reasons-but>
- Rosenberg, A. (2017, October 24). Thank goodness for "Crazy Ex-Girlfriend," the show that's keeping me sane. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/act-four/wp/2017/10/24/thank-goodness-for-crazy-ex-girlfriend-the-show-thats-keeping-me-sane/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.77fcf8447fb7
- Rottenberg, C. (2018). *The rise of neoliberal feminism*. New York, NY: Oxford UP.
- Russell, D. (2012). The reality of TV labour: *Birth Stories*. In E. Podnieks (Ed.), *Mediating moms: Mothers in popular culture* (pp. 253–267). Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP.
- Sears, C. A., & Godderis, R. (2011). Roar like a tiger on TV? Constructions of women and childbirth in reality TV. *Feminist Media Studies*, 11(2), 181–195. doi:10.1080/14680777.2010.521626
- Sifferlin, A. (2016, September 27). Why U.S. women still die during childbirth. *Time*. Retrieved from <https://time.com/4508369/why-u-s-women-still-die-during-childbirth/>
- Slomski, A. (2019). Why do hundreds of US women die annually in childbirth? *JAMA*, 321(13), 1239–1241. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.0714
- Song, F. W., West, J. E., Lundy, L., & Dahmen, N. S. (2012). Women, pregnancy, and health information online: The making of informed patients and ideal mothers. *Gender and Society*, 26(5), 773–798. doi:10.1177/0891243212446336
- Strauss, E. (2014, November 6). The surprising feminism of *Jane the Virgin*. *The Week*. Retrieved from <https://theweek.com/articles/442492/surprising-feminism-jane-virgin>

- Takeshita, C. (2017). Countering technocracy: “Natural” birth in *The Business of Being Born and Call the Midwife*. *Feminist Media Studies*, 17(3), 332–346. doi:10.1080/14680777.2017.1283341
- Tyler, I., & Baraitser, L. (2013). Private view, public birth: Making feminist sense of the new visual culture of childbirth. *Studies in the Maternal*, 5(2), 1–27. doi:10.16995/sim.18
- VanArendonk, K. (2017, October 27). *Jane the Virgin* recap: The time warp. *Vulture*. Retrieved from <http://www.vulture.com/2017/10/jane-the-virgin-recap-season-4-episode-3.html>
- van Teijlingen, E. R. (2017). The medical and social model of childbirth. *Kontakt*, 19(2), 81–82. doi:10.1016/j.kontakt.2017.03.001
- West, J. E. (2011). Technology knows best: The cultural work of hospital birth in 21st century film. *Literature and Medicine*, 29(1), 104–126. doi:10.1353/lm.2011.0307



Mothering in a Pandemic: Navigating Care Work, Intensive Motherhood, and COVID-19

Molly Wiant Cummins¹ · Grace Ellen Brannon¹

Accepted: 4 February 2022 / Published online: 3 March 2022

This is a U.S. government work and not under copyright protection in the U.S.; foreign copyright protection may apply 2022

Abstract

Even before COVID-19, women around the world performed more unpaid domestic labor, specifically unpaid care labor, than men. COVID-19 has only exacerbated the gender gap in this domestic labor. For Western women, especially mothers in the United States of America, the normative discourse of intensive motherhood and the gendered pressure inherent in the unrealistic standards set by the discourse have only increased the amount of unpaid domestic and care labor required of mothers. Using qualitative, in-depth interviews with 18 mothers during May–June 2020, this study examines privileged mothers' perceptions of what they did well in parenting both before and during the early part of the COVID-19 pandemic. The mothers' pragmatic adaptations during the pandemic posed challenges to the norms of intensive motherhood, as did emergent ideas about integrative mothering articulated before the pandemic's onset. We find that while COVID-19 has increased expectations on mothers, it has also provided a turning point wherein expectations can be changed, as the participants suggested. Implications for intensive motherhood scholars, mothers, and communication researchers are discussed, along with future research.

Keywords Intensive motherhood · COVID-19 · Gendered pressures · Qualitative methodology

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) explains unpaid care and domestic work as “non-market, unpaid work carried out in households (by women primarily, but also to varying degrees by girls, men and boys) which includes both direct care (of persons) and indirect care (such as cooking, cleaning, fetching water and fuel, etc.)” [47, para. 2]. As the OECD noted, most

✉ Molly Wiant Cummins
molly.cummins@uta.edu

Grace Ellen Brannon
grace.brannon@uta.edu

¹ Department of Communication, University of Texas Arlington, Arlington, TX, USA

unpaid care work is performed by women. According to a 2018 International Labour Organization (ILO) report, women perform 76.2 percent of the total unpaid care work around the world, which is 3.2 times what men perform [33, p. 3]. This translates to an average of four hours and 25 min per day compared to men's one hour and 23 min of unpaid care work [33, p. 3].

Given these statistics, it comes as no surprise that the COVID-19 pandemic disproportionately affected women. In the United States of America (U.S.), nearly 2.4 million women have dropped out of the workforce since February 2020 [57] in part due to the sudden need for unpaid care work during lockdowns. For mothers, the pandemic has been especially difficult [49]. Cohen and Hsu [12] claimed that while most families have more stress because of COVID-19, mothers in heterosexual couples are spending 15 h more per week on education and household tasks, on average. Spurred by these statistics, Senator Tammy Duckworth wrote in *Time* in August 2020, "American moms are running on empty. Every morning, we wake up feeling guilty that we're not doing enough. Every night, we go to sleep terrified that we're failing" [22, para. 1–3]. Senator Duckworth named an experience so common that the *New York Times* created "The Primal Scream," a hotline where mothers can call in and share their frustrations in one-minute voicemails so they may see "all the messy, heartbreaking moments of everyday fear and chaos, and the rays of joy that can sometimes shine through" [28, para. 17] and know they are not alone.

Prior to COVID-19, mothers navigated a complex parenting terrain in the U.S., facing a lack of federal parenting policies (e.g., paid parental leave) and increasing demands of intensive motherhood [30], a normative discourse relegating mothers to the sole role of child-rearing. Mothers attempted to "have it all," to find a balance between work and family that rarely equalized and left them chasing unrealistic possibilities [26, 36, 59]. The added worries of the pandemic (e.g., full-time employment while navigating a child's remote schooling) have created a perfect storm where mothers are struggling like never before and will continue facing long-term gender inequality in the workplace and at home long after the pandemic subsides [65]. As O'Reilly argues, "[N]ormative motherhood discourses are rewritten in response to, and as a result of, significant cultural and economic change" [48, p. 44]. Given that COVID-19 has dramatically shifted how the world operates, it stands to reason that society is in a liminal space of possibility, ready to challenge motherhood discourses. Yet, the U.S. continues to rely on mothers to complete the extra labor to "bridge the gaps between cultural change and its effect on childrearing" [8, p. 40], treating unpaid care work performed by women as "if it were a costless renewable resource" [17, p. 685]. A year into the pandemic, we see that this pattern continues [29, 65], despite knowing that family policies such as paid maternity leave result in better health outcomes and may even help reduce social disparities [34].

