

## ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: NAVIGATING NEW NORMS OF INVOLVED FATHERHOOD: EMPLOYMENT, GENDER ATTITUDES, AND FATHER INVOLVEMENT IN AMERICAN FAMILIES

Brittany S. McGill, Doctor of Philosophy, 2011

Dissertation directed by: Associate Professor Joan Kahn  
Department of Sociology

In recent decades, gender roles have shifted toward greater overlap of men's and women's roles: women have entered the labor force in record numbers, while new norms of fatherhood emphasize men's involvement with their children in addition to their traditional role of financial provider. These "new fathers" are expected to be more equal partners in parenting, spending time nurturing children and performing both interactive and physical caregiving. However, men may face tension and conflict in attempting to fulfill their roles as both provider and involved father.

The primary tension lies in the conflict of time and place: while the "new father" role requires spending time with children, the "provider" and "good worker" roles require a commitment to spending time on the job. How do men navigate these contradictory roles? To what extent does employment impact men's involvement with their children? Are men with more egalitarian attitudes trading off longer work hours for more time with their children? This dissertation examines these questions using two waves of the Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID-CDS), which offer rich measures of father involvement, employment, and gender attitudes. Specifically, it examines the relationship between employment and father involvement,

and whether and how gender attitudes moderate that relationship. Statistical methods include cross-sectional and fixed effects OLS regressions.

Results indicate that nontraditional attitudes toward the father's role, "new father" attitudes, are associated with both engagement with children and responsibility for their care, particularly engagement in physical care. Attitudes toward public and private roles of women, on the other hand, are not related to father involvement. Results further suggest that the "provider"/"good worker" role prevails for men, much the way the nurturer role tends to prevail for women. Despite inelastic work hours, however, there may in fact be a cohort of "new fathers" whose behavior matches their attitudes, in that they are 1) more involved with their children than more traditional fathers, and 2) they are able to preserve time with children, likely by cutting back on leisure time or incorporating their children into their leisure time.

NAVIGATING NEW NORMS OF INVOLVED FATHERHOOD:  
EMPLOYMENT, GENDER ATTITUDES, AND  
FATHER INVOLVEMENT IN AMERICAN FAMILIES

By

Brittany S. McGill

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
2011

Advisory Committee:  
Associate Professor Joan Kahn, Chair  
Professor Frances Goldscheider  
Associate Professor Feinian Chen  
Professor Sandra Hofferth  
Assistant Professor Kris Marsh

© Copyright by  
Brittany S. McGill  
2011

## Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my children, Dawson and Dylan McGill. I am so grateful that you will never know life without involved fathering.

## Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank Joan Kahn for the mentorship she has provided me throughout my time at the University of Maryland. I am grateful for the guidance and support she and Fran Goldscheider have provided me throughout the dissertation process as my co-advisors. I would also like to thank Suzanne Bianchi, Feinian Chen, Sandra Hofferth, and Kris Marsh for serving on my dissertation committee and providing their time and insights to furthering this work. Next, I am grateful to Betsy Thorn, Cat Warner, and Sarah Kendig for their advice, encouragement, and moral support in getting through the dissertation process. Finally, this dissertation, and the degree more broadly, would not have been possible without the unfailing love and support of the involved “new father” of my own children, Brian McGill. Thank you for all you have done and continue to do for our family; this dissertation and degree are as much yours as mine.

## Table of Contents

Dedication.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vi
List of Appendices.....	vii
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2. Literature Review.....	7
“New Father” Norms: Nurturance, Involvement, and Provision.....	9
Employment and Father Involvement.....	12
Gender Ideology Matters.....	20
Contributions of the Current Study.....	27
Chapter 3. Research Design.....	29
Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	29
Data.....	31
Measures.....	34
Dependent variables: Father Involvement.....	34
Primary Independent Variable: Employment.....	36
Primary Independent Variable: Gender Attitudes.....	37
Control Variables.....	39
Missing Data.....	40
Analysis Plan.....	41
Chapter 4. The relationship between gender attitudes and father involvement: Are “new fathers” more involved with their children than more traditional dads?.....	44
Sample Selection and Description.....	45
Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	46
Results.....	48
Attitudes toward Men’s and Women’s Work and Family Roles.....	48
Bivariate Relationship between Attitudes and Father Involvement.....	49
Multivariate Relationship between Attitudes and Father Involvement.....	50
Discussion.....	53
Chapter 5. The relationship between employment and father involvement: Do “new father” attitudes matter?.....	57

Research Questions and Hypotheses .....	58
Results.....	59
“New Father” Attitudes and Work Hours.....	59
Work Hours and Father Involvement .....	61
Fathering Attitudes, Work Hours, and Father Involvement .....	64
Discussion.....	67
Chapter 6. Conclusion.....	71
Limitations .....	76
Further Research .....	77
References.....	102

## List of Tables

Table 4.1. Descriptive Statistics of Analytic Samples

Table 4.2. Cross-tabulation of Attitude Factors

Table 4.3. Bivariate Relationship between Attitudes, Work Hours, and Father Involvement

Table 4.4. Father Involvement with Resident Focal Child: Cross-sectional Models, 1997

Table 4.5. Father Involvement with Resident Focal Child: Fixed Effects Models, 1997 and 2002

Table 5.1. OLS Coefficients Predicting Fathers' Work Hours, by Father's Age: Cross-sectional Models 1997

Table 5.2. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement: Cross-sectional Models, 1997

Table 5.3. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement: Fixed Effects Models, 1997-2002

Table 5.4. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement Based on Work Hours and Fathering Attitudes: Cross-Sectional Models, 1997

Table 5.5. OLS Coefficients Showing the Effect of Fathers' Work Hours on Father Involvement by Fathering Attitudes: Cross-Sectional Models, 1997

Table 5.6. OLS Coefficients Showing the Effect of Fathers' Work Hours on Father Involvement by Fathering Attitudes: Fixed Effects Models, 1997 and 2002

Table 5.7. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement, by Fathering Attitudes: Fixed Effects Models, 1997 and 2002

## List of Appendices

Table A3.1. Comparison of Children in Analytic Sample (Respondents to Household Booklet) to Children in All Two-Parent Households with Complete Time Diary Data

Table A3.2: Gender Attitude Items in the PSID-CDS

Table A3.3. Change Over Time in Father Involvement, Employment, Attitudes, and Covariates: Fixed Effects Sample, 1997-2002

Table A4.1. Father Involvement with Resident Focal Child: Cross-sectional Models Run on Smaller Fixed Effects Sample of 1997 Data

Table A5.1. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement: Cross-sectional Models Run on Smaller Fixed Effects Sample of 1997 Data

Table A5.2. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement with Interactions between Work Hours and Fathering Attitudes: Cross-sectional Models, 1997

Table A5.3. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement with Interactions between Work Hours and Fathering Attitudes: Fixed Effects Models, 1997-2002

Table A5.4. OLS Coefficients Showing the Effect of Fathers' Work Hours on Father Involvement by Fathering Attitudes: Cross-sectional Models Run on Smaller Fixed Effects

Table A5.5. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement, by Fathering Attitudes: Cross-sectional Models, 1997

Table A5.6. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement with Interactions between Work Hours and Fathering Attitudes: Cross-sectional Models Run on Smaller Fixed Effects Sample of 1997 Data

## Chapter 1. Introduction

In the gender division of labor that began with men's move out of the domestic, agricultural economy, men were expected to provide for their families economically as breadwinners, while women's primary responsibility was the care of children and the home. However, in recent decades, gender roles have shifted toward greater overlap of men's and women's roles: women have entered the paid labor force in record numbers, while new norms of fatherhood now emphasize men's involvement with their children in addition to their traditional role of financial provider (Furstenberg 1988; Gerson 1993; Lamb 2000; Townsend 2002; Lamb and Tamis-LeMonda 2004; Wall and Arnold 2007).

These "new fathers" are expected to be more equal partners in parenting (and other household work), spending time nurturing children and performing both interactive and physical caregiving activities. Whereas much scholarly and popular interest has focused on how women have adapted to their roles in the public sphere, much less work has focused on men's experiences in the private sphere. And, in fact, many men may face great tension and conflict in attempting to fulfill their roles as both provider and involved father. This dissertation examines the relationship between men's employment and their involvement with their resident children and whether and how gender attitudes moderate that relationship.

The primary tension in the "new father" role lies in the conflict of time and place: whereas the "new father" role requires spending time with children, the provider and good worker roles require a commitment to spending time on the job (Kaufman and

Uhlenberg 2000; Ranson 2001; Townsend 2002). How do men navigate these contradictory roles? To what extent does employment impact men's involvement with their children? Are men with more egalitarian attitudes trading off longer work hours for more time—or more “quality” time—with their children?

Research shows that, in contrast to the wage *penalty* experienced by women, men receive a wage *premium* when becoming a parent. Moreover, men typically work more hours after they become fathers (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000; Yeung, Sandberg et al. 2001), consistent with the “provider role.” Some recent research, however, finds evidence that, despite this overall trend, a subgroup of men may be emerging who fit the “new father” description: younger men with more egalitarian gender attitudes who actually *decrease* their work hours when becoming a parent (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000).

This dissertation extends this line of research by exploring fathers' parenting behaviors, in order to determine whether, in fact, a cohort of more involved “new fathers” is really emerging. I use data from the 1997 and 2002 waves of the Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID-CDS), which offer rich measures of father involvement, employment, and gender attitudes. The longitudinal nature of these data allows the unique opportunity to address the endogeneity of decisions about work and family life and better assess a causal relationship, as much of the current research relies on cross-sectional data.

I hypothesize that fathers with “new father” attitudes—namely, more egalitarian attitudes towards men's and women's work and family roles and beliefs in the importance of involved fathering for children—will be more involved with their children:

they may spend more time with their children and share more equally in child care responsibilities with their partners. Similarly, they may take more responsibility for their children than more traditional fathers, such as by scheduling doctors' visits and making childcare decisions. I also hypothesize these fathers work fewer hours in order to spend more time with children. I anticipate that work hours and father involvement will be negatively related, consistent with the conflict of time and place between work and family, but that the relationship between work hours and father involvement will vary by fathering attitudes: whereas traditional fathers may work long hours and spend less time with their children than those who work fewer hours, "new fathers" will spend time with their children regardless of their work hours. In other words, longer work hours will have a weaker impact on the fathering behaviors of "new fathers" than traditional fathers.

Time use studies show some fathers sharing more equally in child care on the weekends, ostensibly when they are less constrained by employment (Yeung, Sandberg et al. 2001; Hook and Wolfe 2009). These studies do not, however, explicitly examine the gender attitudes of fathers and how those attitudes impact the relationship between employment and time with children. In particular, they do not examine attitudes toward the father's role specifically, as gender attitude items in surveys have nearly universally focused on women's roles. Nor do they tell us about other important aspects of father involvement, such as responsibility (Pleck and Masciadrelli 2004). This dissertation project seeks to fill this gap in the literature by examining the relationship between employment and father involvement, as measured by engagement and responsibility (Pleck and Masciadrelli 2004), and whether and how that relationship is moderated by gender attitudes. This project further contributes to the literature by examining richer

measures of gender attitudes than are found in most other studies and by improving assessments of causality through the use of longitudinal data rather than simply cross-sectional data.

We know a great deal about women's time in the workplace and at home, but men have been largely omitted from discussion of the intersections of work and family. This study will examine the other side of this "gender coin," enhancing our understanding of contemporary work and family life of American fathers. While recent research has found that a majority of young adults prefer a more egalitarian division of labor for balancing work and family life—and, in fact, gender flexibility in breadwinning and caretaking is key to family well-being—only a minority have successfully implemented such strategies (Gerson 2010). We also know that fathers' involvement at home has important benefits for the wellbeing of children (Harris, Furstenberg et al. 1998; Amato and Rivera 1999; Pleck and Masciadrelli 2004; Bronte-Tinkew, Carrano et al. 2008), families (Gerson 1993; Coltrane 1996; Gerson 2010), and for men themselves (Eggebeen and Knoester 2001; Schindler 2010). Understanding the experiences and characteristics of men who have more successfully navigated the challenge of balancing employment and involved fatherhood will offer important clues for how to promote paternal involvement among other men (Gerson 1993).

In the chapters that follow, I present a review of the research literature on this topic, a description of the research design and methods, and a discussion of my results and conclusions. Next, in chapter 2, I review the literature on the relationships between employment and father involvement, between gender attitudes and father involvement,

and the limited research on how gender attitudes may affect the relationship between employment and father involvement.

Chapter 3 describes my data and methods used in the analysis. I provide an overview of the PSID-CDS data and how I extracted my analytic sample of children living in two-parent households in 1997 and 2002 with nonmissing data on key variables. Next, I present my measures, including a discussion of the construction of my dependent variables, engagement and responsibility; my first primary independent variable, work hours; and my second primary independent variables, attitudes toward separate spheres of men and women, attitudes toward maternal employment, and attitudes toward the father's role. Finally, I describe my analysis plan, which includes cross-sectional OLS models using the 1997 data, and fixed effects models examining changes within, rather than across, fathers between 1997 and 2002 to better address the potentially confounding effects of unobserved heterogeneity on employment and parenting behaviors.

Chapters 4 and 5 are my results chapters. Chapter 4 addresses the relationship between gender attitudes and father involvement. This chapter first seeks to determine whether nontraditional attitudes toward the father's role align with nontraditional, more egalitarian attitudes toward other aspects of men's and women's work and family roles, specifically attitudes toward maternal employment and separate spheres of men and women. It then addresses whether "new fathers," as identified by nontraditional attitudes toward gender roles of men and women, are more involved with their resident children than more traditional fathers.

Chapter 5 turns to the relationship between employment and father involvement and whether fathering attitudes moderate that relationship. Since the previous chapter

finds that fathering attitudes are the most salient for father involvement, relative to other attitudes toward women's and men's work and family roles, this chapter focuses on fathering attitudes in its definition of "new fathers." First, it addresses whether "new fathers," as defined by nontraditional attitudes toward the father's role, work fewer hours than more traditional fathers. Then, it looks at whether work hours are related to father engagement and responsibility. Finally, it examines whether that fathering attitudes moderate that relationship, to address whether "new fathers" navigate the tensions of their work and family roles differently than more traditional fathers.

Finally, Chapter 6 discusses the conclusions and implications of this dissertation and suggests directions for further research in this area.

## Chapter 2. Literature Review

The social and economic landscape has changed dramatically in the U.S. in recent decades: declines in men's real wages; increases in women's paid labor force participation; increases in divorce, cohabitation, and nonmarital fertility; increases in inequality across family types. These trends have substantial repercussions for how men and women organize and manage work and family life. Some might argue women's public and private workloads have changed more dramatically, given their widespread participation in the public sphere in paid employment while retaining the lion's share of the household labor in the private sphere. The resistance of men to share equally in household labor has led to what has been termed the "stalled revolution" (Goldscheider 2000; Hochschild 1989).

Completing this revolution and closing the gender gap in the private sphere would require men to share more equally in both housework and parenting. Research shows that although men's participation in housework has increased over time, men are reluctant to close the gender gap completely (Shelton 2000; Bianchi and Raley 2005; Gerson 2010). More equally shared parenting between men and women may be relatively more promising, however. Not only does the normative climate support—and indeed expect—an involved, nurturing role of fathers, but men voice desires to be more involved with their children (Gerson 1993; Gerson 2010). In addition, attitudinal trends show increased support for more egalitarian work and family roles for men and women (Coltrane 1996; Gerson 2010).

Behavior change, however, lags behind attitudinal change (LaRossa 1988; Gerson 1993; Dermott 2008; Gerson 2010). While fathers' time with children has increased, mothers still shoulder the majority of child-rearing work (Sandberg and Hofferth 2001; Bianchi, Robinson et al. 2006). Due to the need to provide financially for their families, employment poses a major obstacle to closing the gap between men's desires to be more involved and the realization of those desires (Gerson 1993; Townsend 2002): like mothers, fathers must decide how to allocate their time between the workplace and their families and cannot be in both places at once. Whereas the work-family literature has typically focused on women's experiences, the conflict of time and place produces experiences of work-family conflict for men as well (Gerson 1993; Townsend 2002; Nomaguchi 2009; Gerson 2010). Similarly, evidence shows that fathers face increasing time pressures in recent years as well as mothers (Bittman 2004; Roxburgh 2006; Galinsky, Aumann et al. 2008). In fact, some evidence finds men's feelings of work-family conflict exceed that of women, especially among employed men in dual-earner families (Galinsky, Aumann et al. 2008).

