

© Copyright by

Brent Allen McBride

1988

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: The Effects of a Parent Education/Play Group Program on Father Involvement in Childrearing

Brent Allen McBride, Doctor of Philosophy, 1988

Dissertation Directed by: Greta G. Fein, Professor, Department of Curriculum & Instruction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of a parent education/play group program on the types of involvement fathers have with their children, and on their perceived sense of competence in parenting skills. Subjects were 30 fathers (15 - treatment group, 15 - "wait-list" control group) and their preschool aged children. Treatment group father-child pairs met for 2 hours on 10 consecutive Saturday mornings. Each session consisted of 1 hour of father-child play and 1 hour of the fathers in group discussions on parenting and child development. Measures of the fathers' involvement in childrearing and their perceived sense of competence in parenting skills were taken on a pretest - posttest basis from treatment and control groups. Due to the initial comparability of both groups on pretest and demographic variables, program effects were examined using posttest data only. Three categories (interaction, accessibility, and responsibility) were utilized in defining father involvement. Analyses indicated there were significant program effects on the responsibility assumed by treatment group fathers, as well as on their

perceived sense of competence in parenting skills. No program effects were evident on their levels of interaction or accessibility.

Analyses on the combined pretest data suggests there was a significant positive relationship between the fathers' sense of competence in parenting skills and their responsibility types of involvement.

Pretest data suggested the fathers have different amounts of interaction and accessibility for workdays and non-workdays. Further analyses indicated these two types of involvement are highly related on workdays, but not so on non-workdays. Different patterns of involvement were evident for fathers of girls as opposed to fathers of boys, as well as fathers with employed wives vs. non-employed wives.

The results of these analyses are discussed in terms of future research on the antecedents and modifiability of father involvement, as well as the implications for the development and implementation of parent education and support programs aimed at increasing the parenting options for fathers.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Rebecca McBride. It has been through her loving understanding and support during the long dissertation process that has made this work possible. She has always been my number one supporter, and has never stopped believing in my dreams, even when I doubted them myself. She has been by my side through this whole process working as my assistant with the fathers' program, reading drafts of papers, helping me study for exams, providing me feedback on ideas, and helping me keep some semblance of reality in my life. Knowing that she shares in my dreams and goals for this work has made it worthwhile. Even with all of the late nights and long hours away from home, she has never stopped loving me and supporting me in my work. She, more than anyone else, understands what this dissertation has meant to me, and has been willing to give up a part of me for it. I feel as if she has earned this doctorate as much as I have, and it is for these reasons that I dedicate this dissertation to her.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

There are several people whose help and support in completing this dissertation I would like to acknowledge. First I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Richard Arends, Dr. James Greenberg, Dr. Susan Holloway, and Dr. Michael Lamb. Their helpful comments and suggestions have made this a much stronger study. A special thanks to Dr. Lamb for lending his expertise on father involvement to the project. His input was invaluable. Another special thanks to my advisor, Dr. Greta Fein. I owe much to Dr. Fein. It is she who introduced me to the intricacies of successfully conducting educational research. Her guidance and support have allowed me to develop a solid foundation of skills from which to build upon in my future professional growth. I value having had the opportunity to work and study with her, and look forward to our continued professional and personal relationship.

I would also like to thank the A.E. Meyer Foundation for their financial support of this project. This funding made completing the study much more feasible. I would also like to acknowledge the support of the Center for Young Children at the University of Maryland in allowing me to use their facilities in running my program and study. Finally, I would like to thank all of the fathers and their children who have participated in the Dad's Day at the CYC program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	v
Introduction	1
Methods	11
Subjects	11
Design	14
Treatment	14
Instruments	15
Analyses	20
Results	23
Program Effects	23
Exploratory Analyses	27
Conclusions	37
Discussion	37
Implications	46
Appendix A Literature Review	54
Father Involvement in Childrearing: A Taxonomical Review	
Appendix B Treatment Program Description	85
Appendix C Instruments	93
Appendix D Letter of Consent to Participate	100
References	102

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Characteristics of the Sample	12
2	Pretest - Posttest Correlations of Dependent Variables	19
3	Pretest Scores: Treatment and Control Groups	21
4	Posttest Scores: Treatment and Control Groups	24
5	Correlations of Demographic Variables and Treatment Group Change Scores	26
6	Treatment Group Change Scores by Sex of Child and Maternal Employment Status	28
7	Pretest Intercorrelations: Dependent Measures	29
8	Pretest Intercorrelations: Dependent Measure Subscales	31
9	Correlations of Demographic and Pretest Dependent Measures	33
10	Pretest Scores for Treatment & Control Groups by Sex of Child	34
11	Pretest Scores for Treatment & Control Groups by Maternal Employment	35

Introduction/Rationale

The ways in which parents raise their offspring has a significant impact on children's development, yet researchers and educators have only recently acknowledged the important influence that fathers may have. Fathers play multiple roles in families (including direct childcare), and influence children in multiple ways, directly and indirectly (via mothers). Evidence from studies of fathers' contributions to child development support the view that fathers may influence aspects of a child's development. This influence ranges from enhancing the child's internality and cognitive development (Radin, 1981; Sagi, 1982) to helping shape their sex-role identification (Baruch & Barnett, 1986a; Sagi, 1982). Although fathers may influence some aspects of child development, research findings have sometimes been contradictory or inconclusive (Lamb, Pleck, & Levine, 1986).

Contrary to popular belief, increased levels of father involvement may not always have positive outcomes. Lamb, Pleck and Levine (1985) have suggested that for paternal involvement to have positive consequences, it must be the result of the desires of both parents. Instead of insisting that increased levels of paternal involvement are universally desirable, Lamb and his colleagues have suggested that more attempts need to be made to increase the options available to fathers so that those who wish can become more involved in raising their children. There are different ways in which fathers can become involved in childrearing; some forms of involvement may suit some fathers better than others. The interesting question then becomes how parental options might be expanded or what factors

constrain or limit these options.

At the present time there are limited options available to men in terms of their involvement in raising their children. Typically, paternal involvement is construed as one-to-one interactions. However, other types of involvement are equally important and may contribute to the development of children. If fathers wish to become involved, can they do so in one or more different ways?

Two factors may contribute to the limited options available to men in their paternal roles. The first is a lack of preparation for fatherhood. For a variety of reasons, many men have been found to be unprepared to assume an active parental role, and as a result, are reluctant to become deeply involved in the raising of their children. This lack of preparation can be seen in such areas as knowledge of normal child development (Klinman & Vukelich, 1985; Smith & Smith, 1981; Tomlinson, 1987), developmentally appropriate parenting skills (Palkovitz, 1984), and sensitivity to their children's needs (Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984; Russell, 1982a; Sagi, 1982). Palkovitz (1984) has suggested several reasons why fathers might be unprepared for an active parental role. Fathers often have little exposure to paternal role models, few social opportunities to prepare for fatherhood, limited institutional supports for the paternal role, and a lack of father-child interactions that are obligatory.

A second constraining factor may be the lack of social and institutional support for the paternal role. In our society boys are not given opportunities to receive instruction in or to develop skills needed to become a nurturing parent (Berman & Pedersen, 1987; Klinman, 1986). Further, when these boys reach adulthood and are ready to

start families of their own, the social support and educational systems available to help mothers develop parenting skills are not available to them as fathers (Bolton, 1986; DeFrain, 1977; Levant & Doyle, 1983; Smith & Smith, 1981). This lack of preparation and parenting support limits the options open to fathers as they determine the amount and type of involvement they will have with their children. The purpose of this study was to examine whether a parent education program geared specifically for fathers would increase the type or amount of involvement men have with their young children, thereby overcoming the constraints limiting the parenting options available to them.

In recent years there has been an expansion in the availability of parent education and support programs, although such programs have been primarily geared towards mothers (Bolton, 1986; Levant & Doyle, 1983). Powell (1986) suggests this increase stems from three factors: a) greater concern about the increased pressures on today's families (i.e., dual career families, single parent families, etc.); b) reports from early intervention studies underscoring the importance of parents in facilitating their children's development; and c) recent interest by the research community in family influences on child development and the contributions of social support systems to the quality of family childrearing.

Parent education programs can have beneficial effects on mothers and their children. However, studies investigating parent education programs have focussed predominantly on outcome effects on children (Powell, 1986). Such studies indicate that program participation by mothers may lead to increases in the children's IQ, responsiveness,

and school performance (Andrews et al., 1982; Cochran & Henderson, 1985; Dembo, Sweitzer & Lawritzen, 1985; Slaughter, 1983). Studies examining outcome effects on participating mothers indicate that participation in parent education programs may lead to positive changes in maternal behaviors, attitudes, and competencies (Andrews et al., 1982; Dembo et al., 1985; Dickie & Gerber, 1980).

In recent years, studies of parent education programs have adopted a new perspective. In first generation mother-oriented parent education programs, researchers asked whether program participation vs. no participation had an effect. In the second generation of studies, researchers have not only examined program effects, but have also attempted to identify specific program components responsible for such effects (Powell, 1986). These second generation studies focus on the processes of program participation by mothers, and how these processes relate to the effects gained through program participation.

In recent years, studies of father involvement have changed as well. Early studies of paternal involvement focussed on outcomes such as the cognitive and sex-role development of the child rather than father involvement itself (Lamb, 1986). Researchers have now begun to look more closely at the roles of fathers in childrearing. However, little empirical work has been done examining the various factors associated with paternal involvement, or how parent education and support programs geared specifically for fathers may influence this involvement (Dembo et al., 1985; Lamb, 1986).

One of the few studies specifically examining the effects of parent education for fathers on their involvement with their children appears to hold promise for such programs. In this study, the fathers

of school aged children (6-12 years old) participated in an 8-week parent education program. Significant improvement occurred in the fathers' communication skills with their children and in the children's perceptions of father-child relationships (Levant & Doyle, 1983). Although these results are encouraging, some patterns of parenting behaviors and attitudes may be difficult to change by the time the child is 6 years of age. Studies focussing on specific aspects of paternal involvement in the rearing of young children may lead to a better understanding of the modifiability of these aspects of involvement. This information may also aid early childhood and parent educators in developing and implementing programs that will increase the involvement options available to fathers.

The lack of a clear and consistent definition of father involvement has been a major obstacle to research and to the design and evaluation of parent programs (Baruch & Barnett, 1986a). Lamb and his colleagues (Lamb, Pleck, Charnov & Levine, 1987) have recently proposed a taxonomy (I. Interaction; II. Accessibility; III. Responsibility) which may help to overcome this limitation. Category I of the Lamb taxonomy (Interaction) involves the father interacting one-on-one with his children in activities such as playing with them or reading to them. In category II (Accessibility) the father may or may not be directly engaged in interaction, but is still available to his child. In category III (Responsibility) the father assumes responsibility for the welfare and care of his child. This involvement includes such tasks as making childcare and babysitting arrangements, knowing when the child needs to go to the pediatrician or ensuring the child has clean clothes to wear. Lamb suggests that

being responsible doesn't necessarily involve direct interaction with the child; the anxiety, worry, and contingency planning that comprise paternal responsibility often occurs when the father is doing something else.

The effects of father participation in a parent education/play group program on each of these types of involvement was investigated in the present study. Thus, the aim of the study was to assess a program designed to increase the parenting options of fathers who wish to become more involved with their children. The parent education/play group program involved fathers and their preschool aged children participating together in a series of 10 weekly two hour sessions. Within each two hour session, the fathers spent about one hour in structured and non-structured preschool type activities with their children and another hour in group discussions on various aspects of child development and parenting.

The discussion group curriculum for this program applied notions derived from Lamb's attempt to organize and integrate the research literature on paternal involvement through the development of his taxonomy of father involvement. This curriculum was developed and refined over a year and a half during which 3 successive groups of fathers participated in pilot programs for the study. Topics of interest to fathers were identified in the first 12-week pilot cycle (Fall, 1986) based on discussions during the initial group session. These topics and their presentation were refined and elaborated in the next 12-week pilot cycle (Spring, 1987). The effort to gear the curriculum to categories of involvement identified in Lamb's (1986) model led to 11 substantive discussion sessions and an orientation

session. Each substantive session was designed to address one or more types of involvement; the 11-week series was designed to give roughly equivalent attention to all three categories (see Appendix B for a description of each session). For example, the session "Writing a Want-Ad for a Father" addresses such issues as the duties and responsibilities of fatherhood (type I & III) and the time requirements/constraints of fatherhood (type II). Nine of these 11 sessions were presented in their final form during the last 10-week pilot cycle (Fall, 1987).

This lengthy preparatory period was required for two reasons. First, there were few published programs for fathers to draw upon. In addition, topics pertaining explicitly to each category of Lamb's taxonomy had to be developed. It was necessary to address topics that fathers found relevant and to present these in formats interesting enough to encourage regular attendance and participation. As indicated by the pilot work, the latter aim seems to have been attained; attendance in the final pilot session was 74%. A primary aim of the present study then was to examine whether this program would modify all 3 aspects of fathers' involvement.

Program effects were evaluated using measures derived from Lamb's (1986) taxonomy of father involvement. Specific predictions about program effects were hampered because little is known about the relative modifiability of father involvement. Although there does appear to be a moderate, though imperfect relationship among these three types of father involvement (Lamb, Pleck, Charnov & Levine, 1987), the magnitude and stability of these interrelationships has not been confirmed, thus adding another hinderance to predicting outcomes.

We might assume that categories of father involvement differ in the ease with which they can be changed. For example, a father's job demands may severely limit his accessibility to his child. Change in accessibility may require a change in employment, a change that might not be easily achieved even by fathers who wish to be more involved with their children. For change to occur, the strength of each intervention component must be adjusted to practical constraints on the modifiability of each type of involvement. Because accessibility may be largely a function of external restrictions, change may be less likely to occur in this category. Similar constraints are less evident in the remaining two categories of involvement. For example, category III responsibilities might be increased by the father reading newspaper stories about daycare, by discussing discipline strategies with his wife, or by making the effort to schedule a visit to the doctor for his child. Responsibility is marked more by psychological time than by physical time.

Researchers are currently attempting to identify correlates of paternal involvement. There is some indication that paternal involvement is related to a father's perceived sense of competence as a parent (Baruch & Barnett, 1986b; Dickie & Gerber, 1980; Lamb et al., 1985; Russell, 1982b). Perceptions of parental competence might either encourage paternal involvement or might be a consequence of such involvement; the correlational nature of research in this area does not make it possible to make claims for cause or effect. Further, studies reporting this relation used global measures of father involvement (i.e., they did not distinguish categories of involvement identified in Lamb's model), and weak measures of

competence (e.g., questions such as "How competent do you feel you are as a parent?"). In order to extend earlier findings, the relationship between each type of involvement and the fathers' perceived sense of competence in parenting was examined using pretest measures of these variables.

In sum, the present intervention study was designed to address the following research questions:

1. Does participation in a parent education/play group program increase a father's sense of competence in parenting skills?
2. Does participation in a parent education/play group program increase or change the type of involvement a father has with his young child?
3. Is there a positive relationship between a father's sense of competence in parenting skills and the amount of participation in each category of involvement he has with his child?

This intervention study assessed the following hypotheses: 1) program participants will show higher levels of interaction and responsibility than controls; group differences will not appear in accessibility; 2) treatment program fathers' perceived sense of parenting competence will be higher after program participation than that of controls; and 3) prior to program participation, perceptions of parenting competence will be related to interaction and responsibility, but not to accessibility. In addition, this study provided information about the demographic characteristics and motivation of participating fathers. The relation between these

demographic/motivational variables and program outcomes were also examined. Because the sample size was small, these analyses were exploratory in nature.

control) and their parents. All parents were telephone identified through their places of residence in the community surrounding the apartment complex. The study was a "wait list" control group. Subjects who did not wish to participate in the study were not included in the "wait list" control group. In order to control for the "intent" of those fathers who did not wish to participate in the parent education/peer group program.

Preschool aged children and their fathers were identified as target group either by the father's request for the peer group and development (e.g., mental, cognitive and physical) that children this age experience, along with the impact of familial influences on this development (Brousseau, 1987); and 2.) the lack of preparation for effective parenting by men during this important period of their child's development (Kluger & Yekelich, 1983).

Parent education and support programs geared specifically for fathers are new, and little is known about those who participate or their reasons for doing so. The demographic data collected for this study provides information about fathers who might volunteer for such a program (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

Mean age for the fathers in the study was 34.91 years, with a range of 30 to 43 years. Mean age for the children was 34.8 months.

Method

Subjects

Subjects for the study included 30 fathers (15 treatment, 15 control) and their preschool-aged children. All subjects were volunteers identified through flyers placed in various preschools in the communities surrounding the university where the study took place. A "wait list" control group technique was utilized to assign subjects to treatment and control groups in order to control for the "intent" of those fathers who expressed a desire to participate in the parent education/play group program.