We began this project intending to interview mothers about their perceptions of their own mothering. However, as our project began, the U.S. officially recognized COVID-19 as a national health emergency. Thus, we had the unique opportunity to interview mothers about their perceptions of mothering both before COVID-19 and in the early months of the U.S. lockdown. We asked mothers what they believed they were doing well as parents before COVID-19 and how that shifted as COVID-19 became a daily reality in their families. We recognize that mothers' perceptions

of their “good parenting” were already colored by the pervasive cultural discourse of intensive motherhood [30]. Yet, their answers also illuminated how the discourse might be shifting. Here, we show some of the ways privileged mothers are recognizing and individually challenging intensive motherhood. We begin by discussing the division of labor in unpaid care work, intensive motherhood, and how unpaid care work and intensive motherhood have both been affected by COVID-19. Then, we turn to the mothers’ answers and reflections throughout the interviews. Finally, we offer implications of COVID-19 on intensive motherhood discourse as related to the lived experiences of the participants.

Building a Foundation

Pre-COVID-19

Twenty years ago, Bianchi et al. [6] explained that though the gap was less than it had been in previous years, women (in heterosexual, cohabitating relationships) still performed most of the unpaid domestic labor (e.g., housework). This has consistently been the case around the world [25, 33, 61]. Elson argued that gender equity gains stalled around 2014 [23], positing that the gender wage gap will not end until the unpaid care work gap is recognized and closed (see also [60]). Moreover, Cooke and Hook found that all working women “incurred some wage penalty” for routine housework, even as “the penalty lessened” for top wage-earners [15, p. 733] due to the volume argument which predicts that higher wage-earners spend less time doing housework and thus, “the wage penalty for housework decreases across women’s wage distribution” [15, p. 722]. Yet only the highest-earning men “incurred significant wage penalties for routine housework on employment days” [15, p. 733], demonstrating “little variation in the housework penalty across men’s wage distribution,” per the volume argument [15, p. 722]. Thus, women are routinely penalized for engaging in the unpaid care work of the home.

Undoubtedly, the breakdown of who will perform what unpaid labor in the home is steeped in cultural gender norms and discourses. As these norms become sedimented over time, they begin to seem natural. It should come as no surprise that even when employed full-time, women do more of the unpaid domestic labor [19]. Further, men are more likely to arrange family time around paid work whereas women arrange paid work around family [19]. The result is that men can spend more time in paid work because of their lessened responsibility for housework [10] and/or spend more time engaging in leisure compared to women [35]. Perhaps surprisingly, the unpaid care work gap lessens in childcare; in the last few decades, both women and men have increased time spent on childcare [50]. Still, most unpaid care work is tied to what Milkie et al. referred to as gendered pressures, that, for women, “Performing a task expends the precious resource of time, but also may create feelings of responsibility, generate additional cognitive load, and be understood in terms of how it fits with what wives ‘should’ be doing with their time” [38, p. 171]. The gendered pressures Milkie et al. [38] described complement Western notions of intensive

motherhood [30], specifically in the U.S. As a cultural discourse helping to shape the norms of “good” mothering, intensive motherhood underscores gendered ideas of who should perform unpaid care work.

Intensive Motherhood

In *The Cultural Contradictions of Motherhood*, Hays identified intensive motherhood as the prevailing discourse of what constitutes good mothering, explaining the normative discourse is “*child-centered, expert-guided, emotionally absorbing, labor-intensive, and financially expensive*” [30, p. 8, emphasis original]. Moreover, Hays said intensive motherhood persists because the discourse is what society believes children “need and deserve” [30, p. 21], as based on a White, privileged norm. Building on Hays’s [30] work, Douglas and Michaels wrote about “the new momism” which is “a highly romanticized and yet demanding view of motherhood in which the standards for success are impossible to meet” [21, p. 4] and which they primarily discuss in relationship to mass media. Intensive motherhood has also been discussed as patriarchal motherhood [48], the motherhood mystique [42], total motherhood [64], and hegemonic mothering [46]. As O’Brien Hallstein summarized, intensive motherhood is “the *proper* ideology of contemporary intensive mothering that all women are disciplined into, across race and class lines, even if not all women actually practice it” [44, p. 143, emphasis original]. These discourses demonstrate that a “good mother” is one who spends considerable time, energy, and resources focused on her children.

Not every mother is the ideal standard for intensive motherhood, however. The ideal mother is White, middle-class, cisgender, heterosexual and ideally married [45]. Although it is not explicitly stated in the good mother ideal, mothers can assume this also means they should be able-bodied (without physical disabilities), deemed acceptable to reproduce (both in terms of race—read White—and intellectual ability), and an appropriate age (not too young and not too old). Those who are outside of the ideal can strive to meet intensive motherhood standards but will rarely, if ever, be considered good mothers as a result. As Green noted, “Despite many cultural contradictions and diverse parenting arrangements and practices, intensive mothering remains the normalised cultural and political standard by which motherhood, mothering and mothers are evaluated” [27, p. 198]. Intensive motherhood remains the hegemonic standard against which all mothers are judged.

Intensive motherhood creates unrealistic expectations for mothers, what O’Reilly calls “idealization” [48, p. 14]. The idealized version of good motherhood has resulted in “naturalization” [48, p. 14] as well in which mothers are assumed to be naturally maternal, that they will instinctively know how to mother [39]. Ennis posited the lack of support “from family, from government, from the workplace and from one another” has made motherhood an isolating experience for those who buy into this understanding of parenting [24, p. 8], what O’Reilly names as individualization [48]. This is underscored by intensive motherhood’s connection to neoliberalism which places responsibility squarely on the individual and devalues the carework of mothering (by all genders) because the work is “outside the scope of market

valuation” [43, p. 97]. The rise of intensive motherhood informed and shaped by neoliberalism creates a “perfect storm” for mothers who “must do far more work with far less resources” [48, p. 57]. Simply, without institutional support and/or policies that allow for family time, “mothers’ employment makes it categorically impossible to fulfill the dictates of intensive mothering” [14, p. 3]. For Collins [13], the impossibility of fulfilling intensive motherhood dictates translates to increased guilt for mothers. When it comes to unpaid care work, the guilt may be magnified for privileged mothers who outsource their domestic labor to other women, further reinscribing Milkie et al.’s notion of gendered pressures [38] and leaving unpaid domestic labor devalued [41]. The gendered pressures, including guilt, only intensified in the wake of a global pandemic.