While much of the current research finding evidence of work-family conflict among men utilizes qualitative approaches (Gerson 1993; Coltrane 1996; Townsend 2002; Gerson 2010; Harrington, Deusen et al. 2010), this dissertation complements this work by providing a quantitative look at the work and family experiences of U.S. fathers using nationally-representative, population-based data. In this chapter I will discuss what we know about the "new father" norms and the roles of employment and involvement; what is known about the relationship between employment and father involvement; and

why gender ideology may matter for understanding that relationship in the cultural context of “new father” norms.

*“New Father” Norms: Nurturance, Involvement, and Provision*

In contrast to the father of times past who was expected to mostly be an economic provider, as Coltrane (1996) states, “modern fathering is no longer just procreation and bill paying” (5). A new culture of fatherhood expects men to be more involved in the home as well as the workplace, involved with his children and a more equal partner to his wife or partner (Furstenberg 1988; LaRossa 1988; Goldscheider and Waite 1991; Coltrane 1996; Gerson 2010). The cultural image of the “new father” describes a father who is nurturing and warm with his children; who is actively involved in their routine physical care as well as the traditional play activities; and who emphasizes the emotional aspects of fathering, including understanding, listening, talking, and simply “being there” for his children. The “new father” values his role as a father, believes in the importance of this role for the wellbeing of his children, and feels competent in his nurturing and caretaking capabilities. These qualities represent an overlap with characteristics traditionally attributed to mothers, and as such, I anticipate that “new fathers” will also maintain egalitarian attitudes toward other work and family roles of men and women, as conventionally measured in most national surveys.

Some evidence shows these norms may be “catching on.” Fathers’ time with children has increased in recent years, including participation in the routine tasks of child care. There has also been a rise in nurturing fathers and in the belief that the nurturing and emotional bond is an integral part of the father-child relationship (LaRossa 1988;

Cohen 1993; Gerson 1993; Townsend 2002; Harrington, Deusen et al. 2010). Attitudinal trends show evidence reflective of “new father” norms as well, including an increase in more egalitarian attitudes toward the work and family roles of men and women and more favorable attitudes toward fathering and the importance of fathers in the lives of children (Coltrane 1996; Galinsky, Aumann et al. 2008; Gerson 2010). Finally, fathers voice desires to be more involved with their children than they currently are (Gerson 1993; Townsend 2002; Gerson 2010).

What then keeps men from being more involved with their children, if they desire greater involvement and believe in the importance of that involvement to their children? Research shows a gap between attitudes and behavior (LaRossa 1988; Gerson 1993; Dermott 2008). Through her interviews with men in the New York metropolitan area about work and family life, Gerson (1993) finds a “persistent gap between their desires and choices” (139), as they navigated various opportunities and constraints in work and family life. The conflicts between work and family spheres often lead to men privileging work over family, whether by choice or necessity. As Gerson (1993) writes, “economic inequalities between women and men underlay and reinforced cultural measures of manhood that stress work and earnings over parental dedication” (246). Indeed, despite the expectation of nurturing involvement with children, the cultural image of fathers maintains a central role of providers as well (Cohen 1993; Gerson 1993; Christiansen and Palkovitz 2001; Townsend 2002; Dermott 2008).

These tensions and conflicts within the “new father” role are similarly highlighted in Nicholas Townsend’s (2002) ethnographic work based on a small sample of men employed in Silicon Valley. For the fathers in his study, the “new fatherhood role”

encompasses emotional closeness, provision, protection, and endowment; but of these four elements, provision assumes preeminence and comes primarily from employment. Working to provide, however, is in direct conflict with other elements of the father role by keeping men away from their wives and children, and forcing men to negotiate these tensions (Ranson 2001; Townsend 2002). While the “new father” role requires spending time with children, the “good worker” role requires a commitment to spending time on the job (Ranson 2001). Thus, a role conflict emerges between work and family roles for men, not unlike the concept of role overload discussed in work-family literature (Perry-Jenkins, Repetti et al. 2000; Perry-Jenkins, Goldberg et al. 2007).

Whereas that literature often focuses on women’s experience of employment and parenting, in this case, new norms of involved, emotionally close fatherhood must be wrapped into the traditional provider roles of fathers. As Townsend (2002) describes, cultural and structural factors, such as the separation of work and home, the emphasis on men’s provision of financial support, and the lack of family-friendly policies and benefits from employers, all “work together to prevent the close and involved paternal involvement that is a conspicuous feature of discussions of fatherhood and caring” (137). Little attention has been paid in the broader research literature, however, to how men have navigated this transition into new norms of parenthood and the conflict between traditional and new roles (Gerson 1993; Ranson 2001). In the following section, I discuss what we know in the empirical literature about how employment affects father involvement.

### *Employment and Father Involvement*

The primary tension in the “new father” role lies in the conflict of time and place. The “nurturing” norm of fatherhood encourages fathers to spend time with children. Thus, those who adhere to these new norms of nurturing fatherhood may work less and spend more time with children than those who are more traditional. However, the “provider” element of the father role suggests fathers should exhibit a stronger commitment to work when they become fathers. This encourages fathers to spend less time at home, rather than more, since the provider and good worker roles require a commitment to spending time on the job (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000; Ranson 2001; Townsend 2002). Since, as discussed in the previous section, provision often assumes preeminence for men, one might expect time at work to win out over time with children, resulting in a negative relationship between work hours and father involvement.

So what does the research find regarding the relationship between work hours and father involvement? Overall, the answer is not much. Less attention has been paid to the relationship between employment and parenting for men than for women (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000; Russell and Hwang 2004; Crouter and McHale 2005), perhaps because employment is assumed among fathers: as Crouter and McHale (2005) write, “In comparison to the literature on maternal employment and work hours, less attention has been paid to fathers’ work hours and the implications for parenting, probably because paternal employment is often seen as a given; being the good provider is an integral part of being a husband and a father” (290).

The limited research available poses conflicting findings regarding the relationship of employment and fathering. One strain of this literature finds a negative

relationship. Townsend's (2002) ethnographic findings among his Silicon Valley fathers, for example, are consistent with work hours away from the home preventing close, involved fathering time inside the home. Other small, local samples of fathers have similarly found long work hours to be associated with less involvement with children (Bonney, Kelley et al. 1999; Gaunt 2006; Roeters, Lippe et al. 2009). Many empirical studies of larger, more representative samples find a negative relationship as well (Aldous, Mulligan et al. 1998; Yeung, Sandberg et al. 2001; Woldoff and Cina 2007; Hook and Wolfe 2009; Biggart and O'Brien 2010). In these studies, however, employment measures are typically just a control variable, rather than a focus of the study. Finally, Kaufman and Uhlenberg (2000) find that on the aggregate, fathers work more hours than men without children.

Other research, on the other hand, finds no relationship between employment and time with children (Marsiglio 1991; Deutsch, Lussier et al. 1993; Pleck 1997; Gauthier, Smeeding et al. 2004; Dermott 2006). Using the National Survey of Families and Households, Marsiglio (1991) finds that work hours of the father—and the mother, for that matter—are generally not related to paternal involvement with children. Others have found that paid work has minimal effect on both mothers' and fathers' time with children, as parents appear to preserve time with children by reducing leisure time (Bianchi 2000; Gauthier, Smeeding et al. 2004). Finally, an analysis of the British Household Panel Study finds that employment and parenthood are not related, with the exception of small decreases in work hours during the first year of a child's life; once you control for other factors, fathers' work hours are not all that different from non-fathers' work hours (Dermott 2006). In other words, "when average hours of employment for fathers and

non-fathers are compared, fathers emerge as working longer, but this ignores the fact that fathers and non-fathers differ in other respects as well as their parental status” (32).

What accounts for these mixed findings? Some evidence suggests that the *timing* of employment makes a difference for time with children. Research on nonstandard work schedules has shown us that children in families where one or both parents works a nonstandard work schedule spend more time with their fathers; often these families use a “tag-team” approach to meeting child care needs when parents work non-overlapping shifts (Deutsch 1999; Presser 2004). Yeung et al. (2001) look at the effect of paternal work hours (among other factors) on children’s time with parents in intact families, finding that fathers’ work hours are negatively related to time with children on weekdays but not weekends. They interpret this finding as evidence of “new fathers” on weekends, ostensibly when fathers’ time is less constrained by employment. Hook and Wolfe (2010) extend this research by controlling for work schedules, including measures of both shift and weekend/weekday work, and show that Yeung et al.’s (2001) estimate of weekend-weekday differences in fathers’ time with children may even be underestimated once timing of employment is taken into account.

It may also be the case that is it *relative* employment that matters rather than *absolute* employment. In other words, it is not the total hours worked or the total financial provision to the household that affects time spent engaging in child care, but the *relative* contribution of the mother and father to the provision for the household. Gender and economic theories draw on this line of thought to explain men’s contributions to housework. As such, they may be useful for explaining men’s contributions to child care as well.

“Doing gender” theories, for example, have been used to explain findings of a curvilinear effect of employment on men’s contributions to housework. These theories argue that since housework is considered “women’s work,” women perform their femininity by doing housework and men perform their masculinity by avoiding it (West and Zimmerman 1987). Overall, women’s absolute levels of housework are higher. Some research finds, however, that when husbands are economically dependent on their wives, the husbands do less housework, thereby symbolically enacting their gender (Brines 1994; Bittman, England et al. 2003).

Economic theories, on the other hand, stress earning power of individuals in the paid labor force. Traditionally, women have had lower earning power, so they have specialized in unpaid labor in the household, exchanging housework and child care for economic support from men (Blau, Ferber et al. 2006). As women’s returns to participation in the labor market have improved, less specialization would be expected. Other economic theories, however, emphasize relative resources and the bargaining power of partners to “buy” the household labor of their partner, or to “buy out” of their own share of household labor, based on earning power in the paid labor force. As one partner’s share of the household income increases, for example, one would expect his or her share of the housework to decrease. Research generally finds support for this explanation, except at higher levels of men’s economic dependency on women when trends support doing gender explanations (Brines 1994; Bittman, England et al. 2003).

These studies have focused on the housework component of unpaid household labor. With regard to the care of children, economic theories would predict that the partner providing proportionally less to the household income would perform a greater

share of the child care. Gender theories, on the other hand, would predict that—as child care is traditionally “women’s work”—women would maintain higher absolute and relative levels of child care time. Gender display approaches also suggest that fathers’ involvement will decrease when mothers work or earn more than fathers, thereby introducing nontraditional economic dependency (Hofferth and Goldscheider 2010).

These theories are only helpful, however, to the extent that involvement with children is *similar* to housework vis-à-vis men’s employment hours, and there may be important differences between men’s contributions to housework and child care (Ishii-Kuntz and Coltrane 1992; Deutsch, Lussier et al. 1993; Hynes and Greene 2009). Child care time is likely more desirable than housework, so even men not as involved in housework may be involved with children. Thus, I anticipate these theories to have relatively weaker explanatory power for understanding the relationship between employment and time with children. The type of activity with children may also matter: there is some evidence that fathers do more fun, interactive activities than physical care activities like bathing and feeding that are more similar to housework (Nock and Kingston 1988; Darling-Fisher and Tiedje 1990; Yeung, Sandberg et al. 2001). Thus, physical care activities may operate more like housework in the relationship with men’s employment than do fun, interactive activities.

While work hours are the focal aspect of employment in this study since they best capture the time/place conflict of provision and involvement, other aspects of employment are certainly relevant to father involvement and warrant mention, including the use of leave and other work-family policies, willingness to travel, work scheduling,

occupation, and provision of urgent child care. Among dual-earner couples, for example, Maume (2006; 2008) finds fathers' employment less responsive to child care needs than mothers: fathers are less likely than mothers to impose work restrictions, such as reducing work hours or refusing to travel, in order to tend to child care and other family needs. Brayfield (1995) similarly finds that mothers' work schedules have greater impact on child care than do fathers.'

Limited evidence suggests occupation or class may matter as well, with some types offering more support for fathers' accommodation of family needs, although results are mixed as to whether professional, managerial jobs are more or less constricting (Pleck and Masciadrelli 2004; Russell and Hwang 2004; Haas and Hwang 2009). Some research finds, for example that high-status professional or managerial employees work longer hours and perceive more workplace opposition to using family leave and are seen as less dispensable (Biggart and O'Brien 2010; Pleck and Masciadrelli 2004; Russell and Hwang 2004; Haas and Hwang 2009); yet, these are the employees most likely to take leave, perhaps because have more autonomy or flexibility, are more educated (and thus less traditional), and/or have wives with high-status jobs (Haas 2003; Biggart and O'Brien 2010). Haas and Hwang (2009) find that white-collar workers in Sweden received more formal and informal support for leave-taking than blue-collar workers. The research literature on this, however, is far from thorough and does not suggest a clear direction. Studies of occupation and family involvement have focused on use of parental leave typically around the birth of a child, but one might surmise the same patterns to be true for limiting or structuring one's regular work hours to accommodate family time.

Finally, formal and informal—and perceived or real—workplace barriers, such as “family unfriendly” work cultures or inflexible work hours or schedules, may be in place affecting fathers’ (and mothers’) decisions about work hours and time with their families (Russell and Hwang 2004; Kaufman et al. 2010; McKay and Doucet 2010). Overall, these findings are generally consistent with a dominant role of provision for fathers, similar to those focusing on work hours: fathers’ employment on the aggregate level appears resistant to child care demands, or at least relative to mothers’ employment.

Shifting focus from the independent to the dependent variable, variations in the definition of father involvement may influence findings as well and warrant mention. Father involvement is not just about the *quantity* of time spent with children. *Quality* of time also matters, and is often distinguished by what sorts of activities the parent engages in with his child(ren). Educational activities, such as reading to the child, are differentiated from routine care activities, such as feeding or dressing, or accessibility, where the parent is not directly engaged with the child. Research tends to find that even with the dramatic rise in women’s labor force participation, particularly for mothers of young children, parents’ time with children has not actually decreased (Bianchi 2000; Gauthier, Smeeding et al. 2004; Bianchi, Robinson et al. 2006). Parents appear very protective of the quality time spent with children, which decreases less than routine physical care, for example, when children spend time in nonparental care (Bittman, Craig et al. 2004). Although these studies more often have focused on mothers’ time with children, some find the same trends true for fathers’ time with children.

A further element of father involvement beyond time engaged with children concerns the responsibility a father takes for the care of his children. In Michael Lamb's oft-cited framework for understanding father involvement, the construct of responsibility entails the management of care of children, such as scheduling medical appointments and making decisions about child care (Lamb 2004; Pleck and Masciadrelli 2004). As mothers are typically considered the primary caregivers, even when fathers are involved, the responsibility construct arguably lines up most closely with gender egalitarian parenting of all the domains of father involvement. One might expect work constraints to prevent close involvement in child care decisions and other aspects of responsibility for men more so than women, given the emphasis on provision. Relatively less attention, however, has been paid to responsibility in the empirical research, likely due to limited data (Sandberg 1999; Pleck and Masciadrelli 2004). The current study makes an important contribution to the literature through the inclusion of measures of responsibility.

A final note on the relationship between employment and father involvement regards the endogeneity of decisions about work and family life: employment may constrain involvement with children, just as preferences about involvement with children may influence employment decisions. Either or both may be at play when understanding men's experiences of work and family life. Fixed effects models allow us to rule out the potentially confounding influences of unobserved characteristics—such as certain preferences—on employment and involvement, but they do not rule out the possibility of

bidirectionality, such that fathering behavior influences time spent at work, rather than simply work hours influencing fathering behavior.

### *Gender Ideology Matters*

While structural constraints such as work schedules and leave policies are important influences on father involvement, subjective factors such as gender ideology matter as well (Bonney, Kelley et al. 1999; Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000; Hofferth 2003; Bulanda 2004; Gerson 2010; Hofferth and Goldscheider 2010). It should not be surprising that values, beliefs, and attitudes about men's and women's roles in work and family life should influence how individuals allocate their work and family time. Nor should it be surprising that individuals with different attitudes about work and family roles, including the father role in particular, behave differently when it comes to work and family time. Gerson (1993) describes how these factors influence some individuals to act differently within the same structural constraints as others:

“Just as economic realities may exert pressure on families..., couples may negotiate arrangements that resist these trends, even if the parties involved are unaware of the way broad structural factors are shaping their opportunities. Some men, influenced by popular images of the new, nurturant father, may choose to express their identities as fathers over their occupational identities, irrespective of the financial consequences (80).”

As she notes, some men may be more apt to actively adopt the “new father” norms than others.