Preschool aged children and their fathers were identified as target group subjects for two reasons: a.) the rapid growth and development (social, emotional, cognitive and physical) that children this age experience, along with the impact of familial influences on this development (Minuchin, 1987); and b.) the lack of preparation for effective parenting by men during this important period of their child's development (Klinman & Vukelich, 1985).

Parent education and support programs geared specifically for fathers are new, and little is known about those who participate or their reasons for doing so. The demographic data collected for this study provides information about fathers who might volunteer for such a program (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

Mean age for the fathers in the study was 34.97 years, with a range of 26 to 43 years. Mean age for the children was 34.8 months,

TABLE 1
Characteristics of The Sample

Variable	Treatment		Control		Combined		χ^2	p
	freq	prop	freq	prop	freq	prop		
Sex of Child In Program							.14	.71
boy	9	.60	8	.53	17	.57		
girl	6	.40	7	.47	13	.43		
Total Number of Children							5.00	.08
1	9	.60	5	.33	14	.47		
2	5	.33	8	.53	13	.43		
3	1	.07	2	.13	3	.10		
Birth Order of Child in Program							1.05	.59
1	11	.73	10	.67	21	.70		
2	4	.27	4	.27	8	.27		
3	0	.00	1	.07	1	.03		
Family Income							1.33	.72
<\$15000	1	.07	2	.13	3	.10		
\$15000-\$25000	1	.07	0	.00	1	.03		
\$25000-\$40000	3	.20	3	.20	6	.20		
>\$40000	10	.67	10	.67	20	.67		
Father's Education							5.36	.15
<8th Grade	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00		
9th-12th Grade	0	.00	1	.07	1	.03		
Some College	4	.27	0	.00	4	.13		
College Graduate	3	.20	4	.27	7	.23		
Graduate School	8	.53	10	.67	18	.60		
Mother's Education							1.34	.72
<8th Grade	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00		
9th-12th Grade	1	.07	2	.13	3	.10		
Some College	2	.13	3	.20	5	.17		
College Graduate	4	.27	5	.33	9	.30		
Graduate School	8	.53	5	.33	13	.43		
Employment Status of Mother							.00	1.00
Working - Yes	8	.53	8	.53	16	.53		
Working - No	7	.47	7	.47	14	.47		
Parttime/Fulltime							a	.30
Parttime	2	.25	4	.50	6	.37		
Fulltime	6	.75	4	.50	10	.62		
b								
Father's Age (years)		M=36.07		M=33.87		M=34.97		
range - 26 to 43		SD= 4.88		SD= 4.00		SD= 4.52		
		F(1,28)=1.83, p=.187						
b								
Child's Age (months)		M=34.13		M=35.47		M=34.80		
range - 25 to 44		SD= 6.36		SD= 4.79		SD= 5.57		
		F(1,28)=.42, p=.52						

Note. n=30.

a

Fisher's Exact Test

b

F values from ANOVAs

with a range of 25 to 44 months. There were 17 (57%) boys and 13 (43%) girls participating in the study. Fourteen (47%) of the participating fathers had only one child, 13 (43%) had two, and 3 (10%) had three children. The majority of the fathers (70%) signed up to participate with their first born child. The ethnic make-up of the subjects included 80% white, 7% black, 7% Arabic, 3% Hispanic, and 3% Asian.

The education and income levels of both treatment and control groups were high. There were 20 fathers (67%) who had combined family incomes greater than \$40000, and 6 (20%) with family incomes between \$25000 and \$40000. In terms of education 18 (60%) fathers had advanced degrees or were attending graduate school and 7 (23%) had B.S. degrees. All 30 fathers participating in the study were employed full time outside the home. There were 16 mothers (53%) who were employed outside the home and 14 (47%) who had no outside paid employment. Of the employed mothers, 10 (62%) were employed full time (more than 20 hours per week).

In explaining why they signed up to participate in the program, 15 fathers (50%) indicated they did so to spend some "special" or "quality" time interacting with their child. A total of 5 fathers (17%) indicated they did so to learn more about parenting or fathering, while 8 (27%) indicated they did so for a combination of both reasons. One father (3%) indicated he signed up for the program so that his child could have a chance to interact with other children in a group setting, while one father (3%) failed to respond to this question.

Design

The present study employed a pretest - posttest quasi-experimental design. Pretest and posttest data was gathered from both treatment and control groups. Father-child dyads in the experimental group participated in a 10-week parent education/play group program. Control group father-child dyads participated in a similar 10-week parent education/play group program upon completion of data collection for the 10-week experimental treatment program.

Treatment

Treatment group father-child pairs participated in a parent education/play group program that met for two hours on 10 consecutive Saturday mornings. This 10-week program had two major components; group discussion and father-child play time. Because many men lack a general knowledge of normal child development and parenting skills (Klinman & Vukelich, 1985; Palkovitz, 1984; Smith & Smith, 1981; Tomlinson, 1987) along with the motivational desire or societal options which would encourage them to actively participate in the ways described by Lamb (1986), one hour of each weekly treatment session was spent in group discussions focussing on these various issues. Each discussion session was designed to address one or more of the types of paternal involvement (see Appendix B for a description of the curriculum) and had been developed and refined through extensive pilot work.

A discussion group format for this portion of the treatment was selected due to the tendency of other more didactic parent education programs such as P.E.T., Adlerian, and Behavioral approaches to focus primarily on the child (Dembo et al., 1985) while excluding

opportunities for parents to share their problems and perceptions with one another. The discussion group format allowed the curriculum to be adapted to the fathers' background experiences, concerns, perceptions, etc., thus keeping fatherhood as the primary focus.

During the second hour of the program fathers and their children participated in structured and nonstructured preschool type group activities. Few parent education programs for mothers or fathers include participation with their children (Dembo et al., 1985; Powell, 1986) even though this procedure has been shown to be effective (Andrews et al., 1982). This portion of the program allowed the fathers to explore and discover different ways of interacting with their children, and to develop sensitivity to the needs of their children. Based on information collected during pilot work for this study, fathers view this time with their children as an opportunity to experience first hand some of the developmental patterns discussed in their groups. Klinman (1986) suggests this two-step experiential model for parent education programs holds the most promise for increasing men's involvement in childrearing activities. A relatively high amount of participation in the program was exhibited by the fathers, with an attendance rate of 85%.

Instruments

A combination of self-report and interview data was collected for the present study. The Parenting Sense of Competence Scale (PSOC) was used to measure the fathers' perceived sense of competence in parenting. The PSOC is a 17-item self-report likert type scale (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978) developed as a specific measure of self-esteem in the parenting situation. Two subscales comprise the

PSOC. The first, Skill/Knowledge, assesses the fathers' perceptions of the degree to which they have acquired the skills and understanding to be a good parent. The second, Valuing/ Comfort, assesses the degree to which the fathers value parenthood and are comfortable in that role.

Based on field testing of its final form with 132 subjects (66 mothers, 66 fathers) the PSOC exhibited highly significant levels of reliability over time, with correlations between administrations from .46 to .82 (all at $p < .01$) and 11 of the 18 values above .70 (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978). Item analysis of this data set revealed the PSOC to exhibit high levels of internal consistency with alpha coefficients of .82 for the Skill/Knowledge subscale, .70 for Valuing/ Comfort, and .83 for the total score. High levels of convergent and discriminant validity of the instrument were also exhibited based on correlations of PSOC scores with other theoretically related scales such as the Personal Feelings Scales (Wessman & Ricks, 1966), the General Well-Being Scale (DePuv, 1973), and the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Crandall, 1973). A five point scale is used in scoring responses on the PSOC, with high total scores indicating a higher regard for oneself as a parent. The range of possible total scores was 17 - 85. Pilot work for this study revealed significant increases in PSOC scores for fathers in the treatment group (McBride, 1988).

To measure paternal responsibility, a Child-Care Task Checklist developed by Baruch and Barnett (1983) was used. This checklist lists 11 common child-care tasks such as taking the child to the doctor/dentist, or supervising the child's personal hygiene. Fathers

and mothers completed the checklist together and designated the percentage of time they did each task alone and together, as well as who had primary responsibility for the task (mother, father or both). Responsibility was defined as remembering, planning and scheduling the child-care task. It was assumed that a parent can have responsibility for a task without actually performing it. Scoring for the checklist included a 0 if the mother had primary responsibility for the task, 1 if mother and father together had responsibility for the task, and 2 if the father had primary responsibility for the task. The possible range of scores was 0 - 22, with 0 indicating the father had no responsibility (primary or shared) for the tasks, and 22 indicating the father had primary responsibility for all of the tasks. A Responsibility score for mothers was also drawn from this instrument. Baruch and Barnett (1983) found fathers had little responsibility for the specified tasks, although their completion of them was significantly related to each of the participation variables used in the study as well as their sense of competence in parenting.

To measure levels of paternal accessibility and interaction, an adapted version of the Interaction Time Chart developed by Baruch and Barnett (1983) was used. This chart provided measures of the total amount of time the father was interacting with or accessible (as defined by Lamb) to his child for one workday and one non-workday. Data from this chart was collected through telephone interviews, and was based on the most recent workday and non-workday prior to the interview.

During the interviews the fathers were asked to provide an account of their activities for the most recent workday and non-

workday. Beginning with the time they woke up, the fathers described the nature and context of their activities, and included everything from personal hygiene (shower, shave, etc.), to work activities, to relaxation type activities (watching TV, going for a walk, etc.). The duration of each activity was recorded and then coded as involving either interaction or accessibility when done in proximity or relation to the child. The final Interaction score was the total number of minutes the father interacted with his child on the workday and non-workday combined. Interaction subscale scores for the workday and non-workday were also computed. An Accessibility total score and subscale scores were computed in a similar fashion. By definition, all interaction involved accessibility as well.

Data from the PSOC, the Child-Care Task Checklist, and the Interaction/Accessibility Time Chart were collected for treatment and control groups at pretest (prior to the start of the 10-week treatment program) and at posttest (at the end of the 10-week treatment program, yet before the "wait list" control group started a program). In order to examine the stability of the measures utilized in this study correlations of pretest and posttest scores for treatment and control groups were computed. Analyses revealed that all treatment group pretest scores were significantly correlated with their corresponding posttest scores; $r=.58$ to $.78$ (see Table 2). Accessibility was

Insert Table 2 about here

relatively unstable in the control group ($r=.22$). The remaining control group pretest scores were significantly correlated with their

TABLE 2

Pretest - Posttest Correlations of Dependent Variables

Pretest	Treatment Group ^a			
	PSOC	RESPON- SIBILITY	INTER- ACTION	ACCESS- IBILITY
PSOC	.776 (p=.000)	.164 (p=.280)	-.077 (p=.393)	.001 (p=.499)
RESPONSIBILITY	.463 (p=.041)	.582 (p=.011)	.199 (p=.238)	.192 (p=.246)
INTERACTION	.170 (p=.272)	.181 (p=.260)	.605 (p=.008)	.193 (p=.245)
ACCESSIBILITY	-.236 (p=.198)	.290 (p=.147)	.166 (p=.277)	.649 (p=.004)

Pretest	Control Group ^b			
	PSOC	RESPON- SIBILITY	INTER- ACTION	ACCESS- IBILITY
PSOC	.895 (p=.000)	.172 (p=.270)	.190 (p=.249)	.231 (p=.203)
RESPONSIBILITY	.290 (p=.147)	.917 (p=.000)	-.496 (p=.030)	.149 (p=.298)
INTERACTION	.383 (p=.079)	.016 (p=.478)	.569 (p=.013)	.699 (p=.002)
ACCESSIBILITY	.018 (p=.475)	-.016 (p=.477)	.275 (p=.160)	.219 (p=.216)

Note. PSOC = Parenting Sense of Competence Scale.

^a

n=15

^b

n=15

corresponding posttest scores ($r=.57$ to $.92$). Therefore, the dependent measures used for this study were relatively stable.

Analyses

Three phases of analyses were conducted on the data collected for this study. In Phase 1, preliminary analyses were done to examine whether the use of a "wait-list" control group procedure yielded treatment and control groups that were comparable on demographic and pretest measures. In Phase 2, primary analyses were conducted to examine program effects. In Phase 3, secondary analyses were conducted to explore interrelations among dependent measures, and between these and demographic measures.

In the preliminary analysis, demographic data from both treatment and control groups were used to examine the comparability of the two groups (see Table 1). Results indicated there were no significant group differences, although the difference in family size (Total Number of Children variable) approached significance ($\chi^2(2)=5.00$, $p=.08$).

Means and standard deviations on all pretest data were computed for both treatment and control groups (see Table 3). The mean PSOC

Insert Table 3 about here

pretest score for treatment and control groups combined was 58.0, with a range of 47.0 to 71.0. PSOC pretest means for treatment and control groups individually were 57.4 and 58.6 respectively.

In scoring the Child-Care Task Checklist item #7 (Take to or from regular lessons) was dropped from analysis because 25 (83%) of the

TABLE 3

Pretest Scores: Treatment and Control Groups

Variables	Treatment		Control		MANOVA				ANOVA ^a	
	M	SD	M	SD	Wilkes Crit.	F	df	p	F	p
<u>Full Scale Scores:</u>					.8451	1.15	4,25	.358		
PSOC	57.40	5.75	58.60	6.29					.30	.590
RESPONSI- BILITY	5.87	2.23	4.73	2.54					1.68	.206
INTERAC- TION	237.67	87.91	218.00	94.85					.35	.561
ACCESSI- BILITY	814.33	222.01	867.00	137.97					.61	.442
<u>Interaction & Accessibility Subscales:</u>					.8873	.79	4,25	.540		
INTERACTION										
WORKDAY	63.33	42.50	74.00	69.54					.26	.616
NONWORK	174.33	54.41	144.00	63.59					1.91	.178
ACCESSIBILITY										
WORKDAY	206.00	111.60	226.00	119.93					.22	.640
NONWORK	590.33	191.25	641.60	123.36					.74	.396
<u>PSOC Subscales:</u>					.9790	.29	2,27	.751		
SKILL/ KNOWLEDGE	24.87	3.96	25.07	3.79					.02	.889
VALUE/ COMFORT	32.53	3.87	33.53	3.23					.59	.449

Note. PSOC = Parenting Sense of Competence Scale.

n=30.

Interaction & Accessibility scores in minutes.

^a

df = 1,28

families indicated that it was not applicable to their child. This made the possible range of Responsibility scores 0 - 20. The mean pretest Responsibility score for treatment and control groups combined was 5.3, with a range of 1 - 11. The combined mean of pretest Interaction scores was 227.83 minutes, with a range of 105 - 535. The combined mean of pretest Accessibility scores was 840.67 minutes, with a range of 390 - 1200.

To examine group differences in pretest scores, a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) function was utilized with PSOC, Interaction, Accessibility, and Responsibility scores as the dependent variables and group membership as a factor (see Table 3). The multivariate F ($F(4,25)=1.15, p=.358$) revealed no significant differences between treatment and control groups, thus confirming their comparability on these measures. Subscale pretest scores of the PSOC, Interaction, and Accessibility measures were also examined using MANOVA functions (see Table 3). Analyses revealed no significant pretest differences between treatment and control groups, further demonstrating their initial comparability. The use of a "wait-list" control group technique yielded roughly equivalent groups. Therefore, program effects were examined using posttest data only.

Results

Program Effects

It was hypothesized that participation in the parent education/ play group program would lead to significant program effects on treatment group fathers' perceived sense of competence in parenting skills as well as their levels of interaction and responsibility. The use of a "wait-list" control group technique to assign subjects to treatment and control conditions produced groups that were roughly comparable on demographic variables and on measures used to assess program effects. In the MANOVA analyses used to investigate program effects, posttest PSOC, Interaction, Accessibility and Responsibility scores were entered as dependent variables and group membership was entered as a factor (see Table 4). The

Insert Table 4 about here

multivariate F ($F(4,25)=3.46, p=.022$) indicated a significant difference between treatment and control group posttest scores. Examination of the univariate F's revealed significant differences in PSOC ($F(1,28)=7.75, p=.010$), and Responsibility ($F(1,28)=7.09, p=.013$) posttest scores, with treatment group fathers scoring higher on both measures. Differences on Interaction and Accessibility posttest scores were not significant.

To determine what part of the PSOC scale was contributing to the significant program effects, a MANOVA function was applied to the data using the Skill/Knowledge and Valuing/Comfort subscale posttest scores as dependent variables and group membership as a factor (see Table 4).