Unpaid Domestic Labor and COVID-19

Unsurprisingly, given what the gendered breakdown of unpaid care work was prior to the pandemic, COVID-19 increased the pressure and reliance on women to continue to perform that labor. Collins et al. [14] argued that although men and women equally perceive domestic tasks that need to be completed, men are less likely to complete the tasks, leaving them to women partners. Further, Collins et al. reported that mothers “scaled back their work hours by about 5 per cent” while fathers’ work hours remained stable between March and April 2020 [14, p. 102], showing that more mothers are reducing work responsibilities to meet domestic labor responsibilities with a troubling effect (i.e., a decline) on women’s labor force participation [1]. Specifically, “the loss of full-time nonparental childcare was associated with an increased risk of job loss for mothers,” who are “more likely to be employed when they have access to childcare options” [51, p. 527]. Managing children’s at-home education only added to the pressures mothers faced, with U.S. mothers facing “greater financial worry and emotional strain” related to their employment status and unpaid domestic labor during the early days of the pandemic [54, p. 2]. The increased employment worries spiral out to significant relationships as well, as Waddell and colleagues showed: Using surveys both before and during COVID-19, the researchers found that when women were saddled with more of the unpaid domestic labor, they were “more likely to experience increased relationship problems and dissatisfaction” [62, p. 1778]. When women attempt to reconcile the competing discourses of what constitutes a “good” mother and a “good” worker, they face increased pressure and guilt at not fulfilling either [63].

Given the prevalence of unpaid domestic labor performed by women both prior to and increased by COVID-19, the gendered pressures women, especially mothers, feel has been exacerbated by the pandemic. After all, “Crises can starkly expose longstanding and systemic social problems, and this has been the case with COVID-19 and gendered divisions of labor” [18, p. 320]. Sarker agreed, saying, “Women in times of crisis are always vulnerable and more affected than men, and the coronavirus pandemic is no exception” [55, p. 597]. In our study, we contribute to the literature by interviewing mothers about their perceptions of mothering both before and during the early days of the COVID-19 lockdown in the U.S. These mothers

described feeling increased pressure to perform good mothering, both informed by intensive motherhood standards and due to the influx of persistent unpaid care work during lockdowns, including children's at-home education. These interviews highlight ways privileged mothers in the U.S. may slowly be shifting the dictates of intensive motherhood toward more humanizing discourse, using the abrupt social change of COVID-19 as a necessary turning point for change. Next, we discuss our methods and participants before turning to participant narratives.

Methods

As mentioned above, we initially conceived our project to explore mothers' perceptions of their mothering, focusing on what they did well, with what they struggled, and how they compared themselves to others. Our initial project focused on mothers' perceptions of their mothering, including their perceptions of others' parenting and their own parents' parenting to see how mothers distinguished their styles from those around them. We received Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval as COVID-19 became a recognized health emergency in the U.S. As a result, our interview questions necessarily shifted. There was no way we could ask mothers to focus on their parenting without answers being overshadowed by the raging pandemic creating chaos in mothers' (everyone's) lives. Thus, our project as reported here focused on mothers' pragmatic adaptations and associated gendered pressures [38] both before and during COVID-19.

Participants

After obtaining IRB approval, we posted recruitment calls in several private Facebook groups specifically aimed at mothers, allowing us a diverse (e.g., age, race, ethnicity, and occupation) subject pool from geographically diverse areas in the U.S. Both Facebook groups have members living across the U.S. and are not (solely) local to us. This gave us access to 18 mothers over the age of 18 from across the United States. There were no exclusion criteria; interested participants needed to be at least 18, speak English, and identify as mothers to participate. We fielded responses from interested participants, then had two or three interviews through snowball sampling before reaching saturation in our data [16]. Recent research on motherhood studies uses similar numbers (e.g., [58]: 15 participants). Each participant self-reported their gender identity, and all 18 identified as cisgender women married to men. The participants' ages were primarily in the 30s–40s range, for those who chose to report their ages. Participants reported having between one and four children in total, with most of the children being five years old or younger; the children's ages at time of interview ranged from 7 weeks old (born during the COVID-19 pandemic) to elementary school. Many mothers reported facing unique parenting situations ranging from being mothers of multiples (e.g., twins) to children with various diagnoses, such as time spent in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU) to ADHD or generalized anxiety disorder (GAD). Levels of education varied, with some of the mothers being highly educated (at least a Master's degree). Most of the mothers were White

($n = 16$) with careers outside of the home ($n = 16$). While the homogeneity of much of the participant pool is a limitation we recognize, it also allowed us to recruit participants we already had access to via Facebook mothering groups to which we each belong. Further, intensive motherhood discourse upholds a homogenous ideal [48]; thus, our participant pool represented candidates most likely already rhetorically situated as good in intensive motherhood. Moreover, with the new public health emergency, many mothers were still in survival mode as they navigated the local stay-at-home orders, school closings, and other major life shifts. Those mothers who might have been facing extreme situations (e.g., job loss, home loss, food insecurities, and/or domestic abuse) were not the individuals signing up to be interviewed at that point in time. The threat of the pandemic meant that those privileged mothers—affluent women in relatively stable domestic situations—who had the emotional capacity, time, and access to resources to be interviewed were the people who responded to our call. Even reaching out to our personal networks or further recruiting through snowball sampling did not allow for a more diverse participant pool. Future research should continue examining these unique perspectives.

Procedures

We designed the initial semi-structured interview guide to elicit the mothers' stories about their perceptions of successes and struggles as mothers using open-ended questions asking for examples (Appendix A). While we thought these questions would allow us to better understand how mothers perceive their own mothering, one of our participants highlighted how our framing of the questions was problematic. The participant explained that our questions asked mothers to compare themselves to others, an individualizing move reminiscent of intensive motherhood [48], rather than think about motherhood as a collective and politically efficacious space. We did not define success or struggle for participants; rather, we let them explain their answers based on their own perceptions. Yet, in the same way that resilience is seen to have moral overtones [5], so, too, might success carry particular connotations in the way we framed our questions. Even as we investigated intensive motherhood, we reproduced it through the framing of our interview questions. We therefore recognize that troubling our own questions or the definitions of terms in those questions is an important lesson learned from this project [3].