So, which fathers (if any) respond to the cultural images of the “newfather” and actively resist structural and other constraints to achieve it? Men with egalitarian attitudes toward work and family roles for men and women may be more likely to share both housework and parenting with their partner and similarly also value the involved fathering role. As such, this dissertation proposes two things: 1) fathers with relatively egalitarian gender attitudes will also believe in the value of involved fathers for children, and 2) it is these egalitarian fathers with “new father” attitudes who will also *behave* more similarly to “new fathers,” than those with more traditional beliefs about work and family roles.

Gerson’s (2010) recent ethnographic work on young adults finds that a majority of young adults prefer a more egalitarian division of labor for balancing work and family life, including housework tasks as well as child care. Many men in her study, for example, report wanting to be more involved with their children than their own fathers were, and they also voice preference for a more gender flexible arrangement of breadwinning and caretaking. This supports a notion of “new father” attitudes going hand in hand with egalitarian attitudes toward more conventionally measured work and family roles.

Other work, however, suggests that gender role attitudes may be more complex and multidimensional. Some have found, for example, that gender role attitudes vary by whether they focus on public roles (such as educational or employment roles) or private roles (such as those pertaining to division of labor in the home and the relationships between couples) (Goldscheider and Waite 1991; Willetts-Bloom and Nock 1994; King et al. 1997; Zuo 1997). Goldscheider and Waite (1991), for example, found in their

factor analyses of NLS data on young and mature women that two distinct factors could be discerned: one pertaining to work and one pertaining to family.

These sets of attitudes may be conceptually distinct, and egalitarianism along one dimension may be independent of views on the other dimension. Indeed, some research shows attitudes are more egalitarian toward gender roles in the public sphere, such as those pertaining to maternal employment, but less so toward gender roles in the private sphere (Anderson and Johnson 2003; Goldscheider et al. 2010; McDonald 2000).

Additionally, attitudes toward activities with children may be different from attitudes toward housework activities (Goldscheider et al. 2010). Men may be more inclined, for example, to share more responsibility for child care, an arguably more pleasurable activity than housework.

Most survey items about gender attitudes have focused on women's roles, whereas less is known about men's roles. Some have inferred roles about fathers based on mother's roles (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000) due to this data limitation. However, just as attitudes may vary regarding public and private sector roles, attitudes towards men's and women's roles may vary as well. Research on men's roles is quite limited, but a few sources suggest conflicting evidence. On the one hand, Gerson's (2010) work suggests that men's egalitarian attitudes toward breadwinning (often focused on women's roles in the labor force, for example) go hand in hand with men's roles in the home, particularly related to involved fathering. On the other hand, survey data on adolescent males suggests that attitudes toward male roles are conceptually distinct from attitudes toward female's roles (Pleck et al 1994). This work did not, however, address fathers' roles in particular. Wilcox (2004) also finds evidence of distinction between attitudes

about men's and women's roles: in his study of religion and family life, fundamentalist Christian men espouse traditional gender attitudes toward women's roles while simultaneously supporting an involved fathering role.

Turning to the link between gender attitudes and parenting behaviors, the research has been similarly scant (Roeters, Lippe et al. 2009), especially for fathers, but what is available tends to support a positive association between egalitarian gender attitudes and fathering. Data from the 1987 and 1992 waves of National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), for example, show greater involvement among fathers with egalitarian gender ideology in two-parent families (Aldous, Mulligan et al. 1998; Bulanda 2004); interestingly, mothers' gender ideology was not, however, found to be related to father involvement (Bulanda 2004). Similarly, Hofferth (2003) finds in more recent 1997 PSID-CDS data that fathers' egalitarian attitudes towards some aspects of gender roles are associated with greater father involvement: attitudes toward gender equity were significant, while attitudes toward marriage, traditional mothering, and individualism were not. A positive association between gender egalitarianism and father involvement with children is found in smaller, local or ethnographic samples as well (Palkovitz 1984; Deutsch, Lussier et al. 1993; Coltrane 1996; Bonney, Kelley et al. 1999; Seward, Yeatts et al. 2006). Many of these smaller studies contain much richer measures of gender attitudes than those found in the national data sets, a point I return to in more detail below.

In addition to the typical involvement measures of engagement and responsibility, some research shows men with nontraditional gender ideologies are more likely to take leaves, or longer leaves, following the birth of a child as well (Hyde, Essex et al. 1993;

Almqvist 2008; Lammi-Taskula 2008). Other studies, however, find that gender role attitudes are associated only with certain types of involvement but not others, such as offering praise and showing affection (Hofferth and Goldscheider 2010), or with reading and helping with homework for school-aged children (Marsiglio 1991).

Due to data limitations, most research on gender ideology, however, does not include measures of attitudes toward fathers' roles specifically, except a handful of studies based on smaller, less generalizable samples (Palkovitz 1984; Beitel and Parke 1998; Gaunt 2006). Beitel and Parke (1998) suggest, for example, that it may be the belief that the father's role is important that matters for father involvement, not gender attitudes in general, and data incorporating those beliefs are lacking. Consistent with this hypothesis, Gaunt (2006) finds in her small (n=209), local sample, that attitudes toward the father's role specifically are predictive of involvement with their very young children (6-36 months), whereas abstract gender ideologies are not related to involvement in child care. Thus, attitudes toward fathering may in fact operate independently of attitudes toward women's roles.

Further, many of the gender attitude measures typically found in major datasets are few in number and reflect only the role of the mother and not the father (Bulanda 2004). Hofferth (2003) provides the sole nationally representative study I could find that incorporates attitude items focused specifically on the father's role. Her findings are based on the Child Development Supplement to the 1997 Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID-CDS), and show that positive attitudes toward the father role are positively associated with both time spent with children and responsibility (Hofferth 2003).

Hofferth's (2003) study also illuminates how attitudes toward gender roles and fathering may operate in complex ways and may in fact not be complementary. Some fathers may value involved fathering and see that as important for the child's development, and thus be more involved with their children while simultaneously endorsing less egalitarian roles for men and women and not sharing the housework or supporting employment of women outside the home. Latino men, for example, are more likely to report involved fathering attitudes but have traditional attitudes toward gender equity (Hofferth 2003). Similarly, Wilcox (2004) finds that some men, in this case conservative Protestant men, espouse traditional gender attitudes but are more engaged with their children than men with nontraditional attitudes. Thus, it is important to incorporate attitudes specifically about the father role as well as more typical measures of attitudes toward men's and women's work and family roles.

While research has begun to address a link between gender ideology and father involvement, much less has examined the link between these attitudes and the relationship between employment and father involvement. It may be that fathers with attitudes favorable toward egalitarian gender roles and involved fatherhood are the ones most likely to resist employment constraints on involved, nurturant fatherhood, such as by cutting back work hours to spend more time with children in spite of the cultural emphasis on provision. Some limited evidence available does support this model of gender ideology moderating the relationship between employment and father involvement, as proposed by the current study. Most notably, Kaufman and Uhlenberg (2000), use the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) to examine work

hours before and after the transition to fatherhood. As discussed above, they find a positive relationship between parenthood status and work hours for men overall.

However, for younger men with more egalitarian attitudes, fatherhood is associated with a 9 hour/week *decrease* in work, whereas for traditional men, fatherhood is associated with an 11 hour/week *increase* in work hours. The authors suggest that younger men come from cohorts more likely to have grown up exposed to norms of “new fatherhood,” and those who also retain egalitarian attitudes are the ones more likely to trade off extra work hours for more family time after the birth of a child.

Hofferth and Goldscheider (2010) also show that attitudes toward gender affect the relationship between employment and fathering, but in a different pattern than found by Kaufman and Uhlenberg (2000). Their study of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (Young Adult Sample) examines *relative* work hours of mothers and fathers. They find that gender attitudes do not matter when the mother and father are both working, but traditional gender attitudes are associated with greater involvement when the father is not employed but the partner is employed (Hofferth and Goldscheider 2010). Thus, contrary to previous research, traditional gender attitudes, rather than nontraditional attitudes, appear to be linked to greater involvement in some cases. Further research is necessary to adjudicate among these mixed findings. One explanation for the divergence in findings, however, may be the variation in outcomes measured. Fathering behavior in Hofferth and Goldscheider’s (2010) study is limited to spanking, praise, affection, and reading to the child, which vary somewhat from involvement measures found in many other studies, which focus on other engagement and accessibility measures.

### *Contributions of the Current Study*

The current dissertation will help shed light on some of the mixed findings in the literature and contribute to our understanding of how employment relates to fathering behavior. Additionally, I examine how attitudes about men's and women's work and family roles influence both 1) father involvement, and 2) the relationship between employment and father involvement. Research in both these areas is lacking, particularly the latter. First, I expand the work of Kaufman and Uhlenberg (2000) by looking beyond the initial transition to parenthood, to examine how gender attitudes affect the relationship between employment and involvement with children during preschool- and school-ages.

I build on the works of both Kaufman and Uhlenberg (2000) and Hofferth and Goldscheider (2010) by using richer measures of gender attitudes as well as father involvement. The current data, the 1997 Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID-CDS), contain rich measures of father involvement, employment, and gender attitudes. With regard to father involvement, I examine engagement measures similar to those commonly found in research in this area: time spent with children and types of activities done with children. I also, however, examine the responsibility component of Lamb's model of father involvement, which entails the "the role father takes in making sure that the child is taken care of and arranging for resources to be available for the child (231)" (Pleck and Masciadrelli 2004). Measures of responsibility are rarely available, and hence this aspect of father involvement has been the least studied (Sandberg 1999; Pleck and Masciadrelli 2004).

Turning to gender attitudes, research on gender attitudes and father involvement based on population-based, generalizable samples is particularly lacking. Studies of smaller samples have offered rich measures of gender role attitudes, including measures of attitudes toward fathers' roles in particular, but their generalizability is limited. Studies of larger datasets offer generalizability to the larger population, but their measures have typically been much more limited, often based on only a handful of items typically focusing on the mother's work and family roles and not the father's. The PSID-CDS data are both nationally representative and include rich attitudinal measures: a set of twenty-nine items reflect attitudes about gender roles, marriage, and fathering. As such, the current research will provide a useful quantitative complement to the rich, qualitative work on men's work and family life.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, I offer a fixed effects approach to examining the relationships in question using two years of data, which constitutes a key improvement upon much of the research. The fixed effects component of this study examines within-father change, seeing how fathers and families adjust work and family time in response to changes in employment. This approach allows me to control for the potentially confounding influence of unobserved characteristics on work and family time. As such, I am better able to estimate causal direction in these relationships, in contrast to much of the current research literature on employment and father involvement that is based largely on cross-sectional data.

## Chapter 3. Research Design

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine whether and how fathers' employment affects involvement with their children, and whether gender attitudes moderate the employment-involvement relationship. The data for this analysis come from the first two waves of the 1997 Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics. These data offer the benefits of a longitudinal design and rich measures of employment, gender attitudes, and father involvement. In this chapter, I lay out the research design for this study. After first discussing my research questions and hypotheses, I then describe the data, measures, and analysis plan.

### *Research Questions and Hypotheses*

- 1. Are attitudes about the fathering role similar to attitudes about other aspects of men's and women's work and family roles, particularly those conventionally focused on women's roles?**

Hypothesis: I hypothesize that men with attitudes in favor of involved "new" fathering will also maintain egalitarian attitudes toward other work and family roles of men and women. Gender attitude measures in national surveys more

commonly focus on the roles of women, rather than men, such as whether it is okay for preschool-aged children if mothers are employed outside the home.

**2. Are fathers with “new father” attitudes more involved with their children?**

**In other words, do attitudes translate to behavior?**

Hypothesis: I expect to find that “new fathers” are indeed more involved with their resident children. Specifically, these men may not only spend more time with their children, but they will engage in more physical care of children (traditionally a female domain) as well as play/interactive care (a traditional component of fathering). Further, they will take more responsibility for children, also a traditionally female domain.

**3. Is the relationship between gender attitudes and father involvement association or causal?** In particular, do changes in attitudes over time predict changes in fathering behavior?

Hypothesis: I expect to find that the strength of the relationships between attitudes and behaviors will diminish, but that “new father” attitudes will remain a predictor of fathering behavior.

**4. Do attitudes toward the father’s role predict work hours?**

Hypothesis: Consistent with previous research (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000), fathers with “new father” attitudes will work fewer hours than those with more traditional attitudes.

**5. What is the relationship between employment and father involvement?**

Hypothesis: Work hours and father involvement will be negatively related, consistent with the conflict of time and place between work and family.

**6. Does the relationship between employment and father involvement vary by fathering attitudes?**

Hypothesis: The relationship between work hours and father involvement will vary by fathering attitudes: whereas traditional fathers may work long hours and spend less time with their children than those who work fewer hours, “new fathers” will spend time with their children regardless of their work hours. In other words, longer work hours will have a weaker impact on the fathering behaviors of “new fathers” than traditional fathers.

*Data*

This study uses data from the 1997 and 2002 Child Development Supplement (CDS) to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID). The PSID is a nationally representative study of women, men, and children and the families in which they reside and has been ongoing for more than forty years, collecting a wealth of economic data such as income, employment, and wealth, as well as social information such as marital and fertility information. In 1997, the Child Development Supplement collected data on up to two randomly selected children of PSID respondents, including data on children’s cognitive, behavioral, and physical health; parental investments of time and resources;

and children's time use, among others. Information was provided by primary caregivers, other caregivers, teachers or child care providers, and children themselves in both 1997 and 2002. The CDS constitutes a representative sample of 2,394 child households containing 3,563 children, and had an overall response rate of 88 percent (Hofferth, Davis-Kean et al. 1999). Children were aged 0 to 12 in the 1997 wave, and 5 to 19 in the 2002 wave.

The unit of analysis in the data is the child, although my hypotheses center on the fathers. The outcome of interest in this analysis, father involvement, is measured by children's time with fathers, both the quantity and quality, and the responsibility the father reports taking for that child. Thus, I measure the involvement of the father by the time and activities found in each child's time diary and by the responsibility items in the fathers' survey (usually the other caregiver's household questionnaire). Fathers' responsibility, as well as his attitudes about men's and women's work and family roles, are collected directly from the fathers and included on the file on each of his children's records. Since up to two children per father may be included in the file, I control for clustering within families when performing all multivariate analyses.

*Analytic Sample.* The analytic sample for this study includes both the 1997 and 2002 waves: cross-sectional analyses focus on 1997, while fixed effects analyses examine change between 1997 and 2002. The sample is first limited to those children who were the child of the head or wife in the main PSID file (91% of sample), in order to link the employment information in the main PSID file to the data in the CDS file. The cross-sectional sample then consists of the 1,139 children living in two-parent households, who completed the time diary and the household questionnaire where the gender attitude items

are located, and who have valid weights. The sample is limited to children in two-parent households since several models incorporate both mothers' and fathers' work hours and since there are too few single fathers to analyze separately.

The fixed effects sample consists of 526 of these children who additionally participated in the 2002 wave, completed the time diary and the father's household questionnaire in 2002, and for whom family structure remained intact between the two waves. In other words, both the mother and the father in 1997 are still living with the child in 2002 and are either married or cohabiting with each other. This limitation is to control for family structure over time, since family structure and employment are likely to be jointly determined, and to be able to assess couple-level employment characteristics. Sample sizes from different models vary due to differential numbers of missing values on dependent variables.

In both analytic samples, the largest proportion of cases was lost due to nonresponse on the other caregivers' household booklets, which contain the data on gender attitudes: 1,214 cases were lost due to this restriction in 1997. To illustrate how selective respondents are relative to the whole sample, analyses were conducted that compared the demographic and other descriptive characteristics of those who completed the household questionnaire to those who did not and then further examined the unweighted relationship between employment and father involvement for 1) everyone, and 2) just those who returned the household questionnaire.

Results for these analyses are found in Table A3.1 and indicate that, relative to the full sample of dual parent households who completed at least one time diary, respondents to the household questionnaire are more likely to have a college education or more, more

likely to be white, less likely to be black, and less likely to be in a household where both parents work fulltime. No differences emerged among fathers' work hours or fathers' engagement with their children.<sup>1</sup> Further, only one difference emerged when comparing the relationship between work hours and father engagement: work hours are significantly negatively related to time spent in play activities among the full sample, but this relationship does not quite meet the standard of significance among my analytic sample (results not shown). This may, however, be an artifact of the smaller sample size in my analytic sample relative to the whole sample. I conclude from this analysis that my findings regarding the relationship between employment, father involvement, and gender attitudes will be generalizable to the larger sample.

### *Measures*

#### Dependent variables: Father Involvement

Father involvement is the primary dependent variable construct of this analysis, which I operationalize by focusing on engagement and responsibility (Lamb 2004).