TABLE 4

Posttest Scores: Treatment and Control Groups

Variables	Treatment		Control		MANOVA				ANOVA ^a	
	M	SD	M	SD	Wilkes's Crit.	F	df	p	F	p
<u>Full Scale Scores:</u>					.6439	3.46	4,25	.022		
PSOC	61.33	3.09	57.27	4.74					7.75	.010
RESPONSI- BILITY	6.40	1.64	4.67	1.91					7.09	.013
INTERAC- TION	254.00	91.15	209.00	72.26					2.25	.145
ACCESSI- BILITY	926.00	241.23	837.67	208.22					1.15	.292
<u>Interaction & Accessibility Subscales:</u>					.7969	1.59	4,25	.207		
INTERACTION										
WORKDAY	76.00	57.95	72.00	40.17					.05	.828
NONWORK	178.00	52.23	137.00	67.53					3.46	.073
ACCESSIBILITY										
WORKDAY	276.00	147.28	235.00	103.56					.78	.385
NONWORK	650.00	149.86	596.00	169.66					.85	.363
<u>PSOC Subscales:</u>					.7011	5.76	2,27	.008		
SKILL/ KNOWLEDGE	26.73	2.46	25.53	4.10					.94	.340
VALUE/ COMFORT	34.67	2.55	31.73	2.49					10.14	.004

Note. PSOC = Parenting Sense of Competence Scale.

n=30.

Interaction & Accessibility scores in minutes.

^a

df = 1,28

The multivariate F ($F(2,27)=5.76, p=.008$) revealed a significant program effect for the subscales. The univariate F's revealed a significant difference in treatment and control group posttest scores on the Valuing/Comfort subscale ($F(1,28)=10.14, p=.004$), with treatment group fathers scoring higher than controls. No significant differences on the Skill/Knowledge subscale was found. Thus, at the end of the 10-week program, treatment group fathers saw themselves as more comfortable with their parental role than control group fathers; they did not see themselves as more knowledgeable or skillfull.

Similar analyses on the posttest scores of the Interaction and Accessibility subscales were computed using MANOVA functions (see Table 4). No significant differences were found, although the difference in Interaction scores for non-workdays approached significance ($F(1,28)=3.46, p=.07$), with treatment group fathers scoring higher. These findings suggest there were significant program effects on treatment group fathers' perceived sense of competence in parenting skills (Research Question #1) and responsibility, while no program effects were found on interaction and accessibility (Research Question #2).

Treatment group change scores were computed for the dependent measures to determine if those fathers who exhibited change on the measures differed in some fashion from those who exhibited no change. Change scores were computed by subtracting pretest scores from posttest scores (see Table 5). Mean change scores for the dependent

Insert Table 5 about here

TABLE 5

Correlations of Demographic Variables and Treatment Group Change Scores

	Demographic Variables								
	Mean (SD)	FATHER AGE	CHILD AGE	NUMBER CHILDREN	BIRTH ORDER	INCOME	FATHER EDUCAT.	MOTHER EDUCAT.	MAT. EMP.
PSOC	3.93 (3.88)	-.26	.23	.01	-.03	-.39	.25	.22	-.02
RESPON- SIBILITY	.53 (1.85)	.12	.03	.32	.41	.10	-.14	-.01	.02
INTERAC- TION	16.33 (79.59)	.55 +	.08	-.08	-.25	.04	.40	.06	.08
ACCESSI- BILITY	111.67 (184.73)	.06	.03	-.37	-.67 ++	.20	.05	.18	.07

Note. PSOC = Parenting Sense of Competence Scale.

MAT EMP = Maternal Employment.

n=15.

+ P<.05

++ p<.01

variables were: PSOC: 3.93; Responsibility: .53; Interaction: 16.33; and Accessibility: 111.67. Correlations were computed to examine possible relationships between these change scores and treatment group demographic variables. Analyses revealed only two significant correlations: older fathers became more interactive ($r=.55$) while fathers of first-born children became more accessible ($r=.67$). Change scores were also examined using MANOVA functions to explore differences related to sex of child or maternal employment status (see Table 6).

Insert Table 6 about here

Using PSOC, Interaction, Accessibility and Responsibility change scores as dependent variables, the multivariate F's revealed no significant differences for sex of the child ($F(4,10)=.88$, $p=.508$) or maternal employment status ($F(4,10)=.04$, $p=.997$).

Exploratory Analyses

Research Question #3 asked if there was a positive relationship between a father's sense of competence in parenting skills and the amount of participation in each of the three aspects of involvement. To answer this question intercorrelations were computed on the combined treatment and control group PSOC, Interaction, Accessibility, and Responsibility pretest scores (see Table 7). Analyses revealed a significant positive correlation between PSOC and Responsibility

Insert Table 7 about here

TABLE 6

Treatment Group Change Scores by Sex of Child & Maternal Employment Status

Variables	Male		Female		MANOVA				ANOVA ^a	
	M	SD	M	SD	Wilkes Crit.	F	df	p	F	p
					.7391	.88	4,10	.508		
PSOC	4.67	3.94	2.83	3.87					.79	.390
RESPONSI- BILITY	1.00	1.41	-.17	2.32					1.49	.244
INTERAC- TION	42.22	64.86	-22.50	89.37					2.66	.127
ACCESSI- BILITY	121.11	172.42	97.50	241.26					.05	.828

Variables	Employed		Nonemployed		MANOVA				ANOVA	
	M	SD	M	SD	Wilke's Crit.	F	df	p	F	p
					.9850	.04	4,10	.997		
PSOC	4.00	3.89	3.86	4.18					.004	.946
RESPONSI- BILITY	.50	1.93	.57	1.90					.005	.944
INTERAC- TION	10.00	46.52	23.57	110.18					.102	.755
ACCESSI- BILITY	98.75	229.25	126.43	163.37					.070	.795

Note. PSOC = Parenting Sense of Competence Scale.
n=15.

Interaction & Accessibility scores in minutes.

^a

df = 1,13

TABLE 7

Pretest Intercorrelations: Dependent Measures

	PSOC	RESPON- SIBILITY	INTER- ACTION
PSOC	---	---	---
RESPONSIBILITY	.368 (p=.023)	---	---
INTERACTION	.231 (p=.109)	.135 (p=.235)	---
ACCESSIBILITY	-.103 (p=.293)	-.021 (p=.456)	.243 (p=.098)

Note. PSOC = Parenting Sense of Competence Scale.
n=30.

pretest scores ($r=.37$, $p<.05$). These analyses failed to reveal other significant correlations among the variables, although the relationship between Interaction and Accessibility pretest scores approached significance ($r=.24$, $p=.098$).

When examining subscale intercorrelations (see Table 8), analyses

Insert Table 8 about here

revealed a significant positive correlation between workday Interaction and Accessibility subscales ($r=.76$, $p<.001$), but not between non-workday Interaction and Accessibility ($r=-.01$). Fisher's Z' Transformation scores converted to standardized z scores indicated the differences between these two correlations to be significant ($p<.001$). Correlations between workday Interaction and Total Accessibility ($r=.42$, $p<.01$) and between workday Accessibility and Total Interaction ($r=.49$, $p<.01$) were also significant. Further, neither the correlation between workday and non-workday Interaction, nor between workday and non-workday Accessibility were significant (r 's = $.17$ and $.16$ respectively). Thus, paternal involvement on workdays was unrelated to paternal involvement on non-workdays. Further, fathers' interaction and accessibility were related on workdays, but not on non-workdays.

The relationship between the fathers' background characteristics and their sense of competence in parenting skills and amounts of paternal involvement were explored by correlating the combined pretest scores and demographic variables. Several significant correlations were found (see Table 9). Older fathers interacted less with their

TABLE 8

Pretest Intercorrelations: Dependent Measure Subscales

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 PSOC	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
2 SKILL/ KNOWLEDGE	.825 +++	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
3 VALUE/ COMFORT	.794 +++	.312 +	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
4 RESPONSIBILITY	.368 +	.184	.421 ++	---	---	---	---	---	---
5 INTERACTION	.231	.099	.283	.135	---	---	---	---	---
6 WORKDAY	.310 +	.176	.333 +	.253	.747 +++	---	---	---	---
7 NON-WORKDAY	.054	-.017	.109	-.036	.785 +++	.174	---	---	---
8 ACCESSIBILITY	-.103	-.259	.105	-.021	.243	.418 ++	-.030	---	---
9 WORKDAY	.198	.082	.232	.245	.494 ++	.764 +++	.020	.665 +++	---
10 NON-WORKDAY	-.186	-.295	.004	-.144	-.005	.004	-.011	.814 +++	.158

Note. PSOC = Parenting Sense of Competence Scale.

n=30.

+ P<.05

++ P<.01

+++ P<.001

Insert Table 9 about here

children on workdays and the fathers of older children had less interaction with them, although they were more accessible to them. Fathers with more than one child interacted less with the child participating in the program; fathers participating with second born children had less interaction with them; and fathers with higher family incomes had less interaction and accessibility with their children on workdays.

MANOVA functions were used to explore differences in pretest measures associated with sex of child and maternal employment status. When using the PSOC, Interaction, Accessibility and Responsibility measures as dependent variables and sex of the child as a factor (see Table 10), the multivariate F failed to reveal any significant

Insert Table 10 & 11 about here

differences ($F(4,25)=1.26$, $p=.313$), although the univariate F for Interaction approached significance ($F(1,28)=3.82$, $p=.061$). However, the multivariate F for Interaction and Accessibility subscale scores revealed a significant difference ($F(4,25)=2.69$, $p=.05$). Examination of the univariate F for the workday Interaction subscale ($F(1,28)=6.13$, $p=.02$) indicated that on workdays fathers were more interactive with their daughters. No significant differences in PSOC, Interaction, Accessibility, and Responsibility scores or subscales

TABLE 9

Correlations of Demographic and Pretest Dependent Variables

	AGE FATHER	AGE CHILD	TOTAL CHILDREN	BIRTH ORDER	INCOME	FATHER EDUC.	MOTHER EDUC.
PSOC	-.13	-.01	-.20	.04	-.30	.06	-.18
SKILL/KNOWLEDGE	-.13	-.03	-.16	.06	-.35 +	.08	.10
VALUE/COMFORT	-.08	.01	-.18	.01	-.13	.02	-.46 +
RESPONSIBILITY	-.14	.12	-.12	-.10	-.20	.07	-.02
INTERACTION	-.26	-.36 +	-.47 ++	-.39 +	-.12	.06	.39 +
WORKDAY	-.32 +	.09	-.24	-.26	-.42 ++	.07	.13
NON-WORKDAY	-.09	-.62 +++	-.47 ++	-.33 +	.21	.01	.46 ++
ACCESSIBILITY	-.09	.29 +	.27	.24	-.18	-.06	-.27
WORKDAY	-.26	.36 +	-.08	-.07	-.50 ++	.13	-.02
NON-WORKDAY	.01	.07	.43 ++	.36 +	.12	-.20	-.35 +

Note. PSOC = Parenting Sense of Competence Scale.

n=30.

+ p<.05

++ p<.01

+++ p<.001

TABLE 10

Pretest Scores For Treatment & Control Groups by Sex of Child

Variables	Male		Female		MANOVA				ANOVA ^a	
	M	SD	M	SD	Wilkes Crit.	F	df	p	F	p
<u>Full Scale Scores:</u>					.8325	1.26	4,25	.313		
PSOC	58.18	6.64	57.77	5.17					.03	.856
RESPONSI- BILITY	4.94	2.38	5.77	2.49					.86	.363
INTERAC- TION	200.88	76.82	263.08	97.52					3.82	.061
ACCESSI- BILITY	829.71	207.60	855.00	153.58					.14	.715
<u>Interaction & Accessibility Subscales:</u>					.6989	2.69	4,25	.054		
INTERACTION										
WORKDAY	47.94	28.83	95.77	72.85					6.13	.020
NONWORK	152.94	66.64	167.31	54.38					.40	.532
ACCESSIBILITY										
WORKDAY	204.71	91.54	230.77	141.32					.37	.545
NONWORK	609.12	199.34	624.23	94.38					.06	.803

Note. PSOC = Parenting Sense of Competence Scale.

n=30.

Interaction & Accessibility scores are in minutes.

^a

df = 1,28

TABLE 11

Pretest Scores for Treatment & Control Groups by Maternal Employment

Variables	a		b		MANOVA				c	
	Employed M	SD	Non-employed M	SD	Wilkes Crit.	F	df	p	ANOVA F	p
					.7846	1.72	4,25	.178		
PSOC	57.44	5.12	58.64	6.92					.29	.589
RESPONSI- BILITY	5.81	2.64	4.71	2.09					1.56	.222
INTERAC- TION	250.94	94.77	201.43	80.39					2.34	.137
ACCESSI- BILITY	887.19	149.42	787.50	209.07					2.30	.141

Note. PSOC = Parenting Sense of Competence Scale.
Interaction & Accessibility scores in minutes.

a
n=16

b
n=14

c
df = 1,28

were found for maternal employment status (see Table 11).

The results indicated that the program was successful in increasing the number of fathers who participated in a parent-child program. The program was successful in increasing fathers' sense of competence in parenting skills. Examination of the two subscales revealed that the Self-Efficacy/Confidence subscale was the major contributor to this positive increase in fathers' perceived parental competence. This subscale provides an indication of how the fathers feel about their parental roles in terms of their instructions, their feelings of accomplishment, perceived responsibility, and their personal satisfaction. The results indicated that the program was successful in increasing fathers' sense of competence in parenting skills. Examination of the two subscales revealed that the Self-Efficacy/Confidence subscale was the major contributor to this positive increase in fathers' perceived parental competence. This subscale provides an indication of how the fathers feel about their parental roles in terms of their instructions, their feelings of accomplishment, perceived responsibility, and their personal satisfaction. The results indicated that the program was successful in increasing fathers' sense of competence in parenting skills. Examination of the two subscales revealed that the Self-Efficacy/Confidence subscale was the major contributor to this positive increase in fathers' perceived parental competence. This subscale provides an indication of how the fathers feel about their parental roles in terms of their instructions, their feelings of accomplishment, perceived responsibility, and their personal satisfaction.

The results indicated that the program was successful in increasing the number of fathers who participated in a parent-child program. The program was successful in increasing fathers' sense of competence in parenting skills. Examination of the two subscales revealed that the Self-Efficacy/Confidence subscale was the major contributor to this positive increase in fathers' perceived parental competence. This subscale provides an indication of how the fathers feel about their parental roles in terms of their instructions, their feelings of accomplishment, perceived responsibility, and their personal satisfaction. The results indicated that the program was successful in increasing fathers' sense of competence in parenting skills. Examination of the two subscales revealed that the Self-Efficacy/Confidence subscale was the major contributor to this positive increase in fathers' perceived parental competence. This subscale provides an indication of how the fathers feel about their parental roles in terms of their instructions, their feelings of accomplishment, perceived responsibility, and their personal satisfaction. The results indicated that the program was successful in increasing fathers' sense of competence in parenting skills. Examination of the two subscales revealed that the Self-Efficacy/Confidence subscale was the major contributor to this positive increase in fathers' perceived parental competence. This subscale provides an indication of how the fathers feel about their parental roles in terms of their instructions, their feelings of accomplishment, perceived responsibility, and their personal satisfaction.

Conclusions/Discussion

Data collected in the present study were utilized to determine whether or not participation in a parent education/play group program increases a father's sense of competence in parenting skills or the types of involvement he has with his young children, and to examine whether a positive relationship exists between a father's sense of competence in parenting skills and the amount of participation he has in each of the three categories of involvement. This data set also provided information about the fathers who wished to participate in such a parent education/play group program, as well as an indication of the modifiability of their involvement in childrearing. These findings have implications for future research on paternal involvement and for the future development of programs aimed at increasing parenting options for fathers.

As predicted in hypothesis #1, the parent education/ play group program was successful in increasing fathers' sense of competence in parenting skills. Examination of the two subscales revealed that the Valuing/Comfort subscale was the major contributor to this positive increase in fathers' perceived parental competence. This subscale provides an indication of how the fathers feel about their parental roles in terms of their frustrations, their feelings of accomplishment, perceived preparation for parenting, and their personal satisfaction from their roles as fathers. An example of a Valuing/Comfort subscale statement would be, "Even though being a parent could be rewarding, I am frustrated now while my child is young."

This effect coincides with the nature of the discussion group

portion of the treatment program. Although these discussion sessions provided the fathers with information aimed at increasing their knowledge of child development and parenting, the main goal was to address personal issues related to each of the three types of involvement. Thus, these discussion sessions attempted to sensitize the men to their feelings and desires about involvement in childrearing. Taking these discussions into account, along with the support provided by the peer group and indirectly by the sponsoring institution, it is not surprising to find that the significant increases in fathers' sense of competence appeared on the Valuing/Comfort subscale. It is also possible that having the chance to interact/play with their children in a supportive setting might have contributed to these increases in the Valuing/Comfort subscale scores.

The particular parent education/play group program implemented in this study reflected the recent shift in the nature of parent education programs. The perception of parent education as an expert telling a group of parents about the ages and stages of child development is neither a complete nor accurate portrayal of many of today's programs (Powell, 1986). In the past a "medical" model of program delivery dominated the field of parent education. In this model a family has a perceived problem/ deficit; they enlist the aid of an "expert" parent educator, who then tells them how to solve the problem. This approach is being replaced by a "reciprocal" model of program delivery. In this model family life and parent educators work together with family members to lend mutual support, and to identify resources and techniques capable of helping family relationships

become stronger. Weissbourd (1983) suggests there has been a major movement toward the development of family support programs since the early 1980's. Components of this "reciprocal" model of program delivery were implemented in the discussion group portion of the treatment program. Support came from peers as well as from the group leader. This support may have helped the fathers become more comfortable with their parental role, and come to see its importance.