Between May and June 2020, we first asked participants to verbally acknowledge informed consent and we gave participants the opportunity to ask and have any questions answered about the project. Afterwards, we asked a brief demographic questionnaire, and began audio recording. We conducted eighteen individual interviews, lasting between 22–54 min, for a total of almost 11 h of recorded data. Once collected, the interviews were transcribed near verbatim, excluding filler words as they did not alter meanings. This process resulted in about 154 transcribed pages of single-spaced typed data, with about 60 pages of handwritten and typed notes made during the interviews and data analysis procedures. After transcribing the interviews, we each coded the interviews individually looking for common themes across the data through grounded theory [2, 11]. We identified emergent themes through thematic analysis and resolved

any differences via discussion. Next, we used open coding to identify the major areas of information, many of which aligned with our interview protocol. We then used axial coding to note our categories and subcategories before we used selective coding to highlight exemplars of our themes [20]. We reached theoretical saturation [16] after rereading the transcripts and finding no new or emergent themes. We report participant-chosen pseudonyms throughout the results section.

Mothers' Perceptions

In this section, we analyze the words of participants as they describe their adaptations both pre-COVID-19 and during COVID-19. Others [56, 62] have used surveys to compare before and during-the-pandemic results, but, to our knowledge at the time of writing, this is the first study using qualitative interviews. Again, we recognize that phrasing our interview questions in the binary of success versus struggle disallowed participants to more holistically consider or detail how they perceived their own mothering. As a result, participant answers bled across the false lines we had constructed. Moreover, given that our interviews were during the early part of the pandemic, participants were certainly in flux as they answered our questions. As such, many participants demonstrated how these themes intersected; asking them to answer about parenting wins was often interspersed with the ways they felt they were struggling and vice versa. Similarly, the adaptations before COVID-19 often bled into answers for how mothers were adapting during the pandemic. Although we found some similarities across participants' answers, the definitions of good mothering are unique to each individual. The similarities, however, demonstrate some of the ways mothers' perceptions have been informed by intensive motherhood. Because they all live and mother under the same normative discourse, their definitions are marked by commonalities.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the mothers with the most access to resources (e.g., high income; dual-income homes; childcare throughout the pandemic) were the mothers who seemed most able to name their adaptations as positive. Other participants struggled to name ways they saw felt they were doing well in their mothering. This was particularly the case with Tasha, a White military spouse with two children under four, who seemed to be truly struggling throughout the interview. She remarked that she was "just waiting for this period of life to be over" when considering the pandemic. Speaking with participants like Tasha illuminated how intensive motherhood norms might bog mothers down, might create shame and guilt spirals (e.g., [13, 63]) where mothers feel like they are floundering. We offer first the integrative mothering of pre-COVID-19 to create a baseline of what the mothers considered "normal" life before the pandemic, showing subtle ways some participants were already resistive to intensive motherhood norms and the gendered pressures they felt as paid labor and unpaid labor collapsed into one space.

Integrative Mothering

At a fundamental level, many participants saw good mothering in their ability to meet their children's basic needs of food, shelter, clothing, and cleanliness. For some

mothers, this baseline normalcy felt like a “low bar,” such as for Suzanna, a White mother who works in IT security with two daughters under the age of 10. Suzanna explained good mothering as her children not feeling neglected even as she works a full-time job. Suzanna’s concern emphasized mothers’ individual definitions of good mothering which are highlighted in their answers even if another participant might judge that answer as insufficient mothering. Suzanna’s comment also highlights a resistance to intensive motherhood norms, however. That good mothering for Suzanna is something she understands might be a “low bar” for someone else means she is not as invested in living up to unrealistic standards to feel like a good mother.

Arguably, meeting basic needs is a marker of good motherhood, intensive or otherwise. Yet, importantly, some mothers made mention of good mothering that run counter to intensive motherhood. Several participants explicitly marked the importance of their marriage/partnership as foundational to good parenting, naming equality or teamwork in parenting as vital. Trish explains that she and her husband are “intentional” about their marriage, specifically naming this intentionality as part of her good mothering, so their children will be raised in an environment of “security.” Sparrow, a White, stay-at-home mother to three daughters five and under (the youngest born during COVID-19), explained that it is important that she and her husband are equals in their relationship. She feels they have been fruitful in that endeavor when their children call them out in moments where they believe something is unfair for one parent or the other. Intensive motherhood compels mothers to be the primary parent intensively focused on childcare; for mothers to emphasize the importance of their partners and/or relationships in parenting is a shift away from the normative discourse.

Likewise, a few mothers highlighted how important their careers outside the family were to their identity and perceptions of good parenting. For Lillian L, a White mother to a 6-year-old son, good mothering is modeling that she is a leader and a career woman to her child. Carol, a White marketing professional mother to three daughters between the ages of 3 and 8, too, feels like a good mother when she hears her daughters mention they want to be moms in addition to careers; it makes her feel that she “must be exhibiting something that they see as a positive.” One of the strongest examples came from Kate, a White, professor with a Ph.D., and mother to a four-year-old son and a two-month-old son, who told a story about her mother-in-law telling her child, “Mom has to go to work so that you can have all these nice things.” Kate corrected her mother-in-law, explaining that they would still have nice things if Mom stayed home, but that Mom goes to work because she loves what she does and wants to help other people love thinking and writing. Kate says it was important that her child understand that work was not in service of the child (e.g., to pay bills), but in service of *herself* because she enjoys her job. Moreover, Kate believes that when she is at work, she is giving her children opportunities to be loved by other people, to engage in education and friendship. She is a mother all the time when she approaches it this way; her mothering does not stop when she is not physically present with her children. Kate’s view of mothering allows her to create an identity somewhere between worker and mother, drawing upon the importance of each of these personas in her overall identity. In this way, mothers enjoying their

careers outside the home becomes a challenge to intensive motherhood. They are not expressing only guilt or fear of failing at mothering; these mothers see their mothering as tied directly to their lives outside of their children.