*Engagement.* I measure engagement using the child time diary. Time diaries are considered the most valid and reliable method of gathering information on the time use of parents and children, including how much time they spend together and in what activities they engage, as they suffer less from biases inherent in asking in a stylized fashion about time spent in a given activity (Hofferth, Davis-Kean et al. 1999). The CDS collected a time diary for each child for one weekday and one weekend day, and was completed by the child and/or the child's primary caregiver (usually the mother). The diary constitutes

---

<sup>1</sup> The responsibility scale is located in the household questionnaire and thus could not be included in the selectivity analysis.

a chronological report of the child's activities during a recent, specified 24-hour day, including what the child was doing, how long the activity occurred, what else they were doing if multiple activities occurred simultaneously, who else was present during each activity, and where the activity occurred. Thus, I can determine how much time in the day the child spent with his/her father and the specific activities in which they engaged.

My dependent variables include a continuous measure of the child's *overall engagement* with his or her father. Time spent in all activities in which the father participated is summed for this measure. Weekly estimates of overall engagement are then computed by multiplying weekday time by 5 and weekend day time by 2. I then compute time spent in specific types of activities, in order to differentiate between time spent in *routine physical care*, such as feeding, bathing, and diapering; *achievement-related activities*, such as reading to children and helping with homework; and *play activities*. This classification is consistent with categories used in previous research (Yeung, Sandberg et al. 2001; Hook and Wolfe 2010).

*Responsibility.* The second domain of father involvement I examine pertains to responsibility the father takes for the care of the child. As specified by Lamb's framework, this includes activities such as scheduling doctor appointments, making decisions about the care and schooling of the child, and purchasing clothing for the child when needed (Lamb 2004). I operationalize this measure with the responsibility scale used in Hofferth (2003), which encompasses physical care, discipline, choosing activities, clothes buying, transportation, selecting doctors and making appointments, selecting child care or school, and play activities. These items are located in the household booklet of the survey. Response categories for these items include: 1) I do this, 2) Another

household member does this, 3) I share this task, and 4) Someone else does this task. As done in Hofferth (2003), I recoded these to indicate the father does this task (coded 2), the father shares this task (coded 1), or everything else (coded 0). I then summed these recoded values, for a resulting scale ranging from 0 (least responsibility) to 16 (most responsibility). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale is 0.77.

### Primary Independent Variable: Employment

Employment constitutes the primary independent variable of interest in this study, and there are myriad ways to measure it. Work hours, however, are my main focus, as it most aptly captures the time and place conflict of the nurturer and provider roles. Thus, a continuous measure of total work hours per week is my main independent variable.

I also, however, examine the role of *relative* work hours by including dummy variables for relative work effort of fathers and mothers. As done in previous work (Hofferth and Goldscheider 2010), these variables indicate the mutually exclusive categories of: two full-time earners (both mother and father work 35+ hours per week), he works more than her, she works more than him, and neither work.

Occupation is also included as a control variable, as some evidence suggests professional or managerial occupation may be related to using family leave policies—and perhaps would similarly affect regular work hours—although findings are mixed regarding the direction of the effect.

Other aspects of employment besides work hours, relative work effort, and occupation are important but have not been included due to data limitations. These include work schedule and wages. We know from Harriet Presser's work and others, for

example, that work schedule is key for understanding parental time with children: in particular, fathers are more involved with children if one or both parents work a nonstandard work schedule (Presser 2004; Hook and Wolfe 2010). Unfortunately, it is not possible to obtain information on the work schedule of the father in the CDS.

Finally, absolute and/or relative wages reflect the returns to work and constitute an important measure of contribution to the household. Wages have been found to be significantly associated with father involvement in previous research (Yeung, Sandberg et al. 2001). However, since work hours best capture the time and place conflict of work and family for fathers, I focus on work hours as my primary measure of employment, while controlling for relative work effort and occupation in my models.

#### Primary Independent Variable: Gender Attitudes

The second independent variable construct in this analysis is fathers' attitudes toward men's and women's work and family roles. Interchangeably calling these attitudes as "gender attitudes" for brevity's sake, I am referring to attitudes about gender roles and gender equity, including the typically measured attitudinal items about mother's roles outside the home as well as less often measured attitudes about fathers' roles in the home and the value of father involvement for children. To measure this construct, I use a subset of the twenty-nine gender attitude items found in the household booklets completed by the primary and other caregivers, typically the mothers and fathers, respectively. These items reflect attitudes about gender roles, marriage attitudes, fathering attitudes, and one on spanking. See Table A3.2 for a complete list of these attitude items. The first twenty items reflect attitudes toward gender roles and marriage

that have been included in several other national surveys. The fathering items at the end stem from the “Being a Father” scale (Pleck 1997) and from the “Role of the Father” questionnaire (Palkovitz 1984), and are intended to tap the belief that the father role is important for children’s development (Hofferth, Davis-Kean et al. 1999; Hofferth 2003).

I first created a measure of pro-fathering attitudes by factor analyzing seven of the eight items from the “Being a Father” scale and the “Role of the Father” scale that were included in both the first and second waves of the PSID-CDS. Where necessary, items were reverse coded so that higher values reflect nontraditional attitudes toward the father’s role, namely that fathers should be heavily involved with their children and that fathers and mothers are similarly able to care for children. Examples of these items include: “A father should be as heavily involved in the care of his child as the mother,” and “Fathers play a central role in the child’s personality development.” This factor analysis resulted in a single factor, and the Cronbach’s alpha for this scale is 0.70 for the 1997 wave and 0.67 for the 2002 wave.

Of the other items, the items about spanking (“If children are seriously misbehaving it is best to spank them”) and about attitudes toward marriage (example, “Personal happiness is the primary goal in marriage,” “One sees so few good or happy marriages that one questions marriage as a way of life”) were excluded, as they do not reflect the intended construct of attitudes toward men’s and women’s work and family roles. In addition, five items were dropped that did not load well onto a single factor. The final factor analysis produced two factors with orthogonal rotation from the remaining nine items. A third factor was dropped due to weaker cohesion among items. The final two factors reflect attitudes about separate spheres for men and women (ex.

“There is some work that is men’s and some that is women’s and they should not be doing each other’s.”) and the effect of maternal employment on children (ex. “Preschool children are likely to suffer if their mother is employed”). The Cronbach’s alphas for these two factors are 0.79 and 0.77, respectively, for the 1997 wave. These scales were not replicated with the 2002 data, because several of the attitude items were not included in the 2002 questionnaire.

### Control Variables

In addition to the employment characteristics and gender attitudes discussed above, several other characteristics of fathers, children, and families may affect father involvement. Biological relationship between the father and child, for example, is shown to be an important determinant of involvement, with greater involvement with biological children relative to stepchildren (Marsiglio 1991; Cooksey and Fondell 1996). Hofferth and Anderson (2003), however, point out that controlling for background characteristics of the father diminishes differences in father involvement due to biological ties.. Some research also shows marital status to be important, with married fathers more involved than others (Hofferth and Anderson 2003; Hofferth, Cabrera et al. 2007).

In terms of other characteristics of fathers, some studies show that fathers from different race and ethnic groups exhibit differential levels of involvement (Marsiglio 1991; Cooksey and Fondell 1996; Hofferth and Anderson 2003; Hofferth 2003; Hofferth, Cabrera et al. 2007). Income and education level may be important as well, with more economically advantaged fathers exhibiting higher involvement levels (Harris and Morgan 1991; Cooksey and Fondell 1996; Roggman, Boyce et al. 2002; Hofferth 2003).

Finally, religiosity may be associated with greater father involvement as well (King 2003; Wilcox 2002; Wilcox 2004).

Turning to characteristics of the child(ren), Marsiglio (1991) finds that child characteristics are the strongest predictors of paternal involvement, relative to fathers' and wives'/partners' characteristics. In his and other studies, biological status, age, number, and gender composition of the child(ren) in the household are found to be related to father involvement. As discussed above, the presence in the household of children biologically related to the father is positively associated with father involvement (Marsiglio 1991; Cooksey and Fondell 1996; Hofferth, Cabrera et al. 2007). Younger and more children may be associated with lower levels of involvement in certain activities, since younger and/or more children may require greater caretaking time (Marsiglio 1991; Cooksey and Fondell 1996; Hofferth and Anderson 2003; Gibson-Davis 2008). Finally, several studies find that the presence of boys is associated with greater involvement by fathers (Harris and Morgan 1991; Marsiglio 1991; Cooksey and Fondell 1996; Harris, Furstenberg et al. 1998; Lundberg, McLanahan et al. 2005; Raley and Bianchi 2006).

### Missing Data

For key independent and control variables with small numbers of missing cases (less than ~5%), I impute data on continuous variables using means replacement. Values on dependent variables and categorical independent variables are not imputed. Five missing cases for race of the father were combined with the "other" race category, and one case with missing marital status was dropped from the sample. Dummy variables for

missing data on religious service attendance and occupation were included in all multivariate models to avoid listwise deletion on these variables.

### *Analysis Plan*

The first analytic chapter (Chapter 4) addresses the first three research questions. First, it examines whether attitudes about fathering roles are similar to other attitudes about men's and women's work and family roles, particularly those focused on women's roles, by examining bivariate cross-tabulations and correlations of the attitude factors.

Next, Chapter 4 examines whether fathers with more progressive views toward fathering (i.e., "new fathers") are more involved with their children than other fathers (research questions #2 and #3). In other words, do egalitarian, nontraditional attitudes translate into greater father involvement? This analysis includes both a cross-sectional and a longitudinal, fixed effects component to answer questions #2 and #3, respectively. Using the 1997 data, the cross-sectional analysis uses the three gender attitude factors—pro-fathering attitudes, attitudes toward separate spheres for men and women, and attitudes toward maternal employment—as the primary independent variables in multivariate regression analyses of father involvement. Separate models are run for total engagement time, types of engagement, and responsibility.

The fixed effects analysis uses both the 1997 and 2002 waves to examine whether a change in attitudes is associated with a change in father involvement. In other words, does father involvement over time look different for "new fathers" relative to other fathers? To answer this question, this analysis uses fixed effects models to look at within-person change in father involvement over time. Since these models compare

individuals' behavior to their own behavior over time, rather than comparing across individuals who may differ in unobserved ways, fixed effects models provide a better estimate of causality. The models control for fixed unobservable characteristics that may affect both attitudes and behaviors. Since fixed effects models examine change within the same person, only time-varying controls are included in the models. Characteristics such as race and ethnicity or biological relationship between the father and child, for example, do not change over time and are thus not included in the models.

The second analytic chapter (Chapter 5) examines the relationship between employment and father involvement and how gender attitudes affect that relationship (research questions #4-#6). First, cross-sectional analyses using the 1997 wave examine whether attitudes are related to work hours, to see if fathers with nontraditional attitudes work fewer hours than more traditional fathers (research question #4). I then examine the relationship between work hours and father involvement using multivariate OLS regression analysis, controlling for fathers' sociodemographic characteristics, mothers' and fathers' relative work effort, as well as characteristics of the focal child and other household children (research question #5). Finally, I examine these models separately by quartiles of the fathering attitude distribution to see whether the relationship between work hours and fathering behavior varies by "new father" attitudes (research question #6). Since the previous analyses show that fathering attitudes appear to be the most important influence on father involvement, relative to separate spheres and maternal employment attitudes, and since components of those attitude factors were not asked in both years, only fathering attitudes are included in the models in Chapter 5, rather than

the more comprehensive collection of attitudes toward men's and women's work and family roles.

Each of these analyses are also run using fixed effects models, using the 1997 and 2002 waves to look at within-person change in “new fathers” work hours and fathering behavior over time. Given the endogeneity about decisions about employment and child care time, these analyses examine whether a *change* in employment is associated with a *change* in father involvement.<sup>2</sup> These models improve upon estimates based on cross-sectional data by eliminating the influence of fixed unobservable characteristics that may influence decisions about both work and family time. They cannot, however, control for the reciprocal influences of work and family time. For example, while I am estimating the effect of work hours on time with children, these models cannot rule out the possibility that father involvement influences work hours.

Finally, all models are weighted and control for clustering within families, since up to two children from each household were sampled.

---

<sup>2</sup> The feasibility of fixed effects models requires there to be sufficient variation over time in the independent and dependent variables to model. The average change in dependent and independent variables between 1997 and 2002 is illustrated in Table A3.3 to show that there is indeed variation over time in these measures.

Chapter 4. The relationship between gender attitudes and father involvement: Are “new fathers” more involved with their children than more traditional dads?

Overall, this dissertation examines the conflict of time and place inherent in the “new father” role: while the “new father” role requires spending time with children, the provider and good worker roles require a commitment to spending time on the job. How do men navigate these contradictory roles? To what extent does employment affect men’s involvement with their children? Are men with more egalitarian attitudes trading off longer work hours for more time—or more “quality” time—with their children? Specifically, this research examines the relationship between fathers’ work hours and their involvement with resident children, as measured by engagement and responsibility, and whether and how that relationship is moderated by gender attitudes.

This chapter takes the first step in understanding these complex relationships by first examining whether attitudes toward men’s and women’s work and family roles are indeed related to father involvement. In other words, do attitudes translate to behavior? Gerson’s recent qualitative work, *The Unfinished Revolution*, finds that a majority of young adults prefer a more egalitarian division of labor for balancing work and family life. With respect to men’s parenting roles in particular, not only does the normative climate support—and indeed expect—an involved, nurturing role of fathers, but men voice desires to be more involved with their children (Gerson 1993; Gerson 2010). In addition, attitudinal trends show increased support for more egalitarian work and family

roles for men and women (Coltrane 1996; Gerson 2010; Zuo 1997; Zuo and Tang 2000). Some evidence, however, suggests that behavior change lags behind attitudinal change (LaRossa 1988; Gerson 1993; Dermott 2008; Gerson 2010). This chapter tests this relationship between gender attitudes and father involvement both cross-sectionally and using fixed effects models to better approximate a causal relationship.

### *Sample Selection and Description*

As discussed in the previous chapter, the analytic sample consists of children who are the child of the head or wife in the main PSID file; who were living in two-parent households; who completed a time diary and the father's household questionnaire; and who have valid weights. This amounts to 1,139 children in the cross-sectional 1997 data. A subset of 526 of these children who additionally had complete data for 2002 and who continued to reside with both parents constitutes the fixed effects sample.

As seen in Table 4.1, the vast majority of fathers of children in this sample are married rather than cohabiting (92%). More than half are aged 35 or older (64%) and have at least some college education (57%). Three quarters of fathers (77%) are white; one tenth are Latino; seven percent are black; and five percent are from other races, including Asian, Native Americans, and other groups too small in number to analyze separately. About one third (34%) of fathers attend religious services at least once a week, while nearly half (46%) attend services less than once a month.

Table 4.1 about here

Just over one third of fathers (36%) are employed in professional or managerial occupations, and the vast majority (91%) works at least fulltime hours, including

seventeen percent who work more than fifty hours per week. Only three percent of fathers do not currently work. Most mothers of children in this sample (72%) also currently work, and in forty percent of households both parents are employed fulltime.

The large majority of the children are biologically related to the resident father (94%), and more than half are school-aged, with only 16% one year or younger. The large majority of children (82%) live with at least one other child in the household.

Descriptive characteristics of children in the smaller fixed effects sample parallel those of the larger sample, with a few exceptions. Given the requirement that children continue to reside with both parents between the two years, it is not surprising that children in the fixed effects sample are more likely to live in married (as opposed to cohabiting) parent households and are more likely to live with their biological father. Their fathers are slightly less likely to be a race/ethnicity other than white, black, or Latino. Children were also somewhat more likely to be the only child in the household and less likely to live in a household with three or more children. Given these differences, cross-sectional models will be run on both the larger and smaller samples to understand the bias these differences may introduce to my estimates.

### *Research Questions and Hypotheses*

The research questions and hypotheses addressed in this chapter are as follows.

- 1. Are attitudes about fathering roles similar to other attitudes about men's and women's work and family roles, particularly those focused on women's roles?**

Hypothesis: I hypothesize that men with attitudes in favor of involved “new” fathering will also maintain egalitarian attitudes toward other work and family roles of men and women. Gender attitude measures in national surveys more commonly focus on the roles of women, rather than men, such as whether it is okay for preschool-aged children if mothers are employed outside the home.

**2. Are fathers with “new father” attitudes more involved with their children?**

**In other words, do attitudes translate to behavior?**

Hypothesis: I expect to find that “new fathers” are indeed more involved with their resident children. Specifically, these men may not only spend more time with their children, but they will engage in more physical care of children (traditionally a female domain) as well as play/interactive care (a traditional component of fathering). Further, they will take more responsibility for children, also a traditionally female domain.