In examining changes in the amount of participation in each of the three categories of paternal involvement (Research Question #2), analyses revealed a significant program effect on Responsibility, yet failed to find any significant program effects on Interaction and Accessibility. These findings lend partial support to hypothesis #2. No significant changes were expected on the Accessibility measure due to the external restrictions on this type of involvement. The findings support this hypothesis. It was also hypothesized that significant changes would be found on the Responsibility measures. This hypothesis was also supported. However, no effects were evident on the Interaction measure, even though one was expected.

The failure to find significant program effects on the interaction measure could be due in part to the influence of external restrictions such as work roles, social obligations, etc., much in the same way that accessibility is influenced by external constraints. Program effects on non-workday interaction approached significance ($p=.07$) when separated from workday levels. This would suggest that when external constraints such as work demands are removed, the treatment program may have a better chance of increasing levels of interaction.

Correlations computed on pretest data (see Table 7) support the notion of a relation between interaction and accessibility. Although this relationship did not reach significance ($r=.24$, $p=.098$), it supports Lamb et al's. (1987) contention that these two types of involvement are interrelated. Yet, examination of the subscale intercorrelations (see Table 8) indicates that this contention needs to be qualified.

These analyses revealed a strong relationship between interaction and accessibility on workdays ($r=.75$). But on non-workdays, almost no relationship existed ($r=-.01$). Further, the relationship between workday and non-workday interaction, and between workday and non-workday accessibility was low (r 's = $.17$ and $.16$ respectively). This suggests the amount of interaction fathers have with their children on workdays may be unrelated to the amounts of interaction they have on non-workdays. The same is true for the amounts of accessibility on workdays and non-workdays. At the same time, the amounts of interaction and accessibility fathers have with their children on workdays is highly related, while on non-workdays the amounts of interaction and accessibility they have with their children is unrelated. Once the external constraints of work roles are removed, factors other than available hours are influencing how much interaction fathers have with their children.

It was hypothesized that the fathers' perceptions of parenting competence would be related to interaction and responsibility, but not to accessibility. To explore this relationship PSOC pretest scores were correlated with Interaction, Accessibility, and Responsibility scores (see Table 8). These results are again in

partial agreement with the hypothesized outcomes. Results indicated a significant positive correlation between the PSOC scores and Responsibility scores, although the hypothesized relation between PSOC scores and Interaction did not appear. As expected, the correlation between PSOC and Accessibility pretest scores was also not significant. These findings are in partial support of previous research suggesting that paternal involvement is related to a father's perceived sense of competence in parenting (Baruch & Barnett, 1986b; Dickie & Gerber, 1980; Russell, 1982b). The external constraints on interaction and accessibility may account for the lack of a significant relationship between these types of involvement and fathers' perceived sense of competence in parenting skills. No matter how competent a father feels as a parent, he may still have low levels of interaction and accessibility.

However, subscale intercorrelations suggest that some aspects of perceived competence are related to interaction under some circumstances. The degree to which fathers feel comfortable in their parental roles rather than their levels of skill and knowledge is related to the extent of interaction on weekdays. Thus, those fathers who place more value on and are more comfortable in their paternal roles may overcome the external constraints of work roles. These fathers also assume more responsibility for their children.

Parent education and support programs designed specifically for fathers are new, with little known about those who participate or their reasons for doing so. The data collected for this study provides information about what kinds of fathers sign up to participate in such a program, and gives some insight into the nature

of their involvement in childrearing activities. A profile of these fathers based on the demographic data indicate that these men are somewhat older fathers (mid-30's) from middle class backgrounds; they are well educated, and participate primarily with their first born child. This profile is similar to that of fathers who participated in the three pilot cycle programs conducted prior to this study (McBride, 1988).

The amounts of interaction, accessibility and responsibility reported by these fathers were similar to those found in other studies. Previous studies suggest levels of interaction ranging from 15 minutes to 2 1/2 hours per day (Lamb et al., 1987). Fathers in this study reported spending an average of 1.57 hours per day interacting with their children in a "synthetic" (Pleck, 1985) week (5 times workday interaction plus 2 times non-workday, divided by 7). This amount falls within the range suggested by Lamb and his colleagues. The tendency for the amounts of interactions in the present study to be somewhat on the high end of this range is surprising in that a forced recall technique was used in the telephone interviews rather than asking the fathers to estimate the amount of their interaction. Lamb et al. (1987), Pleck (1985) and others have suggested that measures based on this type of data are usually lower. The higher amounts could be due to the nature of the sample.

One finding from the data on Interaction contradicts previous research. Previous research suggests that fathers interact more with sons than with daughters (Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984; Lamb, 1987; Radin, 1981; Radin & Sagi, 1982; Russell & Russell, 1987). Fathers in this study reported an average of 263 minutes interacting with girls

and 200.88 minutes with boys. This difference favoring girls approached significance when workdays and non-workdays were combined and became significant when broken down for workdays, thus suggesting that under some circumstances these fathers may spend more time interacting with their daughters than with their sons. An interesting question then becomes, "What makes this sample of fathers differ in their interaction patterns with sons and daughters from those in other studies?" Could the present sample be more "middle-class" than the middle class families from other studies? Perhaps the fact that these fathers signed up to participate in a parent education/play group program means that they are different from fathers in other studies.

The amounts of Accessibility that fathers in the present study reported again fall within the range of those found in other studies. Lamb et al. (1987) report this range to be between 1.75 and 4 hours a day. The present group of fathers reported spending an average of 7 hours per day in Accessibility types of involvement. When broken down by day of week the mean Accessibility score was 3.6 hours for workdays and 10.26 hours for non-workdays. A mean accessibility time for a "synthetic" week (Pleck, 1985) was 5.5 hours per day, a figure that falls outside the range suggested by Lamb et al. The 10.26 hours of accessibility on non-workdays contributes to this inflated estimate. The distinction between workdays and non-workdays has not been made in past analyses, yet in a recent study (Grossman, Pollack & Golding, 1988) the amount of time fathers spent playing with and caring for their children jumped from a mean of 4.11 hours on an average weekday to a mean of 9.46 hours on an average weekend day. Separate analyses were than conducted by Grossman and her colleagues

to determine predictors of the quantity of father involvement for weekdays and weekends.

This large difference between workday and non-workday Accessibility and Interaction scores, combined with the strikingly different patterns of correlations for workday and non-workday scores may be a strong indication of the external constraints of the paternal work roles on father involvement. The lack of a correlation between workday and non-workday Interaction levels and between workday and non-workday accessibility levels may be another indication of the strength of these external constraints. The distinction between workday and non-workday father involvement is important in order to develop a more accurate understanding of how men become involved with their children.

The relatively low levels of Responsibility reported by fathers in the present study is consistent with previous studies of paternal involvement. Mothers in the present study assumed almost 3 times the amount of responsibility that fathers did. Although research examining this type of father involvement is sketchy due to the difficulty in quantifying the time involved, the findings of these few studies have been consistent. Fathers fail to assume responsibility for childrearing activities (Baruch & Barnett, 1986; Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984; Gilbert et al., 1982; Radin & Sagi, 1982; Russell, 1982a; Russell & Russell, 1987). Similar results are evident when comparing the findings from the Baruch and Barnett (1983) study of 160 fathers with the present results (both used the same instrument to measure Responsibility). In the Baruch and Barnett study 71% of the fathers had primary responsibility for no child-care tasks, 22% had

primary responsibility for 1, and 7% had primary responsibility for 2 or 3 tasks. In our pretest data, 67% of the fathers had primary responsibility for no child-care tasks, 27% had primary responsibility for 1, and 7% had responsibility for 2 or 3. These two studies were consistent in their results on the same instrument, and support previous research indicating fathers demonstrate little of this type of involvement.

Pretest scores on all dependent measures were examined for the effect of mothers' employment status (see Table 11). The failure to find significant differences is not surprising in light of the controversy over the impact of maternal employment on father involvement. Previous research has suggested that maternal employment is related to father involvement (Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Baruch & Barnett, 1986; McKenry et al., 1986; Radin & Sagi, 1982). Yet, Lamb (1986) suggests that fathers do not spend more time being involved with their children when mothers are employed, but rather the proportion of their involvement goes up because of the mothers doing less. The absolute levels of their involvement appear not to be going up; only their proportional levels. Although not significant, trends were evident in this data suggesting the fathers were increasing their levels of participation in all 3 types of involvement in response to maternal employment status. With a larger sample, these differences might be significant. Thus, the effect of maternal employment status on father involvement is unclear based on this data.

The relationships between treatment group change scores and the demographic variables were examined to determine if those fathers who exhibited change on the measures differed in some fashion from those

who exhibited no change. Analyses revealed that older fathers and fathers of first born children show the most striking program effects. Such findings could reflect the openness to change in parenting patterns of these men in contrast to other fathers. Fathers of first born children are newcomers to their parental role, and have no prior experience to guide their parenting behaviors. Fathers, much like mothers, do not have a great deal of knowledge about normal child development and parenting when first starting out as parents (Klinman & Vukelich, 1985; Smith & Smith, 1981). They also tend to recognize a need for more information. Fathers participating with first born children may come into a parent education/play group program in a more receptive frame of mind for change. This recognition of the need for more information on child development and parenting by first time fathers may also be reflected in the high proportion of participants in the present study/program who enrolled with a first born child.

The fact that older fathers exhibited the most striking change in interaction types of involvement may reflect the nature of delayed parenting. Fathers in the present study were somewhat older (mean age of 36 years) than average. These men, for one reason or another, have put off becoming parents until the timing was appropriate for their unique family situations. Once the decision to start a family has been made, they may adopt the fatherhood role more fully. This conscious decision to become parents at a later age may suggest these fathers are more "committed" or "ready" for fatherhood, and are thus more open to becoming more involved in childrearing.

Implications

Implications for future program development can be drawn from

this study. The roles of fathers are in flux and have been changing in recent years (Lamb, 1986; Pleck, 1984). Historically, men have failed to take an active role in childrearing activities (Lamb et al., 1985), yet it appears this pattern is beginning to vary. Societal standards and expectations which in the past discouraged paternal participation in childrearing are slowly changing, yet many new fathers find themselves unprepared to assume an active parental role. Dickie (1987) suggests these men are coming into 1980's role expectations with a 1950's style of preparation (or lack thereof).

The creation of parent education/play group programs such as the one assessed in this study is one means by which family life and parent educators can help fathers become more comfortable with their paternal role, and better prepare them to meet the demands of new role expectations. The results of this study have shown this program to be effective in increasing fathers' perceptions of parental competence and the amount of responsibility they assume in childrearing. Lamb (1986) suggests that "responsibility" is the most important type of involvement (when viewed in the context of equal opportunity for mothers and fathers), yet research indicates that fathers typically assume little or no responsibility. Research also indicates there is a strong relationship between parental competence and paternal involvement. Through its significant program effects on these two variables, this program may be an effective way of helping men meet new role expectations.

When combined with the findings of previous studies, the results of this investigation are encouraging for the creation of more parent education and support programs for fathers. The program utilized in

the present study addressed 3 of the 4 factors in Lamb's (1986) hierarchy of factors which influence father involvement (1. Motivation; 2. Skills and Self-Confidence; 3. Support; 4. Institutional Practices).

The first factor (Motivation) was indirectly addressed by this program in that the fathers were already motivated when they signed up to participate. In the second factor (Skills and Self-Confidence), Lamb suggests the best way to get men more involved is to get them to enjoy being with their children and to build self-confidence; confidence is most important while skills can come later. The significant program effects on the Value/Comfort subscale of the parenting competence measure suggests this was happening. The men became more comfortable with their roles as fathers. The third factor (Support) was addressed by this program in that the fathers expressed how pleased and supportive their wives were of their participation in the program. Lamb suggests that support from mothers is especially important in encouraging father involvement. The final factor (Institutional Practices) was addressed through the creation of the program itself. Programs such as this one are few and far between, yet they are one form of institutional practice which can help encourage more father involvement.

As family life and parent educators use the results from the present and similar studies in calling for the creation of more such programs, they need to keep in mind the movement toward a "reciprocal" model of program delivery that has been emerging in recent years, along with the implications this trend has for programs for fathers. Berman and Pedersen (1987) suggest that fathers need special support

in their parenting role and that, under conditions of low support, fathers' parenting competence decreases more rapidly than mothers'. Dickie (1987) further contends that these programs should foster fathers' feelings of identity in parenting. In examining studies of intervention-support programs, she suggests there is limited evidence that such programs improve parenting skills; rather they tend to help parents clarify how they feel about their parental role. The results from this study further support these contentions. They also support the idea that such programs can be effective in increasing fathers' willingness to assume greater responsibility for the well-being of their children. If successful, these programs might be instrumental in increasing the parenting options available to fathers.

The profile of fathers who signed up to participate in the present program/study (older, middle-class, well educated fathers of first born children) presents interesting questions for future program development. Did the recruitment procedures utilized for the present program/study fail to reach other types of fathers such as low income, less well educated, and younger fathers? If the advertisements describing the program did reach men from these other groups, were there reasons such as location, costs, etc. that discouraged them from participating? If these groups of fathers did sign-up for the program, would the effects of participation be the same as it was for the fathers in the present sample? These questions need to be addressed as family life and parent educators develop and implement programs aimed at increasing parenting options for a wide range of fathers.

The results of this study also hold implications for future research in this area. Although the study revealed significant program effects on the PSOC and Responsibility measures, effects on the Interaction and Accessibility measures did not appear. These two categories of involvement are important factors in the father-child relationship, although they may be controlled more by external constraints than by factors related to the fathers themselves. In order to develop a better understanding of the modifiability of father involvement more research is needed explore what these constraints may be, how they vary on different days of the week, and how they interact with the fathers' motivations and personalities, social expectations regarding paternal involvement, and social barriers to paternal involvement. Longitudinal studies of programs such as this one are also needed to explore the long term modifiability of paternal involvement. The relative short-term nature of this investigation may have limited its ability to reveal significant effects of program participation.

As the constraints on father involvement are explored in future studies, differences in paternal parenting patterns for workdays and non-workdays should be examined. Data from the present study suggest that interaction and accessibility types of involvement are significantly related for workdays, but not for non-workdays. Parenting patterns may be so strongly controlled on workdays by external forces that other factors such as personality traits and motivation which may influence their non-workday patterns are negated for these workdays. It appears that families have one pattern of paternal involvement for workdays (determined and influenced by one

set of factors) and another pattern for non-workdays (determined and influenced by a different set of factors). The antecedents of these workday and non-workday patterns should be explored and contrasted in future studies.

Although the results from this study indicated that the program had significant effects on the fathers, casual observations suggest that program participation had an impact on the children and spouses, and on the fathers' style of interaction with their children. Further research examining the impact of these types of programs should address such questions as: How does the mother or child's perceptions of the father's role change after they have participated in the program? Is there a difference in the quality of father-child interactions exhibited after participating in such a program? Is there a correlation between the amount of support a father receives from his spouse and the amount of involvement he has in childrearing (before and after program participation)? What demographic and social variables are associated with a father's processes of participation in the group discussions, and which of these processes are related to change?

The distinction among the three types of paternal involvement enabled this researcher to provide a clearer picture of what is meant by father involvement. Researchers should keep this taxonomy in mind as they examine father involvement in future studies. The lack of a clear and consistent definition of father involvement has been a major limitation to research in this field. There are many different aspects of father involvement, each with its own antecedents and consequences. The distinctions provide a more precise understanding

of what father involvement entails. This taxonomy can also guide researchers as they attempt to develop instruments that provide a more accurate measure of the differing types of involvement. Attempts at elaborating this taxonomy should also be made to further refine the distinctions between the different types of involvement (e.g., a distinction between being psychologically accessible to a child as opposed to being just physically accessible).

The effects of increased father involvement should also be examined as researchers and practitioners combine their efforts to create programs aimed at increasing parenting options for fathers, and which in the long run will increase involvement in childrearing by those men who desire to be more involved. There will be an impact on all family members when a father increases his involvement in childrearing as a result of program participation. Although this impact should be positive, there may be some negative aspects such as greater time constraints, increased role strain and confusion, etc. (Lamb et al., 1985). The exact nature of the impact of increased amounts of paternal involvement on all family members will need to be explored.

If fathers assume more responsibility after participating in a parent support program (as suggested by the present study), what will be the effects on the families? Fathers may undertake more child-care tasks and assume more day-to-day responsibility for their children, thus easing the demands of motherhood. The husband-wife relationship may grow stronger as a result of their sharing more parental responsibility. The fathers may experience more personal growth and satisfaction in their parental role. Children may see their fathers

in a different light as they assume more parental responsibilities. These perceptions may lead to positive changes in the children's conceptualization of the paternal role, which in turn could affect their own behavior when they become parents. These and many more questions will need to be examined as researchers explore the impact of increased levels of father involvement. Long-term studies that follow families for years will be needed to answer these questions.