Participants' abilities to navigate the delicate balance of work and home was not separate from intensive motherhood and its inherent gendered pressures. The idea of "leaning in" so that mothers can "have it all" is a neoliberal feminist ideal [53]. Having it all, as Kornfield explained is "implicitly defined as a fulfilling career and a fulfilling home life, and a fulfilling home life is constituted by a stable, passionate, heterosexual romance, a close relationship with happy and healthy children, and a well-groomed middle-class (or above) home" [36, p. 181]. In other words, intensive motherhood, informed by neoliberal feminism, has simply changed the standards of what working mothers should strive toward to be "successful." Indeed, the working mother conception of good mother can "exacerbate the tensions" between work and home, adding to mothers' feelings of failure and guilt [7, para. 48]. As Buzzanell and colleagues explained, the image of the "good working mother" is fragile and those mothers who engage in this construction view their careers, regardless of their enjoyment of the work, as benefitting the family rather than themselves [9, p. 276]. Buzzanell et al. continued, saying the participants in their study framed paid work as better for the whole family "because they [the participants] are better mothers when they are able to go to work..." [9, p. 276]. The participants in our study understood their careers as making them better mothers, but also, as Kate's reframing of her mother-in-law's comments demonstrated, participants do not always engage in a compartmentalization of home and work life; rather, they see the two as combined and informing one another. Instead, these mothers resisted intensive motherhood as they see the necessity of their partners in equal child-raising and/or choose to work outside the home, even if that choice is neoliberally informed. This marks a potential shift in the normative discourse of intensive motherhood. If mothers see the power of viewing their mothering as integrative, as capable of subsuming mothering dialectics (such as working mother or stay-at-home mother), they present a powerful challenge to intensive motherhood, shifting the gendered pressure of who should be responsible for the unpaid care work. Next, we discuss how mothers' perceptions of their adaptations during COVID-19 may present challenges to intensive motherhood norms.

Triage Parenting and Adaptation

The dramatic shift of COVID-19 emphasized that struggles are felt more acutely than positive parenting moments, which often require reflection after the fact [4]. Understandably, listening for participants' adaptations during a crisis was sometimes a difficult endeavor. For example, at least five mothers mentioned some version of just getting through the day as good mothering during COVID-19, indicating their understanding of good mothering parameters having drastically changed. For example, Gail, a White working mother of two sons under age 9, said she did not think the prevailing feeling during the pandemic was good mothering, but that if she looked objectively rather than emotionally, her children are "healthy and safe and

fed,” which felt like good mothering. One participant, Martina, a part-time nurse, and mother to a 9-year-old son and 4-year-old twin boys, named this meeting of basic needs as “triage” parenting, an important adaptation in the immediate aftermath of the pandemic. This idea of triage parenting became a common chord we heard from participants. For example, Carol said, “I sort of feel like I’m a C+ parent on the best of days, and that’s sort of what I’m gunning for....” Some days, they suggested, surviving alone felt like a monumental accomplishment, like Mandy, a White mother to a 3-year-old son and 3-month-old twin boys (born during the pandemic), who felt that being able to get through a day without herself crying was a big accomplishment. The recognition that parameters have shifted, that triage parenting through a trauma is good mothering, is primary to changing the norms of intensive motherhood. Carol’s rating of her parenting as C+ indicates that she knows there is a standard she is supposed to meet (what she might rank A+ parenting), yet she is content with the C+ and says that is her goal. She does not seek to live up to the unrealistic standards of intensive motherhood. Instead, she understands how much she can give as a mother and striving for that is enough for her. Although the participants noted that these moments felt small, they are nonetheless potential challenges to intensive motherhood and the gendered pressure to shoulder this work alone.

In addition to triage parenting, Gail also said that good mothering during COVID-19 meant trying to have honest, age-appropriate conversations with her children about the pandemic. Other mothers echoed this, finding good mothering in allowing space for their children and themselves to process emotions and/or ask questions about the pandemic. Beyond that, connecting with their partner or spouse was also important for many participants, particularly for Carol, who described her and her partner’s roles as extending to “cruise director, homesteader, homeschooler...” saying that the struggles related to the pandemic created strain, because “at the end of the night we’re just toast,” meaning they were so exhausted by the end of the day they did not have the energy to make time for one another. She followed up her description saying that she sent him a text, saying “I miss you,” implying that those simple moments of intentional connection with significant others beyond their children were important. Carol echoes the intentionality Trish used above to demonstrate the importance of relationships with others outside of the child/ren, especially a spouse. Although potentially coopted by intensive motherhood discourse focused on heteronormative and/or nuclear family relationships, highlighting the importance of identity outside of the mother label represents a small resistance to intensive motherhood demands.

The most common way mothers indicated they felt they were engaging in good mothering through COVID-19, however, was adaptation. Mothers were (and are) taking what they have been given and trying to create something positive. Many mothers mentioned carving out more time to spend with their children, making more time for connection with them. Leslie, a lawyer, and mother to an 8-year-old daughter and a 4-year-old son, noted that working from home, for her, means there was more time to see her children during the day, to help make their lunches as a point of connection. Most mothers also talked about finding a new routine amidst the chaos and/or relaxing the old (pre-COVID-19) routine to make life work. Lillian L engaged in good mothering during COVID-19 by trying not to put too much

pressure on anybody, relaxing the routine to find a balance between coping and getting “to their work.” Jennifer, who holds a Master’s degree, and is a White mother to a 3-year-old daughter, said her main adaptation after COVID-19 has been working hard to maintain the same routine they had before the pandemic so from her daughter’s perspective, not much has changed except that they are home more. Ultimately, this adaptation to how life works is the major parenting win for mothers during COVID-19. Of note here are at least three participants (Anne, Carol, and Leslie) who explicitly mention that a major driver of positive parenting moments during the pandemic is not having to be the primary parent on everything—a powerful resistant narrative to the gendered pressure of intensive motherhood as parents navigate this new experience. Adaptation from these participants demonstrates their understanding that life shifted, and they had to shift along with it. Through that shift, participants could further explore what parts of parenting felt rewarding to them rather than what normative discourse dictates. By exploring their own positive parenting moments, participants resisted intensive motherhood in minute ways, allowing them to see how parenting could be done differently.

Implications

This study is unique in that it is one of the first to examine mothers’ own perceptions on mothering during the early days of the COVID-19 pandemic in the U.S. That mothers were able to resist intensive motherhood norms during the COVID-19 pandemic is no small feat. It is, however, indicative of the way mothers continually adapt to the situations they face in order to keep moving forward, as previous research also shows [59]. This is not to say that all privileged mothers have similar stories or resistive moments such as changing the standard of what they consider good parenting to something like triage parenting like the mothers in this study; these participants do not represent a universal perspective. That the mothers in this study were able to find these moments of resistance is certainly related to their intersectionally privileged identities, which affects how current and future discourses may be challenged [40]. Although participants were not claiming to resist intensive motherhood explicitly, their answers demonstrate the ubiquitous nature of intensive motherhood, how mothers have internalized those standards [32], and how they may be pushing the discourse to shift.

To some degree, that mothers can find positive parenting moments in attempting to balance their work lives and home lives and/or their own needs and their children’s needs amidst a pandemic is, in itself, resistant to intensive motherhood. Mothers are not focusing solely on their children, searching out expensive, expert guidance on how to move through COVID-19. Instead, mothers are making life work with what they have, learning to relax old routines to establish new ones and creating a new balance. This novel way of parenting challenges intensive motherhood, perhaps creating a shift in how the normative discourse demands unpaid care work moving forward as mothers navigate this liminal space. Since previous research shows that intensive motherhood ideologies have negative psychological effects on

women, including decreased parental well-being, these are important areas of focus [52].