**3. Is the relationship between gender attitudes and father involvement association or causal? In particular, do changes in attitudes over time predict changes in fathering behavior?**

Hypothesis: I expect to find that the strength of the relationships between attitudes and behaviors will diminish, but that “new father” attitudes will remain a predictor of fathering behavior.

## *Results*

This section addresses each of these research questions in turn. First, I describe the results of cross-tabulations and correlations examining whether nontraditional fathering attitudes are consistent with nontraditional attitudes toward other work and family roles of men and women (Table 4.2). Then I turn to the relationship between those attitudes and fathering behavior. Table 4.3 explores the bivariate relationships between attitudes, work hours, and father involvement, followed by Tables 4.4 and 4.5, which examine whether gender attitudes are significantly related to father involvement from a multivariate perspective.

### Attitudes toward Men's and Women's Work and Family Roles

To address whether fathering attitudes are consistent with other attitudes toward men's and women's work and family roles, Table 4.2 compares fathers' attitudes toward the fathering role to more conventional gender attitudes, including attitudes toward separate spheres for men and women and toward maternal employment. The bivariate cross-tabulation suggests that these three gender attitude factors are distinct and not strongly correlated. For example, only 20% of men with the most traditional (top quartile) attitudes toward fathering also have the most traditional attitudes about maternal employment. In fact, nearly a quarter of men (25%) with the most nontraditional fathering attitudes have the most traditional attitudes about mothers working, and about one fifth (22%) hold the most traditional values about men and women occupying separate spheres. Further, the weighted correlation coefficient for fathering and separate

spheres attitudes is significant ( $p < .0001$ ) but small ( $r = 0.12$ ), whereas fathering and maternal employment are not statistically significantly correlated.

[Table 4.2 about here]

### Bivariate Relationship between Attitudes and Father Involvement

Turning to the relationship between these attitudes, work hours, and fathering behaviors, Table 4.3 shows the bivariate relationship between the three attitude constructs and the father involvement measures. These bivariate results suggest little or no relationship between nontraditional attitudes and work hours, but a positive relationship between nontraditional attitudes and father involvement. There is no significant difference in the mean hours worked across quartiles of gender attitudes (everyone works an average of 43-45 hours per week). Nontraditional attitudes, however, are significantly positively associated with each measure of father involvement, including both engagement and responsibility measures. Fathers with nontraditional attitudes toward fathering, for example, spend an average of 17.3 hours per week with the focal child, compared to 13.9 hours among fathers with the most traditional fathering attitudes ( $p < 0.001$ ). Fathers with nontraditional attitudes also engage in more physical care, play, and achievement-related activities with their children than more traditional fathers. Further, they take significantly more responsibility for the care of their children.

[Table 4.3 about here]

These patterns appear especially strong for attitudes toward involved fatherhood and are relatively weaker for attitudes toward separate spheres for men and women and toward maternal employment. That attitudes about the importance of fathers'

involvement in children's lives are most closely related to what fathers actually do with and for their children should not be surprising. In contrast, attitudes pertaining more to mothers' roles may have less to do with what fathers do with their children. Since, as seen in Table 4.2, separate spheres and maternal employment attitudes are less consistent with fathering attitudes than anticipated, it is not surprising that these attitudes do not appear to be as strongly correlated with fathering behavior.

#### Multivariate Relationship between Attitudes and Father Involvement

These patterns, however, may be the result of other sociodemographic characteristics associated with both attitudes and father involvement. Table 4.4 presents multivariate models predicting father involvement based on gender attitudes, controlling for various characteristics of the father and the child and maternal employment. These results confirm the bivariate findings: fathering attitudes are significantly associated with greater father involvement, both in terms of engagement and responsibility, even after controlling for a wide range of covariates. Nontraditional fathering attitudes are associated with significantly greater overall engagement ( $p < 0.05$ ); time spent in physical care, such as feeding and bathing ( $p < 0.01$ ); time spent in achievement-related activities such as reading to and helping with homework ( $p < 0.05$ ); and responsibility taken for the management of care for the child ( $p < 0.001$ ). These "new father" attitudes are not significantly related to time spent in play activities.

[Table 4.4 about here]

The other two domains of gender attitudes—those pertaining largely to women's roles—show minimal to no relationship, however, with father involvement.

Nontraditional attitudes toward separate spheres for men and women are marginally positively associated with engagement in physical care ( $p < 0.10$ ) and achievement-related activities ( $p < 0.10$ ), while maternal employment attitudes are not significantly related to father involvement.

Some degree of collinearity between fathering attitudes and separate spheres attitudes, however, may be at play. When included in the models without the other two attitudinal constructs, attitudes toward separate spheres for men and women are significantly positively related to time spent in physical care ( $p < 0.05$ ) and achievement-related activities ( $p < 0.05$ ), and may be related to overall engagement time ( $p < 0.10$ ) (results not shown). When included in the models together, however, the effects of fathering attitudes tend to dominate.

Effects of the covariates on father involvement vary. Married men may be more engaged than cohabiting fathers overall ( $p < 0.10$ ) and in play activities ( $p < 0.10$ ). Age of fathers is negatively related to responsibility ( $p < 0.05$ ), but not engagement. Latino fathers ( $p < 0.001$ ) and fathers of “other” races ( $p < 0.05$ ) take significantly more responsibility for resident children, relative to white fathers, and fathers who attend religious services frequently spend more time overall ( $p < 0.05$ ) and take more responsibility ( $p < 0.05$ ) than those who do not attend services frequently. Interestingly, maternal employment is not related to father involvement. Compared with stepfathers, biological fathers are significantly more engaged with their children overall ( $p < 0.05$ ) and in physical care ( $p < 0.05$ ) and achievement activities ( $p < 0.001$ ). Fathers of preschool-aged children spend more time with them overall ( $p < 0.05$ ) and in achievement-related activities ( $p < 0.001$ ), relative to infants. On the other hand, fathers of school-aged

children spend less time than fathers of infants in play activities, but more time in achievement-related activities ( $p < 0.01$ ). Finally, engagement time with the focal child decreases as the number of children in the household increases, both overall ( $p < 0.001$ ) and in play activities ( $p < 0.01$ ).

[Table 4.5 about here]

Table 4.5 displays results from fixed effects models of these relationships, and shows that the effects, although generally in the same direction, weaken and in some cases lose significance. The positive effect of fathering attitudes on physical care remains significant ( $p < 0.05$ ), and the effect on total engagement remains marginally significant ( $p < 0.10$ ). These results compare within families, rather than across families, in effect controlling for the unobservable characteristics that plague cross-sectional research. As such, they suggest that holding “new father” attitudes may be causally related to higher levels of involvement in physical care of children and overall time spent with them. The fixed effects analyses do not include the separate spheres and maternal employment attitude factors, as some of the attitudinal items included in them were not asked in the 2002 wave, and the factors could therefore not be constructed for both years.

While the analytic sample for the fixed effects models is smaller, it is not likely that the differences in estimates are due merely to differences in the sample size or characteristics. Identical cross-sectional models run on the smaller, fixed effect sample produce similar results to those on the full cross-sectional sample. These results are shown in Table A4.1. In these models, pro-fathering attitudes remain significantly positively related to all measure of father involvement at least at the 10% level, except for time spent in play activities, despite the substantially smaller sample sizes.

The results in Table A4.1 do, however, provide some evidence that in this smaller, more select sample, nontraditional attitudes about separate spheres for men and women may be positively related to father engagement overall ( $p < 0.05$ ), and possibly in physical care ( $p < 0.10$ ) and play activities ( $p < 0.10$ ). In addition, counter to expectation, nontraditional attitudes toward maternal employment are negatively related to time spent in achievement-related activities ( $p < 0.05$ ). These deviations from the results in Table 4 suggest that whereas “new father” attitudes may influence father involvement among all dads in two-parent families, other gender attitudes may play a role in father involvement among this smaller, more select sample characterized by relatively stable family structure.

### *Discussion*

As discussed in Chapter 2, the cultural image of the “new father” describes a father who is nurturing and warm with his children; who is actively involved in their routine physical care as well as the traditional play activities; and who emphasizes the emotional aspects of fathering, including understanding, listening, talking, and simply “being there” for his children. Because these qualities represent an overlap with characteristics traditionally attributed to mothers, I anticipated finding that men with attitudes in favor of involved fathering would also maintain egalitarian attitudes toward other work and family roles of men and women, such as those pertaining to employment of mothers and whether men and women should occupy separate spheres. This hypothesis reflected Gerson’s (2010) findings of young adult men favoring egalitarian

sharing of breadwinning and caretaking and desiring greater involvement with their children than experienced in previous generations.

Contrary to this expectation, however, men's attitudes toward the "new fathering" role are not consistent with nontraditional attitudes toward maternal employment and separate spheres for men and women. These findings suggest that some men may be more "enlightened" about their own roles in the private sphere than about mothers' roles in the public sphere and are reminiscent of research suggesting that attitudes toward men's and women's roles are distinct concepts (Pleck et al. 1997; Wilcox 2004). In the public-private dichotomy, maternal employment attitudes reflect the public roles of women, while separate spheres and fathering attitudes most closely line up with the private roles of women and men, respectively. The lack of significant correlation between fathering and maternal employment attitudes suggests that attitudes toward the public role of women and private role of men are distinct. Attitudes toward the private sphere roles of women and men, however, may be somewhat more similar, judging by the slight correlation between the two factors, but are still fairly different. Thus, just as egalitarian views of women's public sphere roles do not necessarily imply egalitarian views of women's private sphere roles (Anderson and Johnson 2003; Goldscheider and Waite 1991; Goldscheider et al. 2010; King et al. 1997; Zuo 1997), these findings suggest that egalitarian views of parenting—particularly involved fathering attitudes—do not necessarily occur in conjunction with egalitarian views of women's roles in the public sphere. Finally, this also suggests that these different attitudinal constructs—attitudes toward involved fathering, maternal employment, and separate spheres for men and

women—may operate independently, rather than similarly, in their relationship with father involvement behaviors.

My second hypothesis was that “new fathers,” as identified by nontraditional attitudes toward men’s and women’s work and family roles, would be more involved with their resident children. Specifically, these men would not only spend more time overall with their children, but these men would engage in more physical care of children (traditionally female tasks) as well as interactive care, and would take more responsibility for children. Bivariate results suggest that this is indeed the case: whereas no significant relationship is discernible between attitudes and work hours, almost all measures of father involvement vary significantly by the three gender attitude factors, with more nontraditional attitudes associated with greater overall time with children; more engagement in physical care and achievement-related activities; and greater responsibility taken for children. It is perhaps not surprising that play activities do not vary significantly by fathering attitudes, as play has always been part of the father’s role.

Multivariate analyses of these relationships indicated that it is nontraditional attitudes towards fathering—those supporting an involved, hands-on role for fathers—that matter for father involvement, whereas attitudes toward other aspects of work and family roles appear less important. This suggests that “new father” attitudes do translate to behavior, but that fathering attitudes are the key element, not the broader attitudes about gender, including those pertaining more to women’s roles. These findings confirm those previously found in research based on smaller, ethnographic samples (Beitel and Park 1996, Gaunt 2006).

The fixed effects findings, however, suggest that many of these relationships are *not* causal by eliminating the potentially confounding effects of fixed unobservable characteristics over time. When examining change over time *within* fathers, rather than *across* fathers, fathering attitudes remain significant only in the case of physical care ( $p < 0.05$ ) and marginally significant in the case of overall engagement ( $p < 0.10$ ). These results are nonetheless encouraging in the context of the gender revolution, since physical care activities have typically been the domain of mothers.

The significant cross-sectional associations observed for other outcomes, however, may be a result of unobserved characteristics influencing both attitudes and fathering behavior. It may be, for example, that fathers who are more family-oriented are both more involved with their children and have pro-fathering, egalitarian attitudes. Without controlling for this unobserved heterogeneity, estimates of these relationships can be misleading, a finding which constitutes an important contribution to the research literature which has otherwise largely relied on cross-sectional data.

Having established there is a significant relationship between “new father” attitudes and fathering behavior, the next chapter turns to whether these attitudes influence employment and the relationship between employment and father involvement.

## Chapter 5. The relationship between employment and father involvement:

### Do “new father” attitudes matter?

As discussed previously, this dissertation examines the relationship between fathers' work hours and father involvement with resident children, as measured by engagement and responsibility, and whether and how that relationship varies by gender attitudes. The previous chapter showed that nontraditional attitudes toward the fathering role are associated with greater father engagement and responsibility and may be causally related to total time with children and time spent in physical care activities. The current chapter focuses on the relationship between *work hours* and father involvement. First, I test whether fathering attitudes are related to work hours to see if the employment behavior of “new fathers” differs from that of more traditional fathers. In this chapter I focus on fathering attitudes rather than broader gender attitudes, since the previous chapter found the latter to be unrelated to father involvement. I then look at the relationship between employment and father involvement to see whether and how work hours influence fathering behaviors. Finally, I examine whether the relationship between work hours and father involvement differs for fathers with more or less traditional fathering attitudes.

Previous research tends to find that work hours are negatively related to father involvement. This pattern is not surprising in light of the “provider” role of fathering: to provide for one's family requires spending time on the job, which means time away from home and one's children. The “new father” role, however, also dictates a hands-on, nurturing role to fathering. This definition of the parental role requires spending time

with children, thus establishing a conflict of time and place in the father's roles of "provider" and "nurturer," similar to that experienced by women. Some research finds evidence of younger men with egalitarian gender attitudes working fewer hours when they become parents, consistent with the "new father" role, despite the overall negative relationship found between work hours and parenthood status (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000). The current study extends this research to look beyond the transition to parenthood to examine fathering behaviors while their children are growing up. In addition to looking at different forms of engagement, this study also considers the seldom tapped construct of responsibility for planning the child's day-to-day life.

### *Research Questions and Hypotheses*

The research questions and hypotheses addressed in this chapter are as follows.

1. **Do attitudes toward the father's role predict work hours?**

Hypothesis: Consistent with previous research (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000), fathers with "new father" attitudes will work fewer hours than those with more traditional attitudes.

2. **What is the relationship between employment and father involvement?**

Hypothesis: Work hours and father involvement will be negatively related, consistent with the conflict of time and place between work and family.

3. **Does the relationship between employment and father involvement vary by fathering attitudes?**

Hypothesis: The relationship between work hours and father involvement will vary by fathering attitudes: whereas traditional fathers may work long hours and spend less time with their children than those who work fewer hours, “new fathers” will spend time with their children regardless of their work hours. In other words, longer work hours would have a weaker impact on the fathering behaviors of “new fathers” than traditional fathers. Presumably, they will take time for some of their additional work hours not just from parenting but from other productive activities like volunteering or networking and/or from leisure (or sleep).

*Results*

This section addresses each of these research questions in turn. First, I describe the results of models examining the relationship between work hours and fathering attitudes (Table 5.1). Then I turn to the relationship between work hours and fathering behavior. Tables 5.2 and 5.3 examine whether work hours are significantly related to father involvement, controlling for other factors. Tables 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6 extend these analyses to see whether these relationships differ between fathers with nontraditional attitudes toward the father’s role (“new fathers”) and relatively traditional attitudes.

“New Father” Attitudes and Work Hours

While the goal of this analysis is to understand how work hours and fathering attitudes influence father involvement, it is important to see first how attitudes and other correlates are related to work hours. In contrast to the relationship between attitudes and fathering behavior, “new father” attitudes do not appear to be strongly correlated with work hours. Table 4.3 shows the mean work hours by attitude quartile as well as the bivariate relationship between fathering attitude quartiles and work hours. There are no statistically significant differences in mean work hours by fathering attitude quartiles. The distributions on work hours appear similar by fathering attitudes as well, with the exception of slightly more traditional dads in the not employed category and slightly fewer in the part-time category, relative to fathers with average or more nontraditional fathering attitudes. The multivariate results in Table 5.1 confirm these findings: in the overall sample, the continuous measure of fathering attitudes is not significantly related to fathers’ work hours, controlling for sociodemographic characteristics of the father, household, and focal child.

[Table 5.1 about here]

Since I anticipated younger fathers would be more likely than older fathers to have grown up with more gender egalitarian expectations for work and family life, and perhaps be more likely to successfully translate attitudes into behavior, I also ran these results separately by father’s age, as shown in Table 5.1. As found in previous work (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000), these results show some evidence ( $p < 0.10$ ) that fathering attitudes are significantly negatively related to fathers’ work hours among younger fathers, but not older fathers. In other words, younger fathers with “new father” attitudes appear to work marginally fewer hours per week than fathers with more

traditional attitudes toward the father role. This age difference in the effect of attitudes on work hours, however, is not statistically significant, according to an interaction term analysis on the full sample (results not shown).