Research examining various aspects of paternal involvement has been expanding rapidly in recent years, yet the creation of parent education and support programs for fathers along with research evaluating such programs has been limited. Although there are limitations to the present study such as a small sample size and the short-term nature of the intervention program and study, the results are sufficiently impressive to encourage the continuation of such lines of research. It is through these efforts that researchers and practitioners alike will develop a better understanding of the modifiability of father involvement. This improved understanding may lead to the development and implementation of parent education and support programs which effectively increase fathers' parenting options.

APPENDIX A

FATHER INVOLVEMENT IN CHILDREARING: A TAXONOMICAL REVIEW

Introduction/Definition of Father Involvement

Statement of the Problem/Rationale

Early Childhood educators have long realized the importance of parents in all aspects of a young child's life. The ways in which parents rear their children has a significant impact on their cognitive, social, emotional and physical development. Although most early childhood professionals are aware of this impact, the importance of fathers in this development has only recently been recognized and acknowledged. If fathers are actively involved in the rearing of their children they may contribute to all aspects of their development.

In recent years there has been a greater amount of public and professional interest in fathering. Accompanying this increase in interest, one would expect to find greater levels of paternal involvement in childrearing. However, increases in actual paternal involvement in childrearing have not been proportional to the increased interest in the topic (Juster, cited in Lamb, 1986). Historically, fathers have failed to take an active role in childrearing (Lamb, Pleck & Levine, 1985). For a variety of reasons, many men have been found to be unprepared to assume an active parental role (Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984; Klinman & Vukelich, 1985; Palkovitz, 1984; Sagi, 1982; Smith & Smith, 1981; Tomlinson, 1987), and as a result, are reluctant to become deeply involved in the raising of their children. In our society boys are not given opportunities to receive instruction in or to develop skills needed to become nurturing parents (Berman & Pedersen, 1987; Klinman, 1986). Further, when these boys reach adulthood and are ready to start families of their own, the

social support systems available to help mothers develop parenting skills are not available to them as fathers (Bolton, 1986; DeFrain, 1977; Levant, 1988; Levant & Doyle, 1983; Palkovitz, 1984; Smith & Smith, 1981). This lack of preparation and support helps to perpetuate the disengagement of men from the rearing of their young children.

Researchers have begun to look more closely at paternal involvement in childrearing and the role of the father in child development (Radin & Sagi, 1982). Studies of the impact of paternal involvement in childrearing have tended to focus primarily on cognitive and sex-role development. Studies have found that increased father involvement enhances children's internality and cognitive development, especially for boy's (Radin, 1981; Radin, 1982; Radin & Sagi, 1982; Sagi, 1982). Studies also indicate that father involvement is a significant influence on the sex-role development of both boys and girls (Baruch & Barnett, 1986a; Radin, 1981; Sagi, 1982). Minuchin (1987) further suggests the influence of the family (including the father's influence) on child development extends beyond the sphere of intellectual growth and into the realm of social development. Although the evidence indicates that fathers may influence different aspects of child development, the findings have sometimes been contradictory or inconclusive (Lamb et al, 1985). With this growing interest in the role of fathers and their impact on child development, researchers should focus their attention on the ways in which fathers become involved with their children and the factors that influence this involvement. One problem with research in this area is that father involvement lacks an agreed-upon definition which takes

into account the different ways fathers may contribute to the rearing of their children.

The purpose of this paper is to review the research literature pertaining to the ways men are involved with their children. An attempt will be made to identify different forms of father involvement and the factors that influence these different forms of involvement.

Definition of Father Involvement

A major problem in reviewing the literature on paternal involvement in childrearing is the lack of a consistent definition of this involvement. In an effort to rectify this problem, Lamb and his colleagues (Lamb, Pleck, Charnov & Levine, 1987) have proposed a three-part taxonomy (1. Interaction; 2. Accessibility; 3. Responsibility) to identify and define the different processes that father involvement in childrearing might entail.

Lamb (1986) has identified the first type of involvement as "engagement/interaction." This type of involvement refers to direct interaction with his children in activities such as playing with them, holding them, talking with them, etc. "Accessibility," refers to the times when the father may not be engaged in direct interaction with his child but is still available to him/her. This type of involvement would include such times as when the father is working in one room of the house while the child is playing in another. Lamb has identified the third type of involvement as "responsibility." In this category of involvement the father assumes responsibility for the welfare and care of his child. A responsible father is aware of the various social, emotional, cognitive and physical needs of the child, and is able to take the steps necessary to help them meet these needs. Lamb suggests

that being responsible doesn't necessarily involve direct interaction with the child, because many times the anxiety, worry, and contingency planning that comprise paternal responsibility often occurs when the father is doing something else. Examples of this type of involvement would include such things as making childcare and babysitting arrangements, knowing when the child needs to go to the pediatrician, ensuring that the child has clean clothes to wear, etc.

For the purpose of this review father involvement is defined in terms of the three categories of Lamb's (1986) taxonomy of father involvement. The research literature will be organized and reviewed as it relates to each of these three categories. In the first section of the review a discussion of the types of research literature included and excluded will be presented. Following this, I will discuss various theoretical perspectives on father involvement. The next three sections will review the research literature as it pertains to each of the three categories of father involvement. The sixth section will explore the ways in which fathers become involved in child-care tasks. The next section will then discuss attitudes and personalities in relation to father involvement. Finally, a summary/conclusion section will discuss some of the implications of this literature for researchers, as well as early childhood and parent educators.

Research Literature Reviewed

Inclusions/Exclusions

The aim of this review is to identify the differences, types and degrees of father involvement in childrearing activities. Included in the review will be studies that look at what fathers do in

childrearing, how often they do it, and the influence of mothers, socioeconomic circumstances, and other factors on these activities. The studies included are ones that attempted to examine these various forms and degrees of father involvement within two-parent families. The studies reviewed employed various correlational, experimental and descriptive methods in order to examine the roles of fathers in childrearing.

Studies looking at paternal involvement in father-absent families were excluded. The dynamics of single-parent families is an important area that needs to be investigated, yet to draw conclusions on the role and effect of father involvement using these families would present a less than accurate picture of the roles that men in general play in the lives of their children. A second type of study excluded from this review are those that only examine outcome effects of father involvement. Fathers, even those who are uninvolved, have a significant influence, for good and for ill, on their children's development (Lamb, Pleck & Levine, 1985). Although these outcomes effects have been, and should continue to be an important area of study, the focus of this review is the father himself, and the factors that influence the types and degree of his involvement in childrearing rather than the effects of this involvement on the child. A third type of study excluded from this review are those assessing negative forms of paternal involvement. Although behaviors by men such as child abuse or neglect could be classified as a Category I form of paternal involvement, studies investigating this form of negative action do not clarify the nature of positive father-child relationships.

Limitations of the Research Literature

Due to the relative newness of research on father involvement in childrearing, limitations of the findings are evident in the literature. Much of what is being written about the roles of father involvement and the nature of the "new father" is journalistic and narrative in style (Lamb, 1986). It has been suggested that the early empirical work in this area focussed largely on the roles of fathers in "traditional" nonemployed mother families (Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984; Russell, 1978; Sagi, 1982). In our present day society the traditional nonemployed mother family is more the exception than the rule, and generalizations to present day families must be looked at with skepticism. Many of these studies also used data obtained entirely from mothers and children rather than the fathers themselves (Klinman & Vukelich, 1985; Radin, 1981), thus creating another limitation.

One method employed in many of the early studies looking at paternal influences that creates more limitations of the literature is the use of data from father-absent families (Lamb, Pleck & Levine, 1985; Radin, 1981). Other methodological problems include the lack of a consistent definition of father involvement (Baruch & Barnett, 1986a; Lamb, 1986), a lack of long term investigations of the patterns of father behaviors (Radin, 1981), and the failure to look at actual differences in the types of paternal involvement (Lamb et al., 1986) have all compounded these problems.

The quality of research on father involvement has improved in recent years. The techniques used to explore various aspects of father involvement have become more sophisticated. A number of the

limitations of earlier studies have been identified, and steps have been taken to overcome them. Thus, stronger conclusions can be drawn from more recent research in this area.

Theoretical Views of Father Involvement

The Changing Views of Father Involvement

The roles of fathers within the family are in flux. Pleck (cited in Lamb, 1986) has identified four phases of change in the conceptualization of paternal roles occurring over the past two centuries. He has identified these phases as: 1) the father as a moral teacher (Colonial period); 2) the father as a breadwinner (from the industrialization of the mid-1860's through the mid-1940's); 3) the father as a sex-role model (mid-40's to mid-70's); and 4) the new nurturant father (mid-70's to present). Although the labels may vary from group to group, researchers, educators and parents alike have all changed in their conceptions of the roles of fathers over time.

Only in the last two decades have the educational and research communities begun to acknowledge fathers' contributions to early child development (Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984; Feldman, Nash & Aschenbrener, 1983). Prior to this time it was assumed that infants and young children were capable of forming attachments only to their mothers, and that mother-infant relationships had a disproportionately significant impact on psychological development (Lamb, 1981; Lamb et al., 1986). As a result, mother-child relationships were explored while those between fathers and children were basically ignored. With the emerging popularity of the "new father" there has been a shift in the emphasis of educational and research programs to the family as a

whole, and to the roles of each member (mothers, fathers and children) within the family.

Theoretical Perspectives of Father Involvement

As stated earlier, the roles of fathers are in flux, and members of the educational and research communities are slowly changing their perspectives as to the influences of fatherhood. Prior to this recent trend many of the major psychological viewpoints of human development (such as Freudian psychology, Parsonian psychology, social learning theory, attachment theory, etc.) failed to acknowledge the importance of the father's role early in a child's life.

Until recently Freud and those schooled in psychoanalytical theory had the greatest influence on the views of paternal roles held by educators and those in the helping professions (Jones, 1985). In Freud's view, the father played a minor role in the early years. Prior to the onset of the Oedipal conflict the mother was the primary focus and influence on the infant and young child. The first libidinal (pleasure enhancing) excitations of the infant are connected with sucking and feeding. It mattered little whether the child was breast-fed or bottle-fed, weaned early or late in life; every child still longed for the mother's breast and for the mother as a whole. Freud saw the mother's image remaining in the child's memory as the first love object and the prototype for all future love (Wolman, 1972). This viewpoint led researchers to study the mother as a primary factor in the child's development, and to ignore the father (Jones, 1985; Robinson & Barret, 1986).

Closely related to Freud's viewpoint is that of Talcott Parsons. Like Freud, Parsons suggested that the child's world was limited to

mother-child relationships prior to the Oedipal conflict, and that it is only at this stage that fathers came into the picture (Gilbert, Hanson & Davis, 1982; Lamb, 1981; Robinson & Barret, 1986). In Parsonian theory, once a child reaches the Oedipal period, mothers and fathers take on sharply different but active roles. Mothers take on an "expressive" role, nurturing the child with warmth, empathy, etc, while fathers take on an "instrumental" role, helping the child move from emotional dependency on the mother toward the autonomy needed to survive as an adult. This viewpoint led researchers and educators to view the ways in which mothers and fathers interact and relate to their children as distinctly different and as having different purposes.

In the 1960's a new theory of human development began to influence thinking about the roles of fathers. This new theory, Social Learning theory, saw the father as a model of masculine behaviors for his children (Jones, 1985; Lamb, 1981; Robinson & Barret, 1986). Social Learning theory encouraged fathers to display typical "masculine" behaviors so that both boys and girls could learn what men are like. This theory also suggests that children of nontraditional fathers would be more empathic than those of traditional fathers (Radin & Sagi, 1982). This perspective was a major influence on much of the early research done on father-infant relationships (Jones, 1985).

The theoretical framework that has dominated much of the research in the late 70's and early 80's on father-child relations is that of Attachment Theory (Lamb, 1981). This framework, developed by theorists such as Bowlby (1969) and Ainsworth (1979), suggests that

the security of the parent-infant relationship can affect other aspects of a child's development. Early attachment theorists concentrated on the maternal-infant relationship and were influenced by Bowlby's belief that mothers, and not fathers, are specially prepared biologically to relate to their infants, and that if mothers don't look after their infants, then the babies are not going to prosper (Jones, 1985; Russell, 1982b). This viewpoint also deprecated the contribution of fathers to an infant's development. In recent years, attachment theorists have discovered that infants can and do develop strong attachments to their fathers early on in their lives. As a result, there has been a shift in research toward looking at father-infant as well as mother-infant relationships in studies of attachment.

Family Systems Theory offers a somewhat different emphasis when looking at father involvement (Robinson & Barret, 1986). In order to understand the behavior of a father within this framework, information about the family as a whole must first be obtained. Although a relatively new perspective, it holds a lot of promise for those educators and researchers who wish to better understand and explain the roles of fathers in the lives of their young children.

Defining paternal involvement in terms of Lamb's (1986) taxonomy of father involvement and then applying this definition to review the literature recognizes the changing perspectives of father roles and father participation in childrearing. Organizing the literature in this fashion acknowledges the Family Systems Theory perspective in examining the family framework as a whole in order to better understand the father's role within this family structure. Although

many of these studies use varying definitions and perspectives to look at paternal involvement, this review organizes the findings under each of the three categories of the taxonomy.

Category I - Lamb's Taxonomy of Father Involvement: Interaction

Father-Child Play

Category I of Lamb's (1986) taxonomy of father involvement involves interaction, or times when the father participates in one-to-one direct interaction with his child. Common techniques used to measure this form of involvement include time use studies, structured interviews asking what parent did specific types of activities and when (these activities usually included play and child-care tasks), and self-report questionnaires examining the various amounts of play and child-care tasks the parents engaged in with the child.

Within Category I of paternal involvement father-child play is probably the most common type of interaction that men have with their children. Evidence suggests that fathers spend a majority of their interaction time playing with their children while mothers spend a majority of their time in child-care tasks (Field, 1978; Lamb, 1980; Lamb, Pleck, Charnov & Levine, 1987; Russell, 1978). This pattern may become stronger as the child increases in age. In a small study it was found that at 15-months the child's primary adult playmate was the mother; at 20 months both parents play equally; at 30 months the father played more often than the mother (Clarke-Stewart, 1978).

Research looking at mother-child and father-child play has shown there are distinct differences between mothers and fathers in their play with their children. Mothers are more likely than fathers to initiate and be involved in fantasy play with their children (Lamb,

1980; Power, 1985; Roopnarine & Mounts, 1985). Fathers, on the other hand, are more likely than mothers to initiate and be involved in rough and tumble and physically stimulating types of play with their children (Lamb, 1980; Power, 1985; Roopnarine & Mounts, 1985; Russell, 1982b). This pattern may not appear in "shared-caregiving" families (families in which the fathers were the primary caretakers of the children or where they share this task with their spouse/mate). In such families mothers and fathers exhibit much more similar patterns of play activities with their children than mothers and fathers from traditional families (Russell, 1982b).

Father Interaction and Sex of the Child

The sex of the child is a strong determiner of the amount of participation men have in Category I. Fathers spend more time interacting with their sons than their daughters (Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984; Lamb, 1987; Radin & Sagi, 1982). Evidence also suggests that fathers tend to make themselves more salient and available to their sons than their daughters (Lamb, 1980). On the other hand, Parke & Sawin (1980) found little differentiation between mothers' and fathers' behaviors toward their very young sons and daughters for routine caregiving tasks, while affection giving is more focused on the opposite sexed infant.

In looking at parental attitudes, differences can be found between mothers and fathers in terms of their beliefs about the amount of influence they have on their children based on the sex of the child. Russell & Russell (1982) found that fathers of boys believed they had a greater influence on their children than fathers of girls, while mothers did not differ in this belief. Gilbert et al. (1982)

found that mothers and fathers agreed more than they disagreed regarding the importance of their influence in a wide variety of parenting behaviors, yet they agreed on more items for a male child than they did for a female child. Durrett et al.(1984) also found that mothers of male infants perceived that their husbands took more pride in their spouses and enjoyed them more than mothers of female infants.

Solo Father-Child Interaction

In Category I types of involvement men have little opportunity to interact with their children when mothers are not around. When mothers are not present, fathers are more apt to interact and become involved with their children, depending on their needs (Palkovitz, 1980). Russell (1978) found that fathers spent an average of only one hour per week interacting and taking responsibility for their child by themselves; 60% of the fathers reported spending even less time. Baruch & Barnett (1986b) found that the proportion of time spent alone on child care by the fathers was just under 20% for fathers with nonemployed wives and just over 30% for fathers with employed wives. Although men are more likely to become involved and interact with their children when left alone with them, for one reason or another they are seldom put into this solo interaction situation.