Even as mothers are challenging and shifting intensive motherhood, they are continually surrounded by the norms established by it [32]. The gendered pressure of extra parenting still primarily falls to mothers, a position that is “not sustainable” as one participant (Gail) put it. The expectations intensive motherhood requires of mothers, especially during a pandemic is not only exhausting; it is impossible. Rather than actively work to change or dismantle the existing inequitable policies that do not support families, intensive motherhood discourse places blame on mothers who do not live up to intensive expectations. Mothers are stronger collectively, but intensive motherhood expectations and individualization almost guarantee that mothers will not have the emotional capacity, time, and/or energy to push for greater change. In the end, this is how intensive motherhood reifies its hegemonic hold over mothers: continue to demand more with fewer resources until there is nothing left to give outside of the strict confines of the discourse [48]. Although mothers in our study have found ways to shift the standards of intensive motherhood amidst a pandemic, however minimal, it is mothers in general who are facing the extra responsibilities to thrive and mothers of color or non-binary and/or trans mothers who bear the brunt of the pandemic costs—economically and socially. This is further exacerbated by the blurring of lines between work and home during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Although it is a firmly entrenched discourse, intensive motherhood is, nonetheless, culturally and rhetorically constructed. As a construct, intensive motherhood recenters White, privileged mothers as the only acceptable model for parenting through insidious depictions in media and everyday conversations about how parenting should happen. Regardless of how aware privileged mothers are of intensive motherhood by name, they are aware of some invisible standard which works to individualize their experiences and individuate them from other mothers. Because intensive motherhood is a construct, however, it is “neither natural nor inevitable” but can be “challenged and changed” [48, p. 16]. Challenging intensive motherhood is accomplished by creating resistant narratives, small fissures in the façade of the discourse that can grow and spread. As Olson and Simon [46] discuss in relationship to breastfeeding discourse, challenging intensive motherhood is about creating a discursive space where choices are recognized and valued. This is not to say there should not be some standard of “good” mothering, but that the current hegemonic standards are unrealistic, damaging to families, and ignorant of or resistant to ways of mothering outside of this norm. Thus, to change the gendered pressures and the discourse of intensive motherhood under which all mothers are judged, society must look outside the intensive motherhood ideal to find ideas. Moreover, privileged mothers must follow the lead of and amplify the messages of parents of color, non-binary/queer parents, and non-Western parents to change intensive motherhood. Collective work across intersectional identities and positionalities is the only hope of dismantling a system designed to reinforce a feeling of failure in mothers aimed at disciplining them back into the fold of intensive motherhood norms.

Limitations and Future Directions

We had several limitations. First, participant demographics were fairly homogenous. Participants were primarily cisgender women married to men, with the majority being White and having careers outside of the home. Yet, research details intensive motherhood as most often tied to White mothers' feelings of motherhood as oppressive [48] hence our focus on their experiences. Further, since the pandemic is disproportionately affecting Black, Indigenous, and Hispanic populations, particularly through home and food insecurities, the experiences these women may have reported would likely have changed the results given that mothers of color often view motherhood through a different lens [31]. Relatedly, given the timing of the pandemic, alongside the authors' own mothering and work balances and the fact that both authors are White or White-presenting, it would have been a challenge to earn participant trust during this global event. Still, because White mothers often reinscribe intensive motherhood [42], it is imperative that they (we) are also part of the frontlines of changing the discourse by listening to and learning from mothers of color. Therefore, future research should examine the lived experiences of marginalized populations, as the ways they push back against intensive motherhood may be different than that of our study's population. Specifically, looking at mothering resilience not only during the COVID-19 pandemic, but amidst racism, attacks on Asian American/Pacific Islanders because of the pandemic, and even the routine separation of families at the U.S. southern border would be powerful.

Second, we conducted all interviews in the study via telephone. We used this modality to encourage greater participation as many people are facing Zoom/video-chatting fatigue, as well as Internet connectivity issues. There were some occasions when having facial expressions to connect with the comments or discussion would have been helpful for data interpretation, so the addition of these nonverbal cues would have been helpful. Because we recommend that future research focus on marginalized mothers and their perspectives of intensive mothering, and Internet access may be an issue, we do feel that telephone interviews were a good substitute as face-to-face meetings would be a public health issue.

Third, research should continue to examine perceptions of mothers as the COVID-19 pandemic continues. Current research shows that COVID-19 effects are worsening preexisting gender inequalities, with negative long-term implications for women's employment regarding exiting the workforce and decreased working hours [37]. Further, women are primarily the frontline workers (e.g., healthcare) during the pandemic, and are the primary caregivers to children facing school and daycare closures [14] thereby increasing a family's (the mother's) domestic duties. Given the numbers of women leaving the workforce, especially to stay at home and care for children, it is vital that research continues to examine how these mothers' perceptions of motherhood have shifted. It is important to investigate long-term effects on each of these issues, but essential to examine them from the perceptions of the mothers themselves, particularly for health-related and social services research. Moreover, conducting follow-up interviews or creating a longitudinal study to investigate how mothering perceptions change over time would be important next steps for future research.

Conclusion

In this study, we interviewed 18 mothers who primarily fit the intensive motherhood ideal about their perceptions of what they did well as mothers both before COVID-19 and during the pandemic. Although the experience of mothering is individualized through intensive motherhood, we found that mothers' perceptions of good mothering typically revolved around finding balance in their lives. The mothers in our study demonstrated through their responses the subtle ways they push back on the expectations they feel regarding intensive motherhood and its inherent gendered pressures, and we argue that their challenges to the discourse are shifting the norms of how it operates. That mothers can still find adaptation in the face of COVID-19, regardless of how difficult it may feel, is an important step to better understanding how intensive motherhood may be undermined. There is no doubt COVID-19 has drastically changed how mothers experience life and perceive their mothering abilities and associated unpaid care work; this break in the system creates space for mothers to collectively work toward dismantling a system that ultimately hurts all families. If normative motherhood discourses are rewritten in a time of change, then now is the time to change the discourse into more inclusive and humane expectations of all genders. Now is the time to work toward better ways of recognizing, understanding, and incorporating a variety of parenting techniques from the lay parent toward more gender equity in the unpaid care work sphere. Now is the time to create a supportive system for all.