The results in Table 5.1 also indicate that married fathers work more hours than cohabiting fathers ( $p < 0.05$ ), particularly among fathers aged 35 and younger ( $p < 0.05$ ). Regardless of age, black fathers work significantly fewer hours than white fathers ( $p < 0.05$ ), and fathers in professional or managerial occupations work significantly more hours than those in other occupations ( $p < 0.001$ ). Finally, fathers in households where the mother is employed may work fewer hours compared to those with nonemployed mothers ( $p < 0.10$ ), particularly among younger fathers ( $p < 0.10$ ).

### Work Hours and Father Involvement

Turning to the relationship between work hours and fathering behavior, Table 5.2 shows results from cross-sectional models predicting the five father involvement measures as a function of fathers' work hours and other covariates. These results suggest a weak, negative relationship between work hours and overall father engagement ( $p < 0.10$ ). Work hours have a small but significant, negative effect on time spent on physical care activities, such as bathing, dressing, and feeding children ( $p < 0.01$ ), but no significant relationship with engagement in play or achievement-related activities or with responsibility. These findings suggest that time spent at work does not influence the time fathers engage with their children in play and achievement activities or the extent to which they take responsibility for the care of those children, either because they are able to make time for those activities or perhaps because they are less time consuming than

other aspects of father involvement. Understandably, fathers who work the longest hours spend less time providing physical care, as this kind of activity is relatively time-consuming and occurs at set times of the day.

[Table 5.2 about here]

The effects of many of the covariates vary by outcome. In terms of engagement, married fathers may spend more time than cohabiting fathers with the focal child ( $p < 0.10$ ), primarily due to greater time spent in play activities ( $p < 0.01$ ). Education does not appear to be related to father involvement, with the exception of high school graduates spending less time in achievement activities than those fathers with less than a high school education ( $p < 0.05$ ), a counterintuitive result. Relative to white fathers, black fathers spend less time playing with the focal child ( $p < 0.01$ ), while Latino and other race fathers spend less time in achievement-related activities ( $p < 0.01$ ). Fathers who attend religious services at least once a week spend more time overall with the focal child than those who attend services less frequently ( $p < 0.05$ ). Biologically-related fathers spend an average of more than four hours per week more than stepfathers with the focal child ( $p < 0.01$ ), including more time spent in physical care ( $p < 0.05$ ) and achievement-related activities ( $p < 0.001$ ). Fathers spend more time in achievement-related activities such as reading and helping with homework with both preschool ( $p < 0.001$ ) and school-aged children ( $p < 0.01$ ), relative to infants, but spend less time playing with school-aged children compared to infants ( $p < 0.05$ ). As the number of children in the household increases, fathers spend less time with the focal child overall ( $p < 0.001$ ) and in play activities ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Fathers' age is negatively related to responsibility taken for the child's care ( $p < 0.05$ ), which may reflect a cohort effect of younger fathers growing up with more norms of shared parenting. Latino ( $p < 0.001$ ) and other race fathers ( $p < 0.01$ ) take more responsibility for the focal child, relative to white fathers. Fathers who attend religious services at least once a week take more responsibility for the focal child than those who attend less than once a month ( $p < 0.01$ ). Biologically-related fathers take significantly more responsibility for the care of the focal child than stepfathers and other father figures not biologically related to the child ( $p < 0.05$ ). Responsibility does not, on the other hand, vary by characteristics of children, including the focal child's age or sex or the total number of children in the household. Interestingly, fathers' occupation and relative work hours are also not significantly related to either responsibility or engagement.

Turning to fixed effects models in Table 5.3, the relationship between work hours and fathering behavior weakens substantially. These models produce no significant relationships between work hours and any of the measures of father involvement, indicating that a change in work hours is not associated with a change in fathering behavior. These results suggest the small, significant effects found for play and overall engagement in the cross-sectional models may be the result of unobserved confounding variables, rather than causality. Thus, time spent at work and with children are jointly determined by some unobserved characteristic, such as preferences for time use, rather than, for example, a decrease in work hours causally leading to an increase in time with children.

[Table 5.3 about here]

It could also be that the differences between the fixed effects and cross-sectional samples, namely that the fixed effects sample is smaller and characterized by greater union stability over time, contribute to the differences in estimates. However, the coefficients in the two specifications are different and the  $p$ -values are substantially larger, suggesting that work hours are not causally related to father involvement. Further supporting this conclusion are the results from cross-sectional models run on this smaller fixed effect sample. These results, found in Table A5.1, produce findings similar to those of Table 5.2, suggesting a true difference between the cross-sectional and fixed effects estimates.

Finally, a few significant trends emerge among the covariates in the fixed effects models. For example, fathers who attend religious services at least once a month engage in significantly more achievement-related activities than those who attend less frequently ( $p < 0.01$ ). Engagement in physical care appears to decrease when the father works in a professional or managerial position ( $p < 0.10$ ). Results also show that fathers' engagement in achievement-related activities increases slightly with the age of the child ( $p < 0.05$ ), and time spent playing with the focal child decreases as the number of children in the household increases ( $p < 0.05$ ).

#### Fathering Attitudes, Work Hours, and Father Involvement

Table 5.4 incorporates fathering attitudes into the relationship between work hours and father involvement. These results show that, as seen in the results in Chapter 4, nontraditional fathering attitudes are associated with greater involvement with children. In particular, fathers with the most nontraditional fathering attitudes engage in

more physical care and achievement-related activities, and take more responsibility for, their children relative to fathers with the most traditional attitudes toward fathering.

[Table 5.4 about here]

The relationship between work hours and father involvement remains unchanged in these models. It may be, however, that fathering attitudes *moderate* the relationship between work hours and father involvement. To examine whether this is the case, Tables 5.5 and 5.6 show father involvement regressed onto work hours separately for fathers with the most traditional and most nontraditional quartiles of fathering attitudes. These models include all previously discussed covariates, although the tables include only the coefficients for fathers' work hours for brevity's sake. Each table shows the coefficients, statistical significance, and sample sizes for models run on separate samples of children with fathers who fall in the most traditional quartile of fathering attitudes and those with the most nontraditional quartile of fathering attitudes. The significance of the difference between the effect of work hours on involvement among these different groups of fathers is determined by the significance of an interaction term between work hours and "new father" (nontraditional) attitudes in a model run on the full sample. The full results of the interaction term analyses are shown in Tables A5.2 and A5.3.

[Tables 5.5 and 5.6 about here]

Despite the small samples sizes for these subgroups, some significant findings still emerge. In the cross-sectional models shown in Table 5.5, for example, fathers' work hours are significantly, negatively related to fathers' engagement in physical care ( $p < 0.01$ ) and play activities ( $p < 0.001$ ) among fathers who have the most traditional attitudes toward fathering. In contrast, findings among fathers with the most

nontraditional attitudes toward fathering—“new father” attitudes—are not significant, with substantially higher  $p$ -values. These results suggest that fathering attitudes may indeed affect the relationship between work hours and fathering behavior: work hours are associated with less time with children among the most traditional fathers but not among the most nontraditional dads. Interaction term analyses, however, do not find this difference in the effect of work hours on involvement to be significant. Similarly, findings are insignificant in cross-sectional models run on the smaller sample used in the fixed effects models (see Table A5.4).

Results from fixed effects models in Table 5.6, however, do find a significant difference between the effect of work hours on involvement, depending on the fathers’ attitudes toward fathering. Despite even smaller sample sizes, these models show that an increase in work hours may be associated with a decrease in overall engagement ( $p < 0.10$ ) and engagement in play activities ( $p < 0.10$ ) among traditional fathers, but not among fathers with “new father” attitudes. Thus, longer work hours may prevent greater father involvement among more traditional fathers, whereas work hours may not be an obstacle for more nontraditional fathers. Interestingly, these results also suggest that work hours may have a small, *positive* association with achievement-related activities ( $p < 0.10$ ) among the most traditional fathers but not nontraditional fathers, although the difference in the effect of work hours is not statistically significant.

Table 5.7 includes the full results for these models and shows that effects of other aspects of employment, including occupation and relative work hours, may vary by attitudes toward fathering as well. Consistent with Hofferth and Goldscheider (2010), in couples where the mother works more than the father, fathers with traditional attitudes

are more involved with children in terms of responsibility ( $p < 0.001$ ) and achievement-related activities ( $p < 0.10$ ), while the same is not true among those with nontraditional attitudes. Among fathers with traditional attitudes, those with professional or managerial positions may also spend more time overall ( $p < 0.10$ ) and in play activities ( $p < 0.01$ ), while the same pattern is not found for those with “new father” attitudes. In fact, among nontraditional dads, those in professional/managerial occupations spend significantly *less* time overall ( $p < 0.05$ ) with the focal child. Regardless of attitudes, however, fathers in professional and managerial occupations spend less time in physical care activities ( $p < 0.05$  and  $p < 0.01$  for traditional and nontraditional fathers, respectively).

[Table 5.7 about here]

### *Discussion*

This chapter has addressed the central conflict of the work-family nexus for men, namely the conflict of time and place presented by the “provider” and “nurturer” roles of the “new father.” Consistent with previous research (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000; Hofferth and Goldscheider 2010), results have shown that attitudes toward men’s roles do moderate the relationship between employment and father involvement in American families today.

The first research question addressed whether employment behavior varies by “new father” attitudes. The results show this to be true: although there is no significant association in the overall sample, younger fathers (35 or younger) with “new father” attitudes appear to work fewer hours than those with more traditional attitudes toward the father role, consistent with previous research (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000). As

Kaufman and Uhlenberg (2000) argued, it should not be surprising that this pattern is found among a younger cohort of fathers, as it is these fathers who are more likely to have grown up in a normative climate of involved fatherhood and are perhaps more likely to successfully implement those norms in their own work and family life.

The next research question addressed the effect of work hours on father involvement, directly addressing the core conflict of time and place. Consistent with previous research and with my hypothesis, cross-sectional results show a significant, negative relationship between work hours and father involvement. The results, however, are small in magnitude, are only significant for physical care provided for children, and are marginally significant for overall time with children. Work hours do not significantly predict time in play or achievement activities; nor are they related to responsibility the father takes for the care of the child. These findings suggest that employment does not constrain the time fathers spend with their resident children. The lack of significant findings for responsibility may stem from a diminished conflict of time and place, as some aspects of responsibility do not require time spent directly with the child, such as making decisions about schooling or scheduling medical appointments.

Similar to results discussed above, fixed effects models for these results show substantially diminished magnitude and significance. The already small effects for work hours in the cross-sectional models become even smaller in the fixed effects models, with much larger  $p$ -values, suggesting an absence of a significant causal relationship between work hours and fathering behavior. These results are consistent with research finding minimal or no relationship between employment and time with children

(Marsiglio 1991; Deutsch, Lussier et al. 1993; Pleck 1997; Gauthier, Smeeding et al. 2004; Dermott 2006), perhaps because parents are able to preserve time with children despite work hours by reducing leisure time (Bianchi 2000; Gauthier, Smeeding et al. 2004). These results also suggest that the significant link between employment and father involvement in cross-sectional studies may be misleading.

The last research question breaks down this relationship by attitudes, addressing whether men with “new father” attitudes navigate the conflict of work and family time differently. Bivariate results suggest that attitudes toward the “new father” role are associated with greater involvement—both engagement and responsibility—with resident children in the cross-section, but have little or no association with work hours. Multivariate results confirm this finding for engagement, showing a significant tradeoff between work and family time for the most traditional fathers but no significant relationship among the most nontraditional fathers. Further, these trends appear to hold up in fixed effects models, suggesting that causation may be behind the relationship, not merely association. These results cannot, however, rule out the possibility of reverse causality, wherein father involvement influences work hours, such as fathers reducing their work hours in order to spend more time with children.

Findings for engagement aspects of father involvement did not translate to responsibility aspects of father involvement: multivariate results did not support a significant relationship between employment and responsibility taken for the care of children. Again, this may reflect a diminished time and place conflict inherent in responsibility, relative to engagement aspects of father involvement.

Overall, these results suggest that dads who subscribe to the “new father” norms of involved fatherhood are spending more time with their resident children despite work hours being resistant to change. Indeed, despite the fact that the majority of fathers in this sample work in excess of 40 hours of work per week, many fathers, particularly economically disadvantaged fathers, may not have the option of cutting back hours of paid employment. Yet those long work hours do not appear to impinge greatly on time spent with children or on men’s contributions to managing their care. Being in a professional or managerial occupation, for example, is associated with substantially longer work hours, yet is not associated with any decrease in involvement with children. This pattern of work-family time use parallels the oft-cited finding that women’s time with children has remained high despite increased work hours over the years (see, for example, Bianchi 2000). Fathers may have less flexibility in reducing work hours than they do in increasing time spent with children. “New fathers” may be more likely to sacrifice their own leisure time, for example, in order to maximize child time. More traditional dads, on the other hand, may continue to adhere to the provider role of fatherhood, viewing breadwinning as their primary form of father involvement (Christiansen and Palkovitz 2001; Palkovitz 1997).

## Chapter 6. Conclusion

This dissertation has addressed the intersections of work and family for men by examining employment and father involvement in the context of contemporary norms of involved, nurturing fatherhood. As family demographers have well documented, gender roles have shifted in recent years toward greater overlap of men's and women's roles: women have entered the paid labor force in record numbers, while new norms of fatherhood now emphasize men's involvement with their children in addition to their traditional role of financial provider. Captured in the scholarly and popular media alike, the cultural image of the "new father" describes a father who is nurturing and warm with his children; who is actively involved in their routine physical care as well as the traditional play activities; and who emphasizes the emotional aspects of fathering, including understanding, listening, talking, and simply "being there" for his children.

Attitudinal trends and qualitative research on men and families tend to reflect support for these new norms of fathering and for more egalitarian work and family roles for men and women in general (Coltrane 1996; Gerson 2010). Behavior change, however, lags behind attitudinal change (LaRossa 1988; Gerson 1993; Dermott 2008; Gerson 2010). Although fathers' time with children has increased, for example, mothers still shoulder the majority of child-rearing work (Sandberg and Hofferth 2001; Bianchi, Robinson et al. 2006). Qualitative findings show this gap as well. Through her interviews with men in the New York metropolitan area about work and family life, for example, Gerson (1993) finds a "persistent gap between their desires and choices" (139), as they navigated various opportunities and constraints in work and family life.

Part of the reason may be that despite a new, more nurturant, involved side of fatherhood, fathers are still expected to provide financially, and there is an inherent conflict of time and place in these roles: while the “new father” role requires spending time with children, the “provider” and “good worker” roles require a commitment to spending time on the job. This analysis has set out to examine this intersection of work and family for men to see if in fact a cohort of “new,” involved fathers is really emerging. Those fathers would not only be more involved with their children but would potentially navigate the work-family nexus to more successfully balance work and family time.

Whereas we know a great deal about how women have adapted to their roles in the public sphere, much less work has focused on men’s experiences in the private sphere. In this paper I have taken a quantitative, population-based perspective on these issues, examining questions of: To what extent does employment impact men’s involvement with their children? Are men with “new father” attitudes trading off longer work hours for more time—or more “quality” time—with their children? In particular, I have looked at the relationship between men’s employment and their involvement with their resident children and whether and how “new father” and other gender attitudes moderate that relationship.

My first research question sought to determine if “new father” attitudes are in fact similar to attitudes about other aspects of men’s and women’s work and family roles. Since many of the characteristics of “new fathers” represent an overlap with characteristics traditionally attributed to mothers—warmth, nurturance, performing physical caregiving activities—I anticipated finding similarity between men’s attitudes toward fathering and their attitudes toward maternal employment and separate spheres

ideology. My findings, however, did not support this hypothesis: fathering attitudes are not related to maternal employment attitudes and are only slightly related to attitudes toward separate spheres of men and women. These results suggest that attitudes toward men's and women's roles—specifically, the private roles of men and the public roles of women—are distinct. This is consistent with previous research finding differences between attitudes toward women's public and private roles (Anderson and Johnson 2003; Goldscheider and Waite 1991; Goldscheider et al. 2010; King et al. 1997; Zuo 1997), as well as some limited research examining men's roles specifically (Pleck et al. 1997; Wilcox 2004). Further, this constitutes an important contribution to the literature, as measures of gender attitudes typically have focused on women's roles, largely omitting direct references to men's roles.

My next research question sought to determine if “new fathers,” as defined by their attitudes toward the fathering role, would be more involved with their children. In other words, do men's attitudes translate to behavior? Consistent with Hofferth (2003) and Gaunt (2006), nontraditional attitudes toward the father's role, “new father” attitudes, are associated with both time spent with children and responsibility he takes for the care of the child. Attitudes toward public and private roles of women, however, are not related to father involvement. Fathering behaviors associated with these attitudes include activities traditionally the domain of mothers, including physical caregiving tasks and responsibility. The latter constitutes an important contribution to the literature, given the scant data available to tap this construct of father involvement. Only the effect on physical care engagement, however, holds up in fixed effects models, which better

approximate a causal relationship and thus improve upon the extant literature's predominant reliance on cross-sectional data.