Primary Caretaking Fathers and "Interaction"

A unique type of father-child interaction pattern is exhibited in primary caretaking father families. This form of family pattern is not common, yet the interaction engaged in by these fathers is markedly different from that of traditional fathers. The parenting and interaction patterns of primary caretaking and shared-caregiving

fathers are much more similar to those of mothers than the patterns exhibited by traditional fathers (Field, 1978; Radin, 1982; Russell, 1982a). Field (1978) suggests that the similarities between mothers and fathers when they are both primary caretakers implies that mother-father differences are not necessarily intrinsic to the gender of the parent. Instead, she suggests these differences are the result of the differential amount of experience they have with their children as a primary or secondary caretaker. This level and type of interaction and involvement by primary caretaking fathers has been found to be inconsistent though, decreasing when the mother is present (Russell, 1982a) and over the course of time (Radin & Goldsmith, 1985).

Category II - Lamb's Taxonomy of Father Involvement: Accessibility
Levels of Father Accessibility

Accessibility refers to time when the father is available to the child whether or not they are actually interacting. Methods used to measure a father's participation in this category include self reports (both estimates and forced recall) through interviews and questionnaires, as well as time-use diaries. As in measuring interaction levels, the use of forced recall techniques to examine father accessibility tend to produce lower total scores than estimates of time spent being accessible (Lamb et al., 1985; Pleck, 1985). Measures of accessibility give the highest estimates of paternal involvement.

The amount of fathers' accessibility varies from study to study. Lamb and his colleagues suggest the range of paternal accessibility is between 1.75 and 4 hours per day. One consistent finding from studies that report on this type of paternal involvement is that mothers tend

to be more accessible to their children than fathers (Golinkoff & Ames, 1979; Kotelchuck, 1975; Pleck, 1985; Robinson, 1977; Russell & Russell, 1987). Lamb et al. (1987) suggest that father accessibility is only about one half that of mothers. When broken down by age of the child, it appears that fathers are more accessible to younger children than older (Pleck, 1985). When wives are employed outside the home, fathers are not increasing their relative accessibility to their children as one might expect. In response to maternal employment status, it is only their proportional accessibility which appears to increase; this being due to the relative accessibility of the mothers declining when they work outside the home.

One distinction most studies reporting on paternal involvement have failed to make in the past is the difference in Interaction and Accessibility for workdays and non-workdays. Due to external constraints on fathers such as work roles, social obligations, etc. their interaction and accessibility tends to be lower on workdays than on non-workdays. An example of this tendency can be found in a more recent study reported by Grossman, Pollack & Golding (1988). Fathers in their sample spent a mean of 4.11 hours in play and caretaking activities with their children on an average weekday. This mean jumped to 9.46 hours for an average weekend day. This sharp jump is reflective of the external constraints on fathers' Interaction and Accessibility. Previous studies examining fathers' accessibility tend to report these amounts as mean hours per day (Baruch & Barnett, 1983; Golinkoff & Ames, 1979; Pleck, 1985; Robinson, 1977) or mean hours per week (Pedersen & Robson, 1969; Russell & Russell, 1987). Although the data reported by Baruch & Barnett (1983), Pleck (1985),

and Robinson (1977) were collected for workdays and non-workdays, they were combined into "synthetic" or "average" weeks for purposes of analyses. This procedure fails to acknowledge the impact that external constraints on father involvement can have on other variables of involvement being investigated.

Category III - Lamb's Taxonomy of Father Involvement: Responsibility Levels of Father Responsibility in Child Care

Category III of Lamb's (1986) taxonomy of paternal involvement (responsibility) emphasizes the assumption of responsibility for the welfare and care of children. This assumption of responsibility can take on many different forms such as making decisions on matters that concern the child (i.e., what preschool to send them to, when should they go to the doctor, etc.), being able to identify the needs of the child (hunger, stress, fear, etc.), making child care and babysitting arrangements, selecting and buying clothes for the child, making sure they are dressed appropriately, etc. Lamb suggests that much of the time involved in being a responsible parent does not necessarily involve direct interaction with the child.

Research looking into the amount responsibility assumed by fathers is sketchy because of the difficulty in quantifying the time involved. Lamb (1986) suggests that this problem may be due to the behaviors that comprise parental responsibility often occur when the parent is ostensibly doing something else. As a result, time use studies may overlook this type of involvement. The kinds of measures that produce findings classified as Category III involvement include questionnaires that measure the father's perceptions of parental role responsibility, measures of knowledge of child development such as the

Parent Expectations Scale, and questionnaires and structured interviews that look at the amount of father participation in activities that involve responsibility.

Regardless of the difficulty involved in measuring parental responsibility, studies have shown that fathers consistently fail to assume responsibility for their children (Baruch & Barnett, 1986a; Clarke-Stewart, 1978; Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984; Gilbert et al., 1982; Radin & Sagi, 1982; Russell, 1978; Russell, 1982a; Russell & Russell, 1987). Russell (1982a) reports that responsibility is consistent across several different cultures. Radin & Sagi (1982) on the other hand found that Israeli fathers in their study assumed more parental responsibility than did their counterparts in the U.S. Whether this pattern of nonparticipation by men in this type of involvement is common world wide is debatable, but the evidence clearly suggests that low participation is the predominant trend for men in our country (see Lamb, 1987 for a more complete discussion of cross-cultural perspectives of father involvement).

Fathers' Knowledge About Child Development

In order for a man to assume parental responsibility, he must possess the types of knowledge and skills needed to meet the demands of this kind of responsibility. Knowledge of normal child development and behavior, knowledge of the educational system, an understanding of the physiological and emotional growth patterns of young children, along with many other types of background knowledge and skills are all necessary and desirable if the father is going to assume responsibility. Studies of shared-caregiving and primary caretaking fathers who have high degrees of responsibility report that these men

were disproportionately more likely to be well educated than those fathers who failed to become involved in this category (Lamb et al., 1982; Russell, 1982b). Some of the knowledge and skills necessary to participate in this category may come from a person's general knowledge and background.

The knowledge and skills needed to assume a great deal of responsibility may not necessarily be gained through general forms of education. Certain specific types of background skills and knowledge are necessary in order for a parent to assume responsibility. For the most part though, fathers lack this type of knowledge and skill, and generally lack preparation for active involvement as a parent (Klinman, 1986; Klinman & Vukelich, 1985; Mendes, 1976; Smith & Smith, 1981). When looking at mothers and fathers, Klinman & Vukelich (1985) found that both lacked a general knowledge of child development, and differences in the amounts of knowledge held by both was minimal. They also suggest that it is only because of the mothers' more active participation in childrearing that they tend to acquire greater amounts of knowledge in this area than men. The women learn by doing while men fail to gain this knowledge as a result of their lack of participation.

It is evident that men seldom assume high levels of responsibility for their children. For a father to assume responsibility in childrearing (Category III) a wide variety of background skills and knowledge are necessary. The evidence suggests that many men do not possess these skills and knowledge, and the only reason women may acquire them is that they have been thrust into active forms of participation.

Father Involvement in Child-Care Tasks

Levels of Father Participation in Child-Care Tasks

Closely related to the three categories of Lamb's (1986) taxonomy of paternal involvement is the type and amount of participation men exhibit in child-care related tasks. Methods used to measure a father's participation in this type of activity include structured interviews looking at who performs specific types of child-care and house-related tasks in the home, self-report questionnaires to determine the father's participation in various child-care and house related tasks, and measures of the father's attitude toward these types of activities. Examples of these types of activities would include preparing the child a meal, picking up their room, cleaning their clothes, etc.

Evidence suggests that fathers' participation in child-care related tasks is very low compared to that of mothers (Clarke-Stewart, 1978; Klinman & Vukelich, 1985; Lamb, 1987; Levant, Slatery & Loiselle, 1987; McKenry et al., 1986; Park & Sawin, 1980; Russell, 1982b). Both husbands and wives are aware of this lack of participation by men in these types of activities, although men perceive themselves as engaging in more family and child-care work to a significantly greater degree than do their wives (McKenry et al., 1986). Fathers (and perhaps mothers) may be seeing themselves as doing more of these activities than they actually do.

This pattern of a lack of participation by men in these child-care related tasks is also evident in families identified as primary caretaking or shared caregiving families. Even though these fathers may be involved in more direct daily interaction with their children

(Category I involvement) they are still participating less in child-care related tasks (Lamb, Frodi, Hwang & Frodi, 1982; Russell, 1982b).
Employment Status, SES, and Father Participation in Child-Care Tasks

One factor significantly related to a father's participation in child-care tasks is the employment status of both parents (Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Baruch & Barnett, 1986a; Ericksen, Yancey & Ericksen, 1979; McKenry et al., 1986). Regardless of whether the mothers worked full-time, part-time, or not at all outside the home, they still performed more of these tasks than fathers (Baruch & Barnett, 1986a; Ericksen et al., 1979). Differences in the reasons why husbands and wives perform these tasks were also found. Mothers perceived this type of activity as a resource that increases their status while fathers perceived it as a response to their wives employment undertaken primarily out of economic need (McKenry et al., 1986). Ericksen et al. (1979) found the amount of father participation in child-care tasks varied with the number of hours worked by the mothers. If mothers were employed part-time, fathers performed more of these tasks than if mothers were employed full time.

Family SES levels are closely related to the employment status of parents in terms of the amount of child-care related tasks a father performs. There appears to be a negative correlation between a father's SES and the quantity of child-care tasks he performs (Ericksen et al., 1979, Model, 1981; Radin & Sagi, 1982).

The accumulation of evidence suggests that fathers are performing very few child-care related tasks while mothers take care of the majority of them. It also appears that maternal employment status and family SES levels may be related to whether or not men become involved

in these types of activities.

Attitudes and Personalities in Relation to Father Involvement

Mother Attitudes and Father Involvement

Attitudes and personalities of both mothers and fathers can be major determinants of the amounts of participation men have in all three types of involvement. The attitudes of both parents in terms of what role the father should take in childrearing is an important influence on a father's level of participation. The mothers' attitude toward the male role and her concept of the role of fatherhood is the single best predictor of paternal involvement (Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Lamb et al., 1985; Palkovitz, 1984; Radin, 1982). Radin (1982) suggests that mothers and fathers tend to agree in their perceptions of the father's role in child care (regardless of what form this may take). Barnett & Baruch (1987) also suggest that when the mother's attitude toward the male role was liberal the fathers participated more in child care, and when traditional the fathers participated less. The mothers may thus be determining just how much and in what ways fathers become involved in childrearing. Lamb et al. (1985) also suggest that increased amounts of paternal involvement may have adverse consequences if the mother prefers that her spouse not be highly involved.

Sex-Role Ideology and Father Involvement

Many educators, researchers and parents alike believe that the sex-role orientation of a man is a strong determinant of what type of involvement he will have as a father. Research in this area has not provided strong support for this belief. Russell (1978) found that men rated as being androgynous carried out more child care tasks and

interacted more with their children than did masculine fathers. Baruch & Barnett (1981) found that although the father's nontraditional sex-role ideology was significantly related to their independent participation in childrearing, no such relationship was found with joint participation (when spouse was present). In a later study Baruch & Barnett (1986a) found that fathers whose attitudes were less traditional and whose wives shared these attitudes were more involved in home chores, but not in child care. In a later report Barnett & Baruch (1987) found that although the mother's attitude toward the male role was a major predictor of father participation in childrearing, the father's attitude toward the male role was not related to any forms of father participation. The most surprising finding in this area came from a study of primary caretaking fathers. In this study Radin (1982) found no significant differences in the sex-role orientation of primary caretaking fathers when compared to more traditional fathers. Although the evidence suggests that parental sex-role orientations influences the type of paternal involvement in childrearing, the exact nature of this influence is unclear.

Perceived Parental Upbringing and Father Involvement

One of the main reasons men give for not being prepared to actively participate in all three categories of father involvement is the lack of a role model from which they can pattern their behaviors. Most present day fathers of young children had fathers who took on a less than active role in raising the children. The recent increase in the desire of men to participate actively in the roles of fatherhood may be a result of their negative reaction to the experiences they had

with their own fathers when growing up. Sagi (1982) has suggested two major hypotheses as to the relationship between a father's father and the relationship the father has with his own child. First, the "compensatory" hypothesis suggests that men who take on an active role in the raising of their children do so in reaction to their own fathers being unavailable and affectively not supportive of them. In this hypothesis the men are trying to compensate for a lack of intense contact with their own fathers. The second hypothesis, the "modeling" hypothesis, suggests that high paternal involvement in child care is associated with fathers whose own fathers were also highly involved in child care.

There is some support for each of these hypotheses. Several studies report that fathers who participated actively in the various categories of father involvement were unhappy with the participation of their own fathers, or who saw their own fathers as being traditional and uninvolved (Alexanders, 1978; Barnett & Baruch, 1987; DeFrain, 1979; Mendes, 1976; Sagi, 1982). There is also some support for the modeling hypothesis that fathers participate more in raising their children because they perceive their own fathers as being more nurturant (Manion, 1977; Reuter & Biller, 1973). Closely related to the modeling hypothesis is Radin's (1982) finding that mothers who had more positive feelings concerning their fathers' involvement when they were young had husbands who were more involved in rearing their children. Feldman et al. (1983) also found that the wives of husbands who actively participated in caregiving were often women who had positive relations with their own fathers. In apparent disagreement with both hypotheses, Radin & Sagi (1982) found that American men did

not replicate their own fathers' involvement regardless of their amounts of participation, while Israeli fathers did.

Other Predictors of Father Involvement

In looking at research investigating the different categories of father involvement in childrearing, other variables that predict different kinds of involvement emerge. One such variable is education. Studies have shown that the more educated the father, the more likely he is to participate in the raising of his children (Erickson et al., 1979; Lamb et al., 1982; Russell, 1982b). Another such variable that acts as a predictor of all three categories of father involvement is the number of hours mothers and fathers are employed outside the home (Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Russell, 1982b). Marital happiness as reported by the husband and/or the wife is another consistent predictor of paternal satisfaction in the roles of fatherhood (Feldman et al., 1983; Tomlinson, 1987). Feldman et al. (1983) claim that long-standing antecedents of parenthood are more predictive of father involvement than the more immediate transitional experience of the pre-natal period.

Further, various measures of personality and attitudes predict paternal involvement in childrearing. This appears to hold true regardless of what category the involvement takes. Surprising is the finding that the mothers' perceptions of the role of the father serves as the single best predictor of father involvement. This finding has many ramifications in terms of the dynamics of the family structures and interactions.

Conclusions/Implications

Men participate in the rearing of their children in many

different ways. Fathers are most likely to be accessible to their children while least likely to assume responsibility. Even their amounts of interaction are minimal when compared to that of mothers, and they interact in different ways than mothers. Lamb (1986) has suggested that "responsibility" is the most important type of involvement (when viewed in the context of equal opportunity for mothers and fathers), yet research indicates that fathers typically assume little or no responsibility. The findings of these studies have many implications for researchers, early childhood educators, and parent educators alike.

The major problem with the research literature in this field is the lack of a clear and consistent definition of father involvement. This lack of consistency creates difficulty in comparing findings and in generalizing from one study to the next. In proposing his taxonomy of father involvement, Lamb (1986) has provided a way of breaking down paternal involvement into workable components that makes the processes of father involvement more understandable and more easily identified. This review has organized research findings as they would fall under each of the three categories of involvement. Future studies in this area might be strengthened by applying categories of this taxonomy in their definitions of father involvement and to the variables to be used within the study. This approach allows researchers a way to capture various forms that father involvement entails, and to examine the impact of each of these forms of involvement on child development.

The need for longitudinal research looking at changes in forms of paternal involvement and the effects of these changes is another task for further research. Most recent research is short term in nature,

with very few covering a time span longer than one year. Father involvement (or lack thereof) is a lifelong process that starts at conception and ends at the death of father or child. To make major generalizations based on short-term studies of six months to a year limits the questions which can be addressed. For a clearer understanding of the nature of paternal involvement and how it changes with the growing of the child and the development of the father-child relationship, longitudinal studies that look at the growth and development of father involvement patterns over time need to be undertaken.

The theoretical approach used in studies looking at paternal involvement also needs to be examined. The one-way directionality of the influence of father involvement on the development of their children prevalent in the research paradigms of many of the early studies is no longer valid. The interaction patterns and influences between father and child are better conceptualized as multi-directional: the behaviors of the father influences the child, and the behaviors of the child influences the father. Added to this multi-directional pattern is the influence of the mother on the father-child dyad, and also all three of their influences on the mother-father-child triad. The Family Systems Theory approach to the interactions and dynamics of the total family appears to hold the most promise for research looking at father involvement in childrearing.

Related to the Family Systems Theory approach in studying paternal involvement is the need to develop a wider variety of outcome measures for such studies. As mentioned earlier, cognitive gains and sex-role development have been the predominant outcome measures used

in father involvement research. Paternal involvement in childrearing can influence the cognitive, social, psychological, emotional and physical development of a child. Attempts need to be made to develop measures that can assess the influence of father involvement in each of these areas.