Appendix A

1. Tell me about your family (age, race, job if applicable, marital status, number of kids, ages, special needs, unique situations, part of mommy groups).
2. In what ways do you feel you are succeeding as a mom?
3. In what ways do you feel you are succeeding as a mom during COVID-19?
4. In what ways do you feel you are struggling as a mom?
5. In what ways do you feel you are struggling as a mom during COVID-19?
6. In what ways do you compare your parenting experiences with other moms?
Would you share an example?
7. In what ways do you find yourself downplaying your parenting experiences?
8. How has the unique situation of ___ affected how you see yourself as a mom?
9. How does your parenting affect your family?
10. Can you talk more about how your parents' parenting has influenced yours?
11. How would you describe your parenting style?
12. How would you compare your parenting style to others?
13. Is there anything else you'd like to add about succeeding or struggling as a mom or what it means to be a mom?

Author Contributions All authors contributed to the study conception, design, and reporting. Material preparation, data collection, and analysis were performed by Molly Wiant Cummins and Grace Ellen Brannon. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Molly Wiant Cummins, and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare no conflicts of interest for this manuscript. No funding was received for conducting this study.

Ethical Approval We received ethical approval from the Institutional Review Board of the University of Texas at Arlington. The procedures in our study adhere to the Declaration of Helsinki tenets.

Consent to Participate We obtained informed consent from each participant included in the study.

References

1. Aaronson, D., Hu, L., & Rajan, A. (2021). Did Covid-19 disproportionately affect mothers' labor market activity? *Chicago Fed Letter Essays on Issues*. <https://doi.org/10.21033/cfl-2021-450>
2. Aldiabat, K. M., & Le Navenec, C. (2011). Philosophical roots of classical grounded theory: Its foundations in symbolic interactionism. *The Qualitative Report*, 16(4), 1063–1080.
3. Wiant Cummins, M., & Brannon, G. E. (2022). Implicating ourselves through our research: A duoethnography of researcher reflexivity. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 51(1), 85–102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08912416211021898>
4. Wiant Cummins, M., & Brannon, G. E. (2021). The balancing act is magnified: U.S. mothers' struggles amidst a pandemic. In A. O'Reilly & F. J. Green (Eds.), *Mothers, mothering, and COVID-19: Dispatches from a pandemic* (pp. 211–220). Demeter Press.
5. Baraitser, L., & Noack, A. (2007). Mother courage: Reflections on maternal resilience. *British Journal of Psychotherapy*, 23(2), 171–188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0118.2007.00016.x>
6. Bianchi, S. M., Milkie, M. A., Sayer, L. C., & Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor. *Social Forces*, 79(1), 191–228. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2675569>
7. Bliithe, S. J. (2015). Mobile working mothers and the simultaneous shift. *The Electronic Journal of Communication/La Revue Électronique de Communication*, 25(1 & 2). http://www.cios.org/ejcpu_blic/025/1/025104.html
8. Brown, S. (2014). Intensive mothering as an adaptive response to our cultural environment. In L. R. Ennis (Ed.), *Intensive mothering: The cultural contradictions of modern motherhood* (pp. 27–46). Demeter Press.
9. Buzzanell, P. M., Meisenbach, R., Remke, R., Liu, M., Bowers, V., & Conn, C. (2005). The good working mother: Managerial women's sensemaking and feelings about work-family issues. *Communication Studies*, 56(3), 261–285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970500181389>
10. Carlson, D. L. (2021). Time availability: Assessing causal ordering in the performance of paid labor and unpaid housework. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 52(2), 180–205. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcfs-52-2-003>
11. Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Sage.
12. Cohen, P. & Hsu, T. (2020, June 3). Pandemic could scar a generation of working mothers. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/03/business/economy/coronavirus-working-women.html>
13. Collins, C. (2021). Is maternal guilt a cross-national experience? *Qualitative Sociology*, 44, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-020-09451-2>

14. Collins, C., Landivar, L. C., Ruppanner, L., & Scarborough, W. J. (2021). COVID-19 and the gender gap in work hours. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28(S1), 101–112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12506>
15. Cooke, L. P., & Hook, J. L. (2018). Productivity or gender? The impact of domestic tasks across the wage distribution. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 80, 721–736. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12467>
16. Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
17. Craig, L. (2020). Coronavirus, domestic labour and care: Gendered roles locked down. *Journal of Sociology*, 56(4), 684–692. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783320942413>
18. Craig, L., & Churchill, B. (2021). Working and caring at home: Gender differences in the effects of COVID-19 on paid and unpaid labor in Australia. *Feminist Economics*, 27(1–2), 310–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2020.1831039>
19. Craig, L., & van Tienoven, T. P. (2021). Gendered shares of the family rush hour in fulltime dual earner families. A cross national comparison. *Social Indicators Research*, 153, 385–405. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-020-02489-3>
20. Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Sage.
21. Douglas, S. J., & Michaels, M. W. (2004). *The mommy myth: The idealization of motherhood and how it has undermined all women*. Free Press.
22. Duckworth, T. (2020, August 1). Sen. Tammy Duckworth: America’s moms are running empty. We need to do more to support them. *Time*. <https://time.com/5874524/tammy-duckworth-americas-moms-running-on-empty/>
23. Elson, D. (2017). Recognize, reduce, and redistribute unpaid care work: How to close the gender gap. *New Labor Forum*, 26(2), 52–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1095796017700135>
24. Ennis, L. R. (2014). Intensive mothering: Revisiting the issue today. In L. R. Ennis (Ed.), *Intensive mothering: The cultural contradictions of modern motherhood* (pp. 1–23). Demeter Press.
25. Ferrant, G., Pesando, L. M., & Nowacka, K. (2014). *Unpaid care work: The missing link in the analysis of gender gaps in labour outcomes*. OECD Development Centre. https://www.oecd.org/dev/development-gender/Unpaid_care_work.pdf
26. Gilbert, J., & Von Wallmenich, L. (2014). When words fail us: Mother time, relational attention, and the rhetorics of focus and balance. *Women’s Studies in Communication*, 37(1), 66–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2013.867915>
27. Green, F. J. (2015). Re-conceptualising motherhood: Reaching back to move forward. *Journal of Family Studies*, 21(3), 196–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13229400.2015.1086666>
28. Grose, J. (2021, February 4). America’s mothers are in crisis: Is anyone listening to them? *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/04/parenting/working-moms-mental-health-coronavirus.html>
29. Gross, T. (2021, February 18). Almost a year into the pandemic, working moms feel “forgotten,” journalist says. *NPR*. https://www.npr.org/2021/02/18/968930085/almost-a-year-into-the-pandemic-working-moms-feel-forgotten-journalist-says?fbclid=IwAR3yWRRjuwVfJKL5aKaQZJzA46Alpd_DDoujGLMcqB6QDZJr-v-bQune38
30. Hays, S. (1996). *The cultural contradictions of motherhood*. Yale University Press.
31. hooks, b. (2015). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Routledge.
32. Huisman, K., & Joy, E. (2014). The cultural contradictions of motherhood revisited: Continuities and changes. In L. R. Ennis (Ed.), *Intensive mothering: The cultural contradictions of modern motherhood* (pp. 86–103). Demeter Press.
33. International Labour Organization (ILO). (2018). *Care work and care jobs: For the future of decent work*. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_633135.pdf
34. Jou, J., Kozhimannil, K. B., Abraham, J. M., Blewett, L. A., & McGovern, P. M. (2018). Paid maternity leave in the United States: Associations with maternal and infant health. *Maternal Child Health Journal*, 22, 216–225. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-017-2393-x>
35. Kamp Dush, C. M., Yavorsky, J. E., & Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J. (2018). What are men doing while women perform extra unpaid labor? Leisure and specialization at the transitions to parenthood. *Sex Roles*, 78, 715–730. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0841-0>