The next set of analyses focused on the role of "new father" attitudes in employment and father involvement, given the weaker effect of the other attitudes and the lack of consistent measures across waves. First, I examined whether "new fathers" work fewer hours than more traditional fathers. Similar to the findings of Kaufman and Uhlenberg (2000), these results suggested a possible negative relationship between "new father" attitudes and work hours among younger fathers, although the result was only borderline significant. Caution should be exercised, however, when interpreting these results, as attitudes and work hours are likely highly endogenous and jointly determined.

Work hours are not, however, strongly predictive of fathering behavior. These next analyses directly addressed the core conflict of time and place in employment and father involvement and found that small, weak effects on play time in the cross-section are no longer significant in fixed effects models. The latter show no significant effect of work hours on any of the measures of father involvement, whether engagement or responsibility. These results are consistent with research finding minimal or no relationship between employment and time with children (Marsiglio 1991; Deutsch, Lussier et al. 1993; Pleck 1997; Gauthier, Smeeding et al. 2004; Dermott 2006), perhaps because parents are able to preserve time with children despite work hours by reducing leisure time (Bianchi 2000; Gauthier, Smeeding et al. 2004). These fixed effects results provide an important improvement upon existing literature that often relies on cross-sectional data and suggest that the negative relationship often found may be misleading.

The next analyses showed that despite the inflexibility in work hours discussed above, and the fact that the majority of fathers work overtime hours, men with “new father” attitudes nevertheless are more involved with their children. This pattern of work-family time use parallels the oft-cited finding that women’s time with children has remained high despite increased work hours over the years (see, for example, Bianchi 2000). Fathers may have less flexibility in reducing work hours than they do in increasing time spent with children. Whereas “new fathers” may be more likely to sacrifice their own leisure time, for example, in order to maximize child time, more traditional fathers, on the other hand, may continue to adhere to the provider role of fatherhood, viewing breadwinning as their primary form of father involvement.

Overall, these results suggest that the “provider”/“good worker” role prevails for men, much the way the nurturer role tends to prevail for women, when it comes to the intersections of work and family. Work hours proved to be inflexible, whether due to workplace constraints, financial constraints, or men’s desires. As some limited research has suggested (Gerson 2010; Pleck and Masciadrelli 2004; Russell and Hwang 2004), real or perceived barriers may exist in the workplace that prevent cutting back work hours. Additionally, many fathers, particularly economically disadvantaged fathers, may not be able to afford to cut back work hours even if workplace circumstances allowed it. However, despite inelastic work hours, there may in fact be a cohort of “new fathers” whose behavior matches their attitudes, in that they are 1) more involved with their children than more traditional fathers, and 2) they are able to preserve time with children, likely by cutting back on leisure time or incorporating their children into their leisure time.

### *Limitations*

Several limitations to this study warrant mention. The first pertains to limited generalizability of findings. Despite using nationally-representative data, these findings cannot generalize beyond two-parent families and, in the case of fixed effects results, two-parent families that are stable over time. As family demographers well know, this is not true of all contemporary families. Further, single fathers represent an important demographic group for fatherhood research but could not be analyzed separately due to insufficient sample size. Similarly, these findings do not speak to nonresident father involvement, which constitutes a critical component of father involvement in American families.

These analyses have also not addressed all aspects of employment that may be important for father involvement. We know, for example, that nonstandard work schedules are an increasingly common characteristic of employment for American families and that these schedules impact the time parents spend with their children (Presser 2004; Hook and Wolfe 2010). Nonstandard work schedules of the father, however, could not be discerned using these data.

In addition, there may be reciprocal effects of work hours and father involvement that cannot be ruled out by these results. These analyses have examined the effect of work hours on father involvement, but it may be the case that involvement with children influences men's work hours as well. Men who wish to be more involved with their children may choose to reduce their work hours, for example, an effect this analysis cannot distinguish.

Finally, these analyses have only begun to tap men's experiences of intersections of work and family; work-family conflict is not measured directly, yet research suggests this is an increasing phenomenon among men (Galinsky et al 2008; Nomaguchi 2009).

### *Further Research*

This area is full of opportunities for further research, as so many questions remain unanswered. Building on some of the limitations discussed above, extending this analysis to single fathers and nonresident fathers would enhance our understanding of employment and father involvement among these other critical groups of fathers. In addition to tapping nonstandard scheduling of work, extending this analysis to examine timing of work and family time on weekend days versus weekdays would give us a deeper understanding of "new fathers'" involvement with their children, as previous research has shown that father involvement varies across the week (Yeung et al. 2001; Hook and Wolfe 2010). Examining father-level time use data or child-level time spent in nonparental care would help illuminate whether "new fathers" are indeed cutting back leisure time to spend time with their children. Finally, we need more research on the formal and informal employment barriers to increasing father involvement. Qualitative work in particular would provide us a more nuanced understanding of work-family conflict and how the workplace constraints men's family time. As Haas and O'Brien (2010) write, "in order for more egalitarian sharing of parenting to occur, we need to more fully understand not just the processes likely to promote men's involvement in

parenting but also the powerful social forces at work that socially constrain men's greater involvement in parenting" (273).

Research has provided us a wealth of knowledge about women's time in the workplace and at home, but men have been largely omitted from discussion of the intersections of work and family. This study has begun to scratch the surface of our understanding of the contemporary work and family life of American fathers, suggesting that work hours are less of an obstacle to some fathers than others. While recent research has found that a majority of young adults prefer a more egalitarian division of labor for balancing work and family life—and, in fact, gender flexibility in breadwinning and caretaking is key to family well-being—only a minority have successfully implemented such strategies (Gerson 2010). The current study's results suggest that long work hours may not be the sole reason for that shortfall; other factors may be at play, perhaps including other aspects of employment or gendered preferences allowing the “provider/good worker” ideals to prevail over further increases in father involvement. We also know that fathers' involvement at home has important benefits for the wellbeing of children (Harris, Furstenberg et al. 1998; Amato and Rivera 1999; Pleck and Masciadrelli 2004; Bronte-Tinkew, Carrano et al. 2008), families (Gerson 1993; Coltrane 1996; Gerson 2010), and for men themselves (Eggebeen and Knoester 2001; Schindler 2010). Understanding the experiences and characteristics of men who have more successfully navigated the challenge of balancing employment and involved fatherhood will offer important clues for how to promote paternal involvement among other men

(Gerson 1993). Additional research in this area is warranted to further our understanding of work-family balance for fathers.

Table 4.1. Descriptive Statistics of Analytic Samples

Characteristic (1997)	Cross-Sectional Sample		Fixed Effects Sample		Unweighted Difference
	N	Total	N	Total	
<b>Father Marital Status</b>					
Married	1038	92.3	498	95.2	*
Cohabiting	101	7.7	31	4.8	*
<b>Father Age</b>					
<30	196	15.1	80	13.5	
30-34	229	20.6	115	22.0	
35-39	360	33.1	161	31.4	
40+	354	31.2	173	33.1	
<b>Father Education</b>					
Less than high school	173	15.5	68	12.5	
High school grad	332	27.1	150	25.0	
Some college	313	26.3	143	26.1	
College grad or higher	321	31.0	168	36.4	
<b>Father Race/Ethnicity</b>					
White	781	76.6	383	78.9	
Black	197	7.4	78	6.2	
Other	47	5.4	13	3.3	*
Latino	80	10.6	44	11.5	
<b>Father's Attendance at Religious Services</b>					
Once a week or more	378	33.7	177	35.9	
1-3 times per month	210	17.9	96	18.0	
Less than once a month	527	45.9	245	43.1	
<b>Father's Occupation: Professional/Managerial</b>					
388	35.6	204	41.0		
<b>Father's Work Hours</b>					
0	39	2.9	16	2.4	
Part-time (1-34)	71	6.7	29	5.8	
Full-time (35-40)	418	33.6	192	32.9	
Overtime (41-50)	429	40.0	204	41.9	
Overtime (51+)	182	16.9	88	17.0	
<b>Mother's employment status</b>					
Not employed	302	28.4	125	24.8	
Part-time (<35 hours)	310	27.5	141	28.4	
Fulltime (35+ hours)	527	44.2	263	46.7	
<b>Couple employment characteristics</b>					
Both work fulltime (35+ hours)	476	39.7	233	40.9	
He works more hours than her	589	54.1	264	53.0	
She works more hours than him*	58	5.0	31	6.0	
Neither works	16	1.2	1	0.0	**
<b>Child biologically related to the father</b>					
1061	94.2	505	96.9	*	
<b>Child Age</b>					
Infant (0-1)	174	15.9	80	15.7	
Preschooler (2-5)	351	29.9	166	31.4	
School age (6+)	614	54.2	283	52.9	
<b>Child Sex</b>					
Male	569	48.8	253	47.7	
Female	570	51.2	276	52.3	
<b>Number of Kids in HH</b>					
1	242	18.5	132	22.7	+
2	550	46.1	258	46.9	
3+	347	35.5	139	30.5	+

Note: Percents are weighted.

\* This category includes 3 cases where both partners work the same number of part-time hours.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table 4.2. Cross-tabulation of Attitude Factors

Separate Spheres Attitudes			
Fathering Attitudes	Most Traditional	Middle 50%	Most Nontraditional
Most Traditional	26.6	58.9	14.5
Middle 50%	25.5	49.9	24.6
Most Nontraditional	22.3	42.3	35.4
Correlation coefficient: 0.12, $p < 0.0001$			
Note: Results are weighted			

Maternal Employment Attitudes			
Fathering Attitudes	Most Traditional	Middle 50%	Most Nontraditional
Most Traditional	19.6	55.9	24.6
Middle 50%	27.8	49.3	23.0
Most Nontraditional	25.3	45.7	29.1
Weighted correlation coefficient: 0.03, $p = 0.32$			
Note: Results are weighted			

Table 4.3. Bivariate Relationship between Attitudes, Work Hours, and Father Involvement

Attitudes	Father's Weekly Work Hours					Mean	Father Involvement (Means)				
	Not Employed	Part-time (1-34)	Fulltime (35-40)	Overtime (41-50)	Overtime (51+)		Total Engagement Time	Physical Care Time	Play Time	Achievement Activities Time	Responsibility Scale
	Percent Distribution										
Fathering											
Most traditional	5.9	2.5	31.0	44.2	16.5	43.8	13.9	3.2	7.1	0.2	5.4
Middle 50%	1.8 **	7.2 **	33.7	39.0	18.2	45.2	14.8	3.8 *	7.5	0.3	6.1
Most nontraditional	1.9 *	9.9 ***	35.8	37.9	14.5	43.1	17.3 ***	4.7 ***	8.5 *	0.6 ***	6.4 ***
Separate spheres											
Most traditional	2.4	8.5	38.9	27.7	22.5	45.0	14.4	3.6	7.4	0.3	6.4
Middle 50%	2.7	6.4	35.1	42.3 ***	13.5 **	43.9	14.9	3.9	7.3	0.3	5.9 *
Most nontraditional	3.5	5.7	25.0 ***	47.8 ***	18.0	44.5	16.6 *	4.1 *	8.5 +	0.6 **	5.8 *
Maternal employment											
Most traditional	1.6	7.0	37.0	38.5	15.9	44.4	14.8	3.6	7.4	0.4	5.9
Middle 50%	4.2 *	8.9	31.8	38.9	16.2	43.6	14.7	3.8	7.3	0.4	6.2
Most nontraditional	1.3	2.0 **	33.6	43.8	19.3	45.7	16.5 +	4.3 *	8.6 +	0.3	5.6
N	39	71	418	429	182	1139	1138	1138	1138	1138	965

Note: Significant results indicate comparisons with fathers less than age 30 or with the "most traditional" category. Engagement times measured in hours per week.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table 4.4. Father Involvement with Resident Focal Child: Cross-sectional Models, 1997

	Total Engagement	Physical Care	Play Activities	Achievement- Related Activities	Respon- sibility
<u>Fathers' gender attitudes</u>					
Pro-fathering attitudes	0.88 *	0.41 **	0.40	0.11 *	0.44 ***
Separate spheres attitudes (+ = nontrad)	0.62	0.21 +	0.04	0.09 +	-0.03
Pro-Maternal employment attitudes	0.36	0.10	0.20	-0.07	0.05
<u>Father characteristics</u>					
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	2.92 +	0.07	1.97 +	0.10	0.21
Age	-0.11	0.00	-0.09	-0.01	-0.04 *
Education					
High school grad (Omitted=<hs)	-0.58	0.17	-1.11	-0.24 *	0.21
Some college	-1.01	-0.29	-1.10	-0.02	-0.26
College grad or higher	-1.85	-0.17	-2.15 *	0.14	-0.34
Race/Ethnicity					
Black (Omitted=white)	-1.00	0.07	-2.16 **	0.23	0.43
Other Race	-0.75	0.03	-1.18	-0.13	1.53 *
Latino	0.73	0.21	-1.87 +	-0.22 +	2.47 ***
Attendance at religious services					
Once/week or more (Omitted=Less than 1x/month)	2.14 *	0.44	0.25	-0.02	0.61 *
1-3 times a month	1.16	0.51	0.10	0.09	0.54 +
<u>Maternal employment</u>					
Part-time (Omitted=Not employed)	0.42	0.15	0.20	0.04	-0.58
Fulltime	0.83	0.17	0.22	0.04	-0.39
<u>Child characteristics</u>					
Biologically related to father	4.22 **	1.07 *	1.09	0.28 ***	0.78 +
Age					
Preschooler: 2-5 (Omitted=Infant, 0-1)	2.46 *	0.60 +	0.44	0.30 ***	-0.14
School-aged: 6-12	-1.79	-0.69 +	-2.13 *	0.32 **	0.02
Sex: Female	-0.10	0.23	-0.03	-0.20 *	-0.21
Number of kids in household	-1.51 ***	-0.12	-0.82 **	-0.05 +	0.09
N	1126	1126	1126	1126	954
R <sup>2</sup>	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.22

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

Table 4.5. Father Involvement with Resident Focal Child: Fixed Effects Models, 1997 and 2002

	Total Engagement	Physical Care	Play Activities	Achievement- Related Activities	Respon- sibility
Pro-fathering attitudes	0.91 +	0.37 *	0.20	0.07	0.02
<u>Father characteristics</u>					
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	0.83	-1.04	2.28	-0.02	-1.34
Father age	-0.05	0.04	-0.06	-0.01	-0.14 +
<u>Attendance at religious services</u>					
Once/week or more (Omitted=less than 1x/month)	-1.53 +	-0.44	-0.30	0.05	-0.18
1-3 times per month	1.14	0.85	0.12	0.44 **	-0.38
<u>Maternal employment</u>					
Part-time (Omitted=Not employed)	3.04	0.56	1.33	0.02	-0.87
Fulltime	0.15	-0.15	-0.05	0.06	-0.44
<u>Child characteristics</u>					
Focal child age	0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.01 **	0.00
Number of kids in hh	-1.16	0.22	-1.57 *	-0.08	-0.43
N	505	505	505	505	413
R <sup>2</sup>	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.04	0.09

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table 5.1. OLS Coefficients Predicting Fathers' Work Hours, by Father's Age: Cross-sectional Models 1997

	Total Sample	AGE <=35	AGE 36+
Pro-fathering attitudes	-0.61	-1.19 +	-0.04
<u>Father characteristics</u>			
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	4.32 *	5.32 *	0.28
Age	-0.18	--	--
Education			
High school grad (Omitted=<hs)	-2.42	-0.27	-3.92
Some college	-1.73	-0.50	-2.94
College grad or higher	-0.83	0.97	-2.93
Race/Ethnicity			
Black (Omitted=white)	-6.13 *	-6.74 **	-6.82 +
Other Race	2.63	0.09	4.66
Latino	1.38	2.31	2.16
Attendance at religious services			
Once/week or more (Omitted=Less than 1x/month)	0.01	-0.86	0.84
1-3 times a month	1.47	2.24	1.15
Occupation: Professional/managerial	4.79 ***	4.80 **	4.93 **
Mother: Employed	-2.13 +	-2.91 +	-1.66
<u>Child characteristics</u>			
Biologically related to father	-1.00	0.99	-3.48
Age			
Preschooler: 2-5 (Omitted=Infant, 0-1)	-1.23	-0.37	-2.23
School-aged: 6-12	-0.33	0.05	-1.07
Sex: Female	0.79	0.61	0.98
Number of kids in household	0.18	-1.54	0.66
N	1139	493	646
R <sup>2</sup>	0.09	0.15	0.09