Recent research holds implications for early childhood and parent educators. Contrary to popular belief, increased levels of father involvement may not always have positive outcomes. Lamb et al. (1985) have suggested that for paternal involvement to have positive consequences, it must be the result of the desires of both parents. Instead of insisting that increased levels of paternal involvement are universally desirable, Lamb and his colleagues have suggested that more attempts need to be made to increase the options available to fathers so that those who wish can become more involved in all three ways.

Although there are possible negative outcomes of increased amounts of involvement in childrearing by men such as greater time constraints, increased role strain and confusion, etc., it is assumed that the possible positive benefits of increased involvement such as the fathers' development of closer, richer relationships with their children, increases in the fathers' sense of competence in their parenting skills along with increases in their general self-confidence, increases in the fathers' opportunities to witness and influence their children's development, and the fathers' development of closer relationships with their spouses as they share in the joys and struggles of raising their children (Lamb et al., 1985) make the prospect of increasing involvement in childrearing activities more

desirable for fathers. In providing these options the likelihood of positive benefits as a result of increased father participation in childrearing will be greater.

Evidence suggests that many men lack the basic skills, knowledge and social preparation to effectively participate in all three types of father involvement. The specific knowledge and skills related to effective parenting are critical for active father involvement at Category III. Because of their lack of skills, knowledge and preparation, most men don't have the option of actively participating in this category of father involvement. One way of providing these options might be for early childhood and parent educators to create programs to help fathers develop the skills and knowledge needed to become actively involved with their children in these two categories.

At the present time there are very few social support or educational programs for fathers (Bolton, 1986; Klinman, 1986; Lamb, 1987; Levant, 1988; Parke & Tinsley, 1981). There have also been very few research studies looking at such programs (Dembo, Sweitzer & Lawritzen, 1985; Levant, 1988). The results of the few studies that have been undertaken hold promise for parent education and support programs for fathers (Levant & Doyle, 1983). Early childhood and parent educators must join with researchers to create parent education programs geared specifically for fathers and their children. In doing so they may increase the options available to men. These programs will also be providing a ready forum for studying the effects of increases in father involvement in all three categories, along with the factors and processes connected with these increases.

Voluntary parent education and social support programs for

fathers created as a result of this impetus might be geared towards supplying the fathers with the knowledge and skills necessary to allow them to increase their participation in all three categories of involvement. They should also provide men with the opportunities to become comfortable with their newly gained insights into father-child interactions within the security of a structured program. As a result, emphasis should be on creating parent education/play group programs for fathers and their children as opposed to simple parent education programs where the fathers go to classes without their children.

If such programs are successful in helping fathers develop these new skills and knowledge, changes should be evident in their behavior patterns in all three categories of involvement. Men participate very little in Category III. Increasing their knowledge and understanding of child development and parenting skills, as well as increasing their awareness of the importance of the paternal role and their sensitivity to the cognitive, social, psychological, emotional and physical needs of their children (all attributes of Category III participation) should result in increases in the amounts of their participation in father involvement in this category. This type of involvement is important, and increases in participation might be beneficial to all members of the family.

At the same time a father is increasing his involvement in Category III, changes in the form of his participation at Category I might also occur. When men are involved with their children it is usually at Category I. However, the patterns of involvement they exhibit in this category are different from those of mothers, and are

not always beneficial to the children. The increased knowledge of child development and sensitivity to the children's needs that allow them to become more involved at Category III might also transfer to changes in behavior at Category I. No longer will they only be involved in rough and tumble and physically stimulating types of interactions, nor will they hold unrealistic expectations for their children's behaviors. Instead, they will be more aware of the importance of other types of interactions such as talking to them, reading with them, singing with them, pretending with them, being physically close with them, etc. for their overall growth and development. The types of interactions that men typically have with their children in this category often does not reflect this awareness. Parent education/play group programs for fathers aimed at increasing their knowledge of child development and parenting skills may result in increased amounts of participation in Category III of father involvement, as well as changes in their interaction patterns at Category I.

Treatment Program Description

Treatment group fathers participated in a parent education/discussion group program that met for two hours on 10 consecutive Saturday evenings. Treatment group fathers and their children pairs participated in a similar 10-week program upon completion of the posttest data collection. Each two hour session was divided into two sections. The first of each weekly session was spent with the fathers in group discussions on various aspects of child development and parenting. During this time assistants supervised and led activities with the children in another room. The curriculum for the discussion group sessions applied material derived from Lamb's effort to organize and integrate the research literature on paternal involvement. Each session was designed to address issues of importance of the types of involvement. A discussion group format for this portion of the treatment was selected due to the tendency of other more didactic parent-education programs such as P.E.T. (parenting effectiveness training) to focus primarily on the child while excluding opportunities for parents to share their problems and perceptions with one another. The discussion group format allowed this focus on child behavior and parenting to be adapted to the fathers' background experiences, concerns, perceptions, etc., thus keeping the father as the primary focus. The 10-week program was designed to give roughly equivalent attention to all three categories of father involvement. The following is a list and description of the topics covered during the program.

1. Opening Group Session

The main goal of this first discussion group session is to give

Treatment group father-child pairs participated in a parent education/play group program that met for two hours on 10 consecutive Saturday mornings. The "wait list" control group father-child pairs participated in a similar 10-week program upon completion of the posttest data collection. Each two hour session was divided into two sections. One hour of each weekly session was spent with the fathers in group discussions on various aspects of child development and parenting. During this time assistants supervised and led activities with the children in another room. The curriculum for the discussion group sessions applied notions derived from Lamb's effort to organize and integrate the research literature on paternal involvement. Each session was designed to address issues at one or more of the types of involvement. A discussion group format for this portion of the treatment was selected due to the tendency of other more didactic parent education programs such as P.E.T., Adlerian, and Behavioral approaches to focus primarily on the child while excluding opportunities for parents to share their problems and perceptions with one another. The discussion group format allowed this focus on child behavior and parenting to be adapted to the fathers' background experiences, concerns, perceptions, etc., thus keeping the father as the primary focus. The 10-week program was designed to give roughly equivalent attention to all three categories of father involvement. The following is a list and description of the topics covered during the program.

1. Opening Group Session

The main goal of this first discussion group session is to give

the men a chance to introduce themselves and to get to know each other. For a discussion group format to be successful the participants must feel comfortable with the group and with its structure. Time is spent during this first session explaining the nature and goal of the program, along with the nature of the discussion group format. A big portion of the time is spent having each of the fathers share with the group reasons why they signed up for the program, and what they hope to get out of participation for themselves and their child.

2. Want-Ad for a Father

During this session the men brainstorm together as they attempt to write a newspaper want-ad to recruit a father for their own child. This process forces the fathers to step back and examine exactly what their conception of the "role of the father" is. Topics discussed for use in the ad include the duties and responsibilities of a father, the types of preparation necessary for fatherhood, the pay and benefits of fatherhood, time requirements, age and personality requirements, etc. This process forces the men to take time to evaluate their own perceptions of what they believe a father should be, and then compare these perceptions with their own parental situations. Issues are raised in this session that relate to all three categories of paternal involvement. For example, when discussing the duties of a father, the types of interactions fathers want to have (and are expected to have) with their children are brought up. Should it be all play, or a mixture of play and functional child care tasks?

These are Category I (Interaction) issues. The discussion of time requirements and constraints relate to Category II (Accessibility) issues. When discussing the types of preparation necessary for fatherhood and their responsibilities once they become fathers, Category III (Responsibility) issues are being addressed.

3. Educating Young Children

This session starts with a 25-minute PBS video presentation on educating young children. The tape presents two opposing viewpoints on how education should be handled for preschoolers (i.e., Glen Doman's "Better Baby Institute" approach vs. David Elkind's notion of the "Hurried Child" and the need for developmentally appropriate educational practices). This tape is very effective at presenting these two opposing viewpoints, and naturally leads to discussion as the fathers share their reactions. This session addresses Category III (Responsibility) issues as the fathers become aware of how young children learn and the reasons why they should take an active part in their children's learning and development. Category I (Interaction) issues are also addressed as the fathers discuss ways in which they can help foster and encourage their children's learning and development without putting unnecessary pressure or demands on them.

4. Sibling Rivalry

This session is geared to help the fathers examine the various

reasons for sibling rivalry. Strategies are discussed as to how parents can effectively handle these types of problems, as well as a discussion of why sibling rivalry occurs. The session also leads into a discussion of the problems involved when parents begin comparing their children; not only amongst their own, but with other children when in group situations. The main goal is to encourage the fathers to appreciate the unique individuality of their children, and to be aware of those things about the child they can and cannot change, and to know the differences. Category I (Interaction) issues are addressed as the fathers discuss how the ways they interact with their children can make them each feel special/unique, or how it can make them feel slighted or jealous of a sibling. Ways in which the fathers can step in to diffuse an intense rivalry situation (Category I issue) are also discussed. Category II (Accessibility) issues are being addressed as the fathers discuss the importance of spending "special" time with each child periodically rather than always trying to do things with all of the children together. As the fathers learn more about the importance of identifying the uniqueness of each child, and why not to compare children, they are addressing Category III (Responsibility) issues.

5. Super Hero/Fantasy Play

This session is based on a discussion of how parents can effectively counteract the violent nature and influence of Super Hero cartoons so prevalent on TV. This is done through examining the various types of super hero, fantasy and dramatic play

children exhibit. From this session the men become aware of the various types of learning and development that occur when children are engaged in fantasy and pretend play. Category I (Interaction) issues are addressed as the fathers discuss ways in which they can become involved in their children's pretend play, and how they can rechannel the violent super hero play into more positive forms through their involvement. Category III (Responsibility) issues are being addressed as the fathers discuss and learn more about why fantasy and pretend play is important for their children's development, and why they should create an environment that would encourage this type of play.

6. Ages & Stages of Development

This session is spent discussing the various types of behaviors that are normal for each developmental stage a child goes through. Although this usually happens in each discussion session regardless of the topic, it is the primary focus during this session. The goal is to help the fathers become aware that there are different types of behaviors at each developmental stage, and expectations for child behaviors need to be reflective of these differences. As the fathers learn about how each child develops at their own pace, and that parents need to become sensitive to the developmental needs of their children they are addressing Category III issues. As they discuss such things as developmentally appropriate ways to play and interact with their children (e.g., discussing why playing games with rules is appropriate for a 6 or 7-year old but not necessarily for a 2-year

10. Closing/Reflection

This last session is spent with the men reflecting back and sharing what they felt was most beneficial to them and their child from participating in the program. This session is also geared to allow for a discussion of the changing roles of fathers.

During the other hour of the treatment program the fathers and their children participated in structured and nonstructured preschool type activities. This portion of the treatment allowed the fathers to explore and discover different ways of interacting with their children, and to develop sensitivity to the needs of their children. A thematic approach was used during this portion of the program. Developmentally appropriate activities were selected each week that revolved around a theme and which fostered and encouraged the children's overall development (i.e., small and large motor manipulatives, language activities, math and science activities, music activities, dramatic play and block play, etc.). "Helping Hands" signs were displayed at each activity so the fathers would be aware of the various types of learning and development that might have been occurring with the child at each activity. These activities were also structured so as to encourage the fathers to actively participate in them with their children.

old), Category I issues are being addressed.

7. Discipline (2 weeks)

Discipline seems to be a very important topic for the fathers, so two weeks are devoted to this subject. The two sessions are geared to allow the fathers to discuss various aspects of discipline such as why do children misbehave, what is the difference between punishment and discipline, why do young children need and want limitations, what are some different discipline strategies (i.e., spanking, time-out, ignoring behavior, etc.), and so on. Category III issues are being addressed as the fathers discuss the reasons why it is important for both parents to play an active role in family discipline, rather than letting one spouse shoulder all of the responsibility. Category I issues are addressed as the fathers discuss how their own interactions (or lack thereof) and behaviors have a strong impact on their children's behavior.

9. Time Constraints/Role Strain of Fatherhood

This session is devoted to discussing the various factors that pull on a father as he becomes more involved in childrearing. Reasons why these role strains and pressures occur are discussed, as well as strategies on how to effectively deal with and overcome them. All three types of father involvement are addressed in this session.

PSOC

DAD'S DAY QUESTIONNAIRE - PART 1
(to be filled out by the father alone)

Social Security # (last 4 digits): _____

Please check the extent to which you agree or disagree for each of the following statements:

	1 Strongly Agree Agree	2 Agree	3 Not Sure	4 Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree
1. The problems of taking care of a child are easy to solve once you know how your actions affect your child, an understanding I have acquired.					
2. I meet my own personal expectations for expertise in caring for my child.					
3. A difficult problem in being a parent is not knowing whether you are doing a good job or a bad one.					
4. I would make a fine model for a new father to follow in order to learn what he would need to know in order to be a good parent.					
5. Even though being a parent could be rewarding, I am frustrated now while my child is young.					
6. I do not know why it is, but sometimes when I'm supposed to be in control, I feel more like the one being manipulated.					
7. My father was better prepared to be a good father than I am.					
8. Being a parent is manageable, and any problems are easily solved.					
9. Sometimes I feel like I'm not getting anything done.					
10. If anyone can find the answer to what is troubling my child, I am the one.					
11. Considering how long I've been a father, I feel thoroughly familiar with this role.					
12. I go to bed the same way I wake up in the morning - feeling I have not accomplished a whole lot.					

FATHER'S SKILL QUESTIONNAIRE - PART II
 (To be filled out by mother and father)
 A Study of Social Security Reports

	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
13. I honestly believe I have all the skills necessary to be a good father to my child.					
14. Being a good father is a reward in itself.					
15. My talents and interests are in other areas, not in being a parent.					
16. If being a father of a young child were only more interesting, I would be motivated to do a better job.					
17. Being a parent makes me tense and anxious.					

DAD'S DAY QUESTIONNAIRE - PART II
(to be filled out by mother and father)

Last 4 digits of Social Security Number: _____

The following items are about activities parents do with children. For each activity we would like to know what percent of the time each of you does the activity with your child alone, and what percent of the time the two of you do the activity together. We would also like you to tell us who remembers and plans or schedules (has responsibility) each activity, regardless of who actually ends up doing it. Again, it could be either or both of you.

EXAMPLE	0 - 20% of the time	20-40%	40-60%	60-80%	80-100% of the time	Responsi bility
Make child a snack.		✓				
a. Father alone	✓					H W B
b. Father & Mother			✓			
c. Mother alone						

	0 - 20% of the time	20-40%	40-60%	60-80%	80-100% of the time	Responsi bility
1. Take child to a birthday party.						
a. Father alone						H W B
b. Father & Mother						
c. Mother alone						
2. Take child to a doctor/dentist.						
a. Father alone						H W B
b. Father & Mother						
c. Mother alone						
3. Go to a conference with child's teacher.						
a. Father alone						H W B
b. Father & Mother						
c. Mother alone						
4. Supervise a part of morning routine, e.g. dressing, breakfast, etc.						
a. Father alone						H W B
b. Father & Mother						
c. Mother alone						

	0 - 20%	20-40%	40-60%	60-80%	80-100%	Responsi- bility
	of the time					
<hr/>						
5. Clean child's room.						
a. Father alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
b. Father & Mother	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	H W B
c. Mother alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
6. Spend special time at bedtime, e.g. read story.						
a. Father alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
b. Father & Mother	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	H W B
c. Mother alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
7. Take to or from regular lessons (not school).						
a. Father alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
b. Father & Mother	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	H W B
c. Mother alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
8. Buy child's clothes.						
a. Father alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
b. Father & Mother	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	H W B
c. Mother alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
9. Take child to a museum, park, etc.						
a. Father alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
b. Father & Mother	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	H W B
c. Mother alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
10. Supervise child's personal hygiene.						
a. Father alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
b. Father & Mother	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	H W B
c. Mother alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
11. Stay home or make arrange- ments for child care when child is sick.						
a. Father alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
b. Father & Mother	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	H W B
c. Mother alone	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	

ACCESSIBILITY/INTERACTION TIME CHART

Social Security # (last 4 digits): _____

Date: _____

Time	Accessibility Father Behaviors	Interactions	Accessibility Child Behaviors
AM			
5:30 - 5:45	_____	_____	_____
5:45 - 6:00	_____	_____	_____
6:00 - 6:15	_____	_____	_____
6:15 - 6:30	_____	_____	_____
6:30 - 6:45	_____	_____	_____
6:45 - 7:00	_____	_____	_____
7:00 - 7:15	_____	_____	_____
7:15 - 7:30	_____	_____	_____
7:30 - 7:45	_____	_____	_____
7:45 - 8:00	_____	_____	_____
8:00 - 8:15	_____	_____	_____
8:15 - 8:30	_____	_____	_____
8:30 - 8:45	_____	_____	_____
8:45 - 9:00	_____	_____	_____
9:00 - 9:15	_____	_____	_____
9:15 - 9:30	_____	_____	_____
9:30 - 9:45	_____	_____	_____
9:45 - 10:00	_____	_____	_____
10:00 - 10:15	_____	_____	_____
10:15 - 10:30	_____	_____	_____
10:30 - 10:45	_____	_____	_____
10:45 - 11:00	_____	_____	_____
11:00 - 11:15	_____	_____	_____
11:15 - 11:30	_____	_____	_____
11:30 - 11:45	_____	_____	_____
11:45 - 12:00	_____	_____	_____
PM			
12:00 - 12:15	_____	_____	_____
12:15 - 12:30	_____	_____	_____
12:30 - 12:45	_____	_____	_____
12:45 - 1:00	_____	_____	_____
1:00 - 1:15	_____	_____	_____
1:15 - 1:30	_____	_____	_____
1:30 - 1:45	_____	_____	_____
1:45 - 2:00	_____	_____	_____
2:00 - 2:15	_____	_____	_____
2:15 - 2:30	_____	_____	_____
2:30 - 2:45	_____	_____	_____
2:45 - 3:00	_____	_____	_____