36. Kornfield, S. (2014). Pregnant discourse: “Having it all” while domestic and potentially disabled. *Women’s Studies in Communication*, 37(2), 181–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2014.911233>
37. Landivar, L. C., Ruppner, L., Scarborough, W. J., & Collins, C. (2020). Early signs indicate that COVID-19 is exacerbating gender inequality in the labor force. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 6, 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023120947997>
38. Milkie, M. A., Wray, D., & Boeckmann, I. (2021). Gendered pressures: Divergent experiences linked to housework time among partnered men and women. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 52(2), 147–179. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcfs-52-2-002>
39. Miller, T. (2007). “Is this what motherhood is all about?”: Weaving experiences and discourse through transition to first-time motherhood. *Gender and Society*, 21(3), 337–358. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243207300561>
40. Moore, J. (2018). From “I’m never having children” to motherhood: A critical analysis of silence and voice in negotiations of childbearing face. *Women’s Studies in Communication*, 41(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2017.1421282>
41. Moras, A. (2017). “This should be my responsibility”: Gender, guilt, privilege and paid domestic work. *Gender Issues*, 34, 44–66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12147-016-9165-6>
42. Newman, H. D., & Henderson, A. C. (2014). The modern mystique: Institutional mediation of hegemonic motherhood. *Sociological Inquiry*, 84(3), 472–491. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12037>
43. O’Brien Hallstein, D. L. (2006). Conceiving intensive mothering: *The Mommy Myth, Maternal Desire*, and the lingering vestiges of matrophobia. *Journal of the Association for Research on Mothering*, 8(1–2), 96–108.
44. O’Brien Hallstein, D. L. (2008). Silences and choice: The legacies of White second wave feminism in the new professoriate. *Women’s Studies in Communication*, 31(2), 143–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2008.10162526>
45. O’Brien Hallstein, D. L. (2017). Introduction to mothering rhetorics. *Women’s Studies in Communication*, 40(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2017.1280326>
46. Olson, L. N., & Simon, J. M. (2020). *An ideological analysis of breastfeeding in contemporary America: Disciplining the maternal body*. Lexington Books.
47. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2019, June 3). *Enabling women’s economic empowerment: New approaches to unpaid care work in developing countries*. <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/4d0229cd-en/index.html?itemId=/content/component/4d0229cd-en>
48. O’Reilly, A. (2016). *Matricentric feminism: Theory, activism, and practice*. Demeter Press.
49. O’Reilly, A. (2021). “Certainly not an equal-opportunity pandemic”: COVID-19 and its impact on mothers’ carework, health, and employment. In A. O’Reilly & F. J. Green (Eds.), *Mothers, mothering, and COVID-19: Dispatches from a pandemic* (pp. 41–52). Demeter Press.
50. Pailhé, A., Solas, A., & Stanfors, M. (2021). The great convergence: Gender and unpaid work in Europe and the United States. *Population and Development Review*, 47(1), 181–217.
51. Petts, R. J., Carlson, D. L., & Pepin, J. R. (2021). A gendered pandemic: Childcare, homeschooling, and parents’ employment during COVID-19. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28(S2), 515–534. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12614>
52. Rizzo, K. M., Schiffrin, H. H., & Liss, M. (2013). Insight into the parenthood paradox: Mental health outcomes of intensive mothering. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 22(5), 614–620. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-012-9615-z>
53. Rottenberg, C. (2018). *The rise of neoliberal feminism*. Oxford University Press.
54. Ruppner, L., Tan, X., Carson, A., & Ratcliff, S. (2021). Emotional and financial health during COVID-19: The role of housework, employment and childcare in Australia and the United States. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28(5), 1937–1955. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12727>
55. Sarker, M. R. (2021). Labor market and unpaid works implications of COVID-19 for Bangladeshi women. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28(S2), 597–604. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12587>
56. Shafer, K., Scheibling, C., & Milkie, M. A. (2020). The division of domestic labor before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in Canada: Stagnation versus shifts in fathers’ contributions. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 57(4), 523–549. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cars.12315>
57. Silva, D., & Miranda, L. (2021, February 6). About 275,000 women left workforce in January in “critical” pandemic trend, experts say. *NBC News*. <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/about-275-000-women-left-workforce-january-critical-pandemic-trend-n1256942>

58. Steimel, S. (2021). Communication privacy management and pregnancy loss in interpersonal workplace communication. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 44(3), 397–418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2020.1843579>
59. Thornton, D. (2014). Transformations of the ideal mother: The story of mommy economicus and her amazing brain. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 37(3), 271–291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2014.944734>
60. Tomlinson, J. (2008). Causes and consequences of the divergent working-time patterns of employed mothers in the UK and the US: Developing a comparative analysis. *Gender Issues*, 25, 246–266. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12147-008-9064-6>
61. UN Women. (2019). *Progress of the world's women 2019–2020: Families in a changing world, summary*. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/progress-of-the-worlds-women>
62. Waddell, N., Overall, N. C., Chang, V. T., & Hammond, M. D. (2021). Gendered division of labor during a nationwide COVID-19 lockdown: Implications for relationship problems and satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 38(6), 1759–1781. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407521996476>
63. Whiley, L. A., Sayer, H., & Juanchich, M. (2021). Motherhood and guilt in a pandemic: Negotiating the 'new' normal with a feminist identity. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28(S2), 612–619. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12613>
64. Wolf, J. B. (2011). *Is breast best? Taking on the breastfeeding experts and the new high stakes of motherhood*. New York University Press.
65. Zamarro, G., & Prados, M. J. (2021). Gender differences in couples' division of childcare, work and mental health during COVID-19. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 19, 11–40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-020-09534-7>

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.