(continued on back)

APPENDIX D

Letter of Consent to Participate

Time	Accessibility Father Behaviors	Interactions	Accessibility Child Behaviors
PM			
3:00 - 3:15	_____	_____	_____
3:15 - 3:30	_____	_____	_____
3:30 - 3:45	_____	_____	_____
3:45 - 4:00	_____	_____	_____
4:00 - 4:15	_____	_____	_____
4:15 - 4:30	_____	_____	_____
4:30 - 4:45	_____	_____	_____
4:45 - 5:00	_____	_____	_____
5:00 - 5:15	_____	_____	_____
5:15 - 5:30	_____	_____	_____
5:30 - 5:45	_____	_____	_____
5:45 - 6:00	_____	_____	_____
6:00 - 6:15	_____	_____	_____
6:15 - 6:30	_____	_____	_____
6:30 - 6:45	_____	_____	_____
6:45 - 7:00	_____	_____	_____
7:00 - 7:15	_____	_____	_____
7:15 - 7:30	_____	_____	_____
7:30 - 7:45	_____	_____	_____
7:45 - 8:00	_____	_____	_____
8:00 - 8:15	_____	_____	_____
8:15 - 8:30	_____	_____	_____
8:30 - 8:45	_____	_____	_____
8:45 - 9:00	_____	_____	_____
9:00 - 9:15	_____	_____	_____
9:15 - 9:30	_____	_____	_____
9:30 - 9:45	_____	_____	_____
9:45 - 10:00	_____	_____	_____
10:00 - 10:15	_____	_____	_____
10:15 - 10:30	_____	_____	_____
10:30 - 10:45	_____	_____	_____
10:45 - 11:00	_____	_____	_____
11:00 - 11:15	_____	_____	_____
11:15 - 11:30	_____	_____	_____
11:30 - 11:45	_____	_____	_____
11:45 - 12:00	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX D

Letter of Consent to Participate

LETTER OF CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

The goal of the ABC program has been developed for a number of reasons - the most important being to give children the opportunity to learn about "reading" from illustrations with their parents and with other children who share their interests in being actively involved readers. However, another valuable goal of the program is to provide data for the program director's studies of parenting to assist and professional educators who emphasize of parent education and support programs for fathers. The gathering of data includes observations, the taking of photographs, and parents responding to questionnaires and interviews. The research is being conducted under the permission for research involving human subjects. All data collection will be anonymous. Subjects in photographs used for articles, press presentations, etc. will also not be identified. Responses participating in the program do so with the understanding that at any time, they can withdraw from the data collection process, while still participating in the parent education/reading group program. A summary of the data collected will be provided to participants upon completion of analysis.

I have read the above statements relative to the data being collected and photographs being taken as part of the Let's Try program. I consent as my child

and myself as participants. I waive all rights that I have as claims for present or future in connection with publication or other showing of these pictures, regardless of whether such publication, exhibition, or other showing is under philanthropic, commercial, private ownership, institutional, and irrespective of whether a fee or remuneration or title is paid or charged.

I grant this consent to participate as a voluntary contribution to the interest of education and subject only to the condition that my child and myself will not be identified by name in the research or photographs.

(Father or Guardian)

(Date)



DAD'S DAY AT THE CYC PARTICIPATION CONSENT FORM

The Dad's Day at the CYC program has been developed for a number of reasons - the most important being to give fathers the opportunity to spend some "quality" time interacting with their children and with other men who share their interests in being actively involved dads. However, another valuable role of the program is to provide data for the program director's mission of stressing to public and professional audiences the importance of parent education and support programs for fathers. The gathering of data includes observations, the taking of photographs, and parents responding to questionnaires and interviews. This research is being conducted under the guidelines for research involving human subjects. All data collection will be anonymous. Subjects in photographs used for articles, slide presentations, etc. will also not be identified. Subjects participating in the program do so with the understanding that at any time, they can withdraw from the data collection portion, while still participating in the parent education/play group program. A summary of the data collected will be provided to participants upon completion of analyses.

I have read the above statements relative to the data being collected and photographs being taken as part of the Dad's Day program. I consent to my child:

_____ and myself to participate. I waive all rights that I have to claims for payment or royalties in connection with exhibition or other showing of these pictures, regardless of whether such exhibition, televising or other showing is under philanthropic, commercial, private ownership, institutional, and irrespective of whether a fee or admission or film rental is charged.

I grant this consent to participate as a voluntary contribution in the interest of education and subject only to the condition that my child and myself will not be identified by name in the research or photographs.

(Father or Guardian)

(Date)



REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M.D. (1979). Infant-mother attachment. American Psychologist, 34, 932-937.
- Andrews, S.R., Blumenthal, J.B., Johnson, D.L., Kahn, A.J., Ferguson, C.J., Lasater, R.M., Malone, P.E., & Wallace, D.B. (1982). The skills of mothering: A study of Parent Child Development Centers. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 47. (6, Serial No. 198).
- Barnett, R.C., & Baruch, G.K. (1987). Determinants of fathers' participation in family work. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49, 29-40.
- Baruch, G.K., & Barnett, R.C. (1981). Fathers' participation in the care of their preschool children. Sex Roles, 7, 1043-1055.
- Baruch, G.K., & Barnett, R.C. (1983). Correlates of fathers' participation in family work: A technical report. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, working paper #106.
- Baruch, G.K., & Barnett, R.C. (1986a). Fathers' participation in family work and children's sex-role attitudes. Child Development, 57, 1210-1223.
- Baruch, G.K., & Barnett, R.C. (1986b). Consequences of fathers' participation in family work: Parent's role strain and well being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 983-992.
- Belsky, J. (1979). Mother-father-infant interaction: A naturalistic observational study. Developmental Psychology, 15, 601-607.
- Berman, P.W., & Pedersen, F.A. (1987). Research on men's transitions

- to parenthood: An integrative discussion. In P.W. Berman & F.A. Pedersen (Eds.), Men's transitions to parenthood: Longitudinal studies of early family experience (pp. 217-242). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bolton, F.G. (1986). Today's father and the social services delivery system: A false promise. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The father's role: Applied perspectives (pp.429-441). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss. New York: Basic Books.
- Clarke-Stewart, K.A. (1978). And daddy makes three: The father's impact on mother and young child. Child Development, 49, 466-478.
- Cochran, M., & Henderson, C. (1985). Family matters: Evaluation of the Parental Empowerment program. Final report to the National Institute of Education. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Crandal, R. (1973). The measurement of self-esteem and related constructs. In J.P. Robinson & P.R. Shaver (Eds.), Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- DeFrain, J.D. (1977). Sexism in parenting manuals. Family Coordinator, 26, 245-251.
- DeFrain, J. (1979). Androgynous parents tell who they are and what they need. Family Coordinator, 28, 237-243.
- Dembo, M.H., Sweitzer, M., & Lawritzen, P. (1985). An evaluation of group parent education: Behavioral, P.E.T., and Adlerian programs. Review of Educational Research, 55, 155-200.
- Dickie, J.R. (1987). Interrelationships within the mother-father-infant triad. In P.W. Berman & F.A. Pedersen (Eds.), Men's transitions to parenthood: Longitudinal studies of early family

- experience (pp. 113-143). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dickie, J.R., & Gerber, S.C. (1980). Training in social competence: The effect on mothers, fathers, and infants. Child Development, 51, 1248-1251.
- DuPuy, H.L. (1973). The General Well-Being Schedule. In the National Center for Health Statistics, Plans and Operation of the Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, Vital and health Statistics. Public Health Service: Government Printing Office.
- Durrett, M.E., Otaki, M., & Richards, P. (1984). Attachment and the mother's perception of support from the father. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 7, 167-176.
- Easterbrooks, M.A., & Goldberg, W.A. (1984). Toddler development in the family: Impact of father involvement and parenting characteristics. Child Development, 55, 740-752.
- Ericksen, J.A., Yancey, W.L., & Ericksen, E.P. (1979). The division of family roles. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 301-313.
- Feldman, S.S., Nash, S.C., & Aschenbrenner, B.G. (1983). Antecedents of fathering. Child Development, 54, 1628-1636.
- Field, T. (1978). Interaction behaviors of primary versus secondary caretaker fathers. Developmental Psychology, 14, 183-184.
- Gibaud-Wallston, J., & Wandersman, L.P. (1978, Sept.). Development and utility of the Parenting Sense of Competence Scale. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.
- Gilbert, L.A., Hanson, G.R., & Davis, B. (1982). Perceptions of parental role responsibilities: Differences between mothers and fathers. Family Relations, 31, 261-269.

- Golinkoff, R.F., & Ames, G.J. (1979). A comparison of fathers' and mothers' speech with their young children. Child Development, 50, 28-32.
- Grossman, F.K., Pollack, W.S., & Golding, E. (1988). Fathers and children: Predicting the quality and quantity of fathering. Developmental Psychology, 24, 82-91.
- Jones, L.C. (1985). Father-infant relationships in the first year of life. In S.H. Hanson & F.W. Bozett (Eds.), Dimensions of Fatherhood (pp. 92-114). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Klinman, D.G. (1986). Fathers and the educational system. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The father's role: Applied perspectives (pp.413-428). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Klinman, D.G., & Vukelich, C. (1985). Mothers and fathers: Expectations for infants. Family Relations, 34, 305-313.
- Kotelchuck, M. (1976). The infants' relationship to the father: Experimental evidence. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The role of the father in child development (pp.329-344). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Lamb, M.E. (1978). Qualitative aspects of mother- and father-infant attachments. Infant Behavior and Development, 1, 265-275.
- Lamb, M.E. (1980). The development of parent-infant attachments in the first two years of life. In F.A. Pedersen (Ed.), The father-infant relationship: Observational studies in the family (pp.21-43). New York: Praeger.
- Lamb, M.E. (1981). Fathers and child development: An integrative overview. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The role of the father in child development (pp. 1-70). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lamb, M.E. (1986). The changing roles of fathers. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.),

- The father's role: Applied Perspectives (pp. 3-27). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lamb, M.E. (1987). The emergent American father. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The father's role: Cross-cultural perspectives (pp. 3-25). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lamb, M.E., Frodi, A.M., Hwang, C-P., & Frodi, M. (1982). Varying degrees of paternal involvement in infant care: Attitudinal and behavioral correlates. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development (pp. 117-137). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lamb, M.E., Hwang, C-P., Frodi, A.M., & Frodi, M. (1982). Security of mother- and father-infant attachment and its relation to sociability with strangers in traditional and nontraditional Swedish families. Infant Behavior and Development, 5, 355-367.
- Lamb, M.E., Pleck, J.H., & Levine, J.A. (1985). The role of the father in child development: The effects of increased paternal involvement. In B.B. Lahey & A.E. Kazdin (Eds.), Advances in clinical child psychology (Vol. 8, pp.229-266). New York: Plenum.
- Lamb, M.E., Pleck, J.H., & Levine, J.A. (1986). Effects of increased paternal involvement on children in two-parent families. In R.A. Lewis & R.E. Salt (Eds.), Men in families (pp. 141-158). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Lamb, M.E., Pleck, J.H., Charnov, E.L., & Levine, J.A. (1987). A biosocial perspective on paternal behavior and involvement. In J. B. Lancaster, J. Altman, A. Rossi, & L. Sherrod (Eds.), Parenting across the lifespan: Biosocial perspectives (pp. 111-142). Chicago.

- Levant, R.F. (1988). Education for fatherhood. In P. Bronstein and C.P. Cowan (Eds.), Fatherhood today: Men's changing role in the family (pp. 253-275). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Levant, R.F., & Doyle, G.F. (1983). An evaluation of a parent education program for fathers of school-aged children. Family Relations, 32, 29-37.
- Levant, R.F., Slattery, S.C., & Loiselle, J.E. (1987). Fathers' involvement in housework and child care with school-aged daughters. Family Relations, 36, 152-157.
- Manion, J. (1977). A study of fathers and infant caretaking. Birth and the Family Journal, 4, 174-179.
- McBride, B.A. (1988, April). Parent education for fathers: Its impact and effect. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- McGillicuddy-DeLisi, A.V. (1982). Parental beliefs about developmental processes. Human Development, 25, 192-200.
- McKenry, P.C., Price, S.J., Gordon, P.B., & Rudd, N.M. (1986). Characteristics of husbands' family work and wives' labor force involvement. In R.A. Lewis & R.E. Salt (Eds.), Men in families (pp. 78-83). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Mendes, H.A. (1976). Single fathers. The Family Coordinator, 25, 439-444.
- Minuchin, P. (1987). Schools, families, and the development of young children. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 2, 245-254.
- Model, S. (1981). Housework by husbands. Journal of Family Issues, 2, 225-237.
- Palkovitz, R. (1980). Predictors of involvement in first-time fathers.

Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 3603B-3604B A.

(University Microfilms NO. 8105035)

- Palkovitz, R. (1984). Parental attitudes and fathers' interactions with their 5-month-old infants. Developmental Psychology, 20, 1054-1060.
- Parke, R.D., & Sawin, D.B. (1980). The family in early infancy: Social interactional and attitudinal analyses. In F.A. Pedersen (Ed.), The father-infant relationship: Observational studies in the family setting (pp. 44-70). New York: Praeger.
- Parke, R.D., & Tinsley, B.R. (1981). The father's role in infancy: Determinants of involvement in caregiving and play. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The role of the father in child development (pp. 429-457). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Pedersen, F.A., & Robson, K.S. (1969). Father participation in infancy. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 39, 466-472.
- Pleck, J. (1982). Husbands' and wives' family work, paid work, and adjustment. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, working paper #95.
- Pleck, J.H. (1984). Working wives and family well-being. New York: Garland.
- Pleck, J.H. (1985). Working wives/working husbands. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Powell, D.R. (1986). Research in review: Parent education and support programs. Young Children, 41 (3), 47-53.
- Power, T.G. (1985). Mother- and father-infant play: A developmental analysis. Child Development, 56, 1514-1524.
- Radin, N. (1981). The role of the father in cognitive, academic, and

- intellectual development. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The role of the father in child development (pp. 379-427). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Radin, N. (1982). Primary caregiving and role-sharing fathers. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development (pp. 173-204). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Radin, N., & Goldsmith, R. (1985). Caregiving fathers of preschoolers: Four years later. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 31, 375-383.
- Radin, N., & Sagi, A. (1982). Childrearing fathers in intact families, II: Israel and the USA. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 28, 111-136.
- Reuter, M.W., & Biller, H.B. (1985). Perceived paternal nurturance-availability and personality adjustments among college males. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40, 339-342.
- Robinson, J. (1977). How Americans use time: A social-psychological analysis. New York: Praeger.
- Robinson, B.E., & Barret, R.L. (1986). The developing father: Emerging roles in contemporary society. New York: Guilford Press.
- Roopnarine, J.L., & Mounts, N.S. (1985). Mother-child and father-child play. Early Child Development and Care, 20, 157-169.
- Russell, G. (1978). The father's role and its relation to masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. Child Development, 49, 1174-1181.
- Russell, G. (1982a). Highly participant Australian fathers: Some preliminary findings. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 28, 137-156.
- Russell, G. (1982b). Shared-caregiving families: An Australian study. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development (pp. 139-171). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

- Russell, A., & Russell, G. (1982). Mother, father, and child beliefs about child development. The Journal of Psychology, 110, 297-306
- Russell, G., & Russell, A. (1987). Mother-child and father-child relationships in middle childhood. Child Development, 58, 1573-1585.
- Slaughter, D.T. (1983). Early intervention and its effects on maternal and child development. Monographs of the society for Research in Child Development, 48, (4, Serial No. 202).
- Sagi, A. (1982). Antecedents and consequences of various degrees of paternal involvement in child rearing: The Israeli Project. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development (pp. 205-232). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Smith, R.M., & Smith, C.W. (1981). Childrearing and single parent fathers. Family Relations, 30, 411-417.
- Tomlinson, P.S. (1987). Father involvement with first born infants: Interpersonal and situational factors. Pediatric Nursing, 13, 101-105.
- Weissbourd, B. (1983). The family support movement: Greater than the sum of its parts. Zero to Three, 4, 8-10.
- Wessman, A., & Ricks, D. (1966). Mood and personality. New York: Holt, Rinehold & Winston.