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table 5.2. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement: Cross-sectional Models, 1997

	Overall Engagement	Physical Care	Play	Achievement- Related Activities	Respon- sibility
Fathers' work hours	-0.08 +	-0.03 **	-0.03	0.00	0.00
<u>Father characteristics</u>					
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	3.21 +	-0.12	2.56 **	0.11	-0.73
Age	-0.13	0.00	-0.10 +	-0.01	-0.04 *
<u>Education</u>					
High school grad (Omitted=<hs)	-0.58	0.20	-1.21	-0.21 *	0.27
Some college	-0.71	-0.08	-1.11	0.02	-0.01
College grad or higher	-1.26	0.05	-1.83	0.17	-0.33
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>					
Black (Omitted=white)	-1.31	-0.12	-2.13 **	0.08	0.17
Other Race	-1.66	0.03	-1.90	-0.23 **	2.09 **
Latino	0.57	0.18	-1.91 +	-0.24 *	2.73 ***
<u>Attendance at religious services</u>					
Once/week or more (Omitted=Less than 1x/month)	2.03 *	0.42	0.31	0.02	0.81 **
1-3 times a month	1.09	0.49	0.09	0.11	0.66 *
Occupation: Professional/managerial	0.52	0.28	-0.18	0.09	0.22
<u>Couple employment characteristics</u>					
Dad works more than mom (Omitted: both fulltime)	-0.78	-0.13	-0.19	0.10	0.03
Mom works more than dad	-0.98	-0.17	-0.91	0.70 +	0.79
Neither parent works	-2.58	-1.66	-0.02	0.05	2.48
<u>Child characteristics</u>					
Biologically related to father	4.68 **	1.13 *	1.50	0.30 ***	0.90 *
<u>Age</u>					
Preschooler: 2-5 (Omitted=Infant, 0-1)	2.15 +	0.49	0.32	0.27 ***	-0.21
School-aged: 6-12	-2.20	-0.86 *	-2.33 *	0.29 **	-0.19
Sex: Female	-0.01	0.28	-0.02	-0.17 *	-0.18
Number of kids in household	-1.48 ***	-0.09	-0.82	-0.04 *	0.07
N	1126	1126	1126	1126	954
R <sup>2</sup>	0.11	0.07	0.10	0.08	0.22

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table 5.3. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement: Fixed Effects Models, 1997-2002

	Overall Engagement	Physical Care	Play	Achievement- Related Activities	Respon- sibility
Fathers' work hours	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	-0.03
<u>Father characteristics</u>					
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	3.44	-0.16	3.65	0.03	-1.38
Father age	-0.35	-0.02	-0.30	-0.03	0.11
<u>Attendance at religious services</u>					
Once/week or more (Omitted=less than 1x/month)	-1.21	-0.31	-0.20	0.08	-0.14
1-3 times per month	0.91	0.76	0.03	0.44 **	-0.30
Occupation: Professional/managerial	-0.29	-1.45 +	1.09	0.11	-0.07
<u>Couple employment characteristics</u>					
Dad works more than mom (Omitted: both fulltime)	1.73	0.52	0.90	0.04	-0.12
Mom works more than dad	3.51	1.91	1.89	0.87	-0.38
<u>Child characteristics</u>					
Focal child age	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00 *	0.01
Number of kids in hh	-1.36	0.10	-1.66 *	-0.10	-0.34
N	505	505	505	505	413
R <sup>2</sup>	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.05	0.09

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table 5.4. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement Based on Work Hours and Fathering Attitudes: Cross-Sectional Models, 1997

	Overall Engagement	Physical Care	Play	Achievement- Related Activities	Respon- sibility
Fathers' work hours	-0.08 +	-0.03 *	-0.04	0.00	0.00
Most nontraditional fathering attitudes	1.08	0.95 **	0.04	0.31 *	1.12 ***
Middle 50% fathering attitudes	0.52	0.38	0.62	0.09	0.38
<u>Father characteristics</u>					
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	3.25 +	-0.08	2.56 **	0.12	-0.66
Age	-0.13	0.00	-0.09	-0.01	-0.04 *
Education					
High school grad (Omitted=<hs)	-0.63	0.16	-1.20	-0.22 *	0.19
Some college	-0.86	-0.21	-1.11	-0.03	-0.18
College grad or higher	-1.41	-0.07	-1.94 +	0.14	-0.46
Race/Ethnicity					
Black (Omitted=white)	-1.35	-0.16	-2.12 **	0.06	0.11
Other Race	-1.67	0.03	-1.97	-0.23 *	2.12 **
Latino	0.53	0.15	-1.92 +	-0.25 *	2.67 ***
Attendance at religious services					
Once/week or more (Omitted=Less than 1x/month)	1.93 *	0.33	0.33	-0.01	0.68 **
1-3 times a month	1.09	0.50	0.07	0.11	0.64 *
Occupation: Professional/managerial	0.51	0.26	-0.12	0.08	0.19
<u>Couple employment characteristics</u>					
Dad works more than mom (Omitted: both fulltime)	-0.80	-0.15	-0.21	0.09	0.01
Mom works more than dad	-1.00	-0.19	-0.93	0.69 +	0.89
Neither parent works	-2.43	-1.52	-0.01	0.10	2.63
<u>Child characteristics</u>					
Biologically related to father	4.53 **	1.00 *	1.49	0.26 **	0.77 +
Age					
Preschooler: 2-5 (Omitted=Infant, 0-1)	2.22 +	0.55 +	0.25	0.30 ***	-0.13
School-aged: 6-12	-2.08	-0.74 *	-2.43 *	0.34 **	-0.04
Sex: Female	-0.05	0.25	-0.05	-0.18 *	-0.21
Number of kids in household	-1.49 ***	-0.09	-0.83 **	-0.04 +	0.07
N	1126	1126	1126	1126	954
R <sup>2</sup>	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.24

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table 5.5. OLS Coefficients Showing the Effect of Fathers' Work Hours on Father Involvement by Fathering Attitudes: Cross-Sectional Models, 1997

Dependent Variable	Most Traditional			Most Nontraditional			Significant difference?
	Estimate	N	R <sup>2</sup>	Estimate	N	R <sup>2</sup>	
Overall Engagement	-0.18	298	0.14	-0.03	289	0.12	n.s.
Physical Care	-0.07 **	298	0.13	0.01	289	0.14	n.s.
Play	-0.14 ***	298	0.15	-0.05	289	0.13	n.s.
Achievement-related Activities	0.00	298	0.09	0.00	289	0.13	n.s.
Responsibility	0.00	246	0.26	0.03	259	0.35	n.s.

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include all previously described covariates, although not shown here. See Appendix Table J for full model results. Most traditional fathers are defined as the the lower 25% of the distribution of fathering attitudes; most nontraditional fathers are those in the upper 25% of the distribution. Difference in effect of work hours on father involvement is determined by the significance of an interaction term analysis of work hours and attitude quartiles run on the full sample. Full results from that model available in Appendix Table G.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table 5.6. OLS Coefficients Showing the Effect of Fathers' Work Hours on Father Involvement by Fathering Attitudes: Fixed Effects Models, 1997 and 2002

Dependent Variable	Most Traditional			Most Nontraditional			Significant difference?
	Estimate	N	R <sup>2</sup>	Estimate	N	R <sup>2</sup>	
Overall Engagement	-0.22 +	134	0.12	0.16	134	0.21	**
Physical Care	-0.03	134	0.13	0.07	134	0.34	n.s.
Play	-0.15 +	134	0.13	0.07	134	0.04	+
Achievement-related Activities	0.02 +	134	0.13	0.01	134	0.08	n.s.
Responsibility	-0.04	100	0.37	-0.06	124	0.14	n.s.

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include all previously described covariates, although not shown here. See Appendix Table K for full model results. Difference in effect of work hours on father involvement is determined by the significance of an interaction term analysis of work hours and attitude quartiles run on the full sample. Full results from that model available in Appendix Table H.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table 5.7. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement, by Fathering Attitudes: Fixed Effects Models, 1997 and 2002

	Overall		Physical Care		Play		Achievement-Related Activities		Responsibility	
	Engagement		Trad'l	Nontrad'l	Trad'l	Nontrad'l	Trad'l	Nontrad'l	Trad'l	Nontrad'l
	Trad'l	Nontrad'l	Trad'l	Nontrad'l	Trad'l	Nontrad'l	Trad'l	Nontrad'l	Trad'l	Nontrad'l
Fathers' work hours	-0.22 +	0.16	-0.03	0.07	-0.15 +	0.07	0.02 +	0.01	-0.04	-0.06
<u>Father characteristics</u>										
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	-3.86	8.21	-0.77	1.73	-2.48	0.87	0.48	-0.01	-0.58	0.54
Father age	-0.62 **	-2.42	-0.17 +	-0.84	-0.37 *	-0.36	-0.01	-0.09	0.51	-0.41
Attendance at religious services										
Once/week or more (Omitted=less than 1x/month)	0.81	-2.95 *	0.22	-1.01 *	-0.46	-0.33	-0.20	0.05	-0.41	-0.28
1-3 times per month	-1.01	0.95	0.60	0.63	-1.12	-0.49	-0.01	1.02 *	-1.05	0.12
Occupation: Professional/manageria	6.98 +	-8.38 *	-1.89 *	-2.85 **	7.70 **	-2.58	0.00	-0.32	-0.49	0.51
<u>Couple employment characteristics</u>										
Dad works more than mom (Omitted: both fulltime)	-0.59	2.10	-1.05	1.02 +	0.63	1.78	-0.02	0.31	0.16	-0.55
Mom works more than dad	0.07	-4.38	0.81	1.20	0.53	-0.73	1.20 +	0.19	2.69 ***	-1.58
<u>Child characteristics</u>										
Focal child age	-0.05	0.00	-0.01	0.02 *	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	-0.01 +	-0.01	0.02
Number of kids in hh	-4.07	1.57	-0.51	1.28 +	-2.47 **	-0.40	-0.14	-0.39	-1.43 *	0.18
N	134	134	134	134	134	134	134	134	100	124
R <sup>2</sup>	0.12	0.21	0.13	0.34	0.13	0.04	0.13	0.08	0.37	0.14

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A3.1. Comparison of Children in Analytic Sample (Respondents to Household Booklet) to Children in All Two-Parent Households with Complete Time Diary Data

	Analytic Sample		Full Sample		Unweighted Difference
	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	
Father work hours	1139	43.7	1961	43.9	
Total weekly engagement	1126	15.4	1929	15.1	
Weekly time in physical care	1126	3.9	1929	3.9	
Weekly time in play	1126	7.8	1929	7.4	
Weekly time in achievement-related activities	1126	0.4	1929	0.4	
<u>Father characteristics</u>					
Father Married	1139	91.1	1960	88.3	*
Father Age	1139	36.5	1961	36.2	
Father Education					
Less than high school	1139	15.2	1961	16.6	
High school grad	1139	29.2	1961	30.2	
Some college	1139	27.5	1961	28.5	
College grad or higher	1139	28.2	1961	24.7	*
Father Race/Ethnicity					
White	1139	68.6	1961	60.6	***
Black	1139	17.3	1961	23.2	***
Other	1139	7.1	1961	8.5	
Latino	1139	7.0	1961	7.8	
<u>Employment characteristics</u>					
Father's Occupation: Professional/Managerial	1139	34.1	1961	31.5	
Mother's employment status					
Not employed	1139	26.5	1961	25.6	
Part-time (<35 hours)	1139	27.2	1961	26.0	
Fulltime (35+ hours)	1139	46.3	1961	48.4	
Couple employment characteristics					
Both work fulltime (35+ hours)	1139	41.8	1961	45.1	+
He works more hours than her	1139	51.7	1961	49.1	
She works more hours than him *	1139	5.1	1961	4.8	
Neither works	1139	1.4	1961	1.1	
<u>Child characteristics</u>					
Biologically related to father	1139	93.2	1961	91.4	+
Child Age					
Infant (0-1)	1139	15.3	1961	15.2	
Preschooler (2-5)	1139	30.8	1961	31.0	
School age (6+)	1139	53.9	1961	53.8	
Child Sex: Female	1139	50.0	1961	48.9	
Number of Kids in HH	1139	2.2	1961	2.3	

Note: Percents are unweighted.

\* This category includes 3 cases where both partners work the same number of part-time hours.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

**Table A3.2: Gender Attitude Items in the PSID-CDS**

Below are the gender attitude items from the household booklet. These items are asked of both the primary and other caregivers (usually the mother and father), and are asked in both 1997 and 2002. Response categories include: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree

A37. Please circle the number that indicates your level of agreement with the following statements.

- a. Most of the important decisions in the life of the family should be made by the man of the house
- b. If a husband and a wife both work full-time, they should share household tasks equally
- c. Women are much happier if they stay at home and take care of their children
- d. There is some work that is men's and some that is women's and they should not be doing each other's
- e. It is much better for everyone if the man earns the main living and the woman takes care of the home and family
- f. It is more important for a wife to help her husband's career than to have one herself
- g. It is usually a good idea for a couple to live together before getting married in order to find out whether they really get along.
- h. It's better for a person to get married than to go through life single.
- i. One sees so few good or happy marriages that one questions marriage as a way of life
- j. Personal happiness is the primary goal in marriage
- k. All in all, there are more advantages to being single than to being married
- l. An employed mother can establish as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who is not employed
- m. Parents should encourage just as much independence in their daughters as in their sons.
- n. Preschool children are likely to suffer if their mother is employed
- o. All in all, the benefits of being a parent just aren't worth the costs
- p. Being a father and raising children is one of the most fulfilling experiences a man can have.
- q. Mothers should not work full time if their child is younger than 5 years old.
- r. It is fine for children under 3 years of age to be cared for all day in a daycare center or daycare home
- s. If children are seriously misbehaving it is best to spank them
- t. Being a mother and raising children is one of the most fulfilling experiences a woman can have.
- u. Marriage is a lifetime relationship and should never be ended except under extreme circumstances.
- v. It is essential for the child's well-being that fathers spend time interacting and playing with their children
- w. It is difficult for men to express tender and affectionate feelings toward children
- x. A father should be as heavily involved in the care of his child as the mother
- y. Fathers play a central role in the child's personality development
- z. Fathers are able to enjoy children more when the children are older.
- aa. The way a parent treats a child in the first four years has important life-long effects.
- bb. If it keeps him from getting ahead in his job, a father is being **too** involved with his children.
- cc. In general, fathers and mothers are equally good at meeting their children's needs.

Table A3.3. Change Over Time in Father Involvement, Employment, Attitudes, and Covariates: Fixed Effects Sample, 1997-2002

	Change from 1997-2002	
	Mean or Percent	N
<u>Father Involvement</u>		
Total weekly engagement (in hours)	-2.4	516
Weekly time in physical care (in hours)	-0.6	516
Weekly time in play (in hours)	-1.4	516
Weekly time in achievement-related activities (in hours)	0.1	516
Responsibility	-0.7	420
Father Work Hours per Week (mean)	1.6	529
Percent change		
Decreased hours 1997-2002 by more than 10	7.35	529
Decreased hours 1997-2002 by up to 10	24.37	529
Hours stayed the same	28.82	529
Increased hours 1997-2002 by up to 10	22.88	529
Increased hours 1997-2002 by more than 10	16.58	529
Fathering Attitudes	-0.1	529
<u>Father characteristics</u>		
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	0.0	529
Father age	4.9	529
Attendance at religious services		
Once/week or more (Omitted=less than 1x/month)	0.1	529
1-3 times per month	0.0	529
Less than once per month	-0.1	529
<u>Employment characteristics</u>		
Father occupation: Professional/managerial	0.0	529
Mother's work hours per week (mean)	0.9	529
Percent change		
Decreased hours 1997-2002 by more than 10	19.83	529
Decreased hours 1997-2002 by up to 10	12.82	529
Hours stayed the same	25.08	529
Increased hours 1997-2002 by up to 10	17.31	529
Increased hours 1997-2002 by more than 10	24.97	529
Couple employment characteristics		
Dad works more than mom (Omitted: both fulltime)	0.0	529
Mom works more than dad	0.0	529
<u>Child characteristics</u>		
Number of kids in household	0.0	529

Note: Percents are weighted.

Table A4.1. Father Involvement with Resident Focal Child: Cross-sectional Models Run on Smaller Fixed Effects Sample of 1997 Data

	Total Engagement	Physical Care	Play Activities	Achievement- Related Activities	Respon- sibility
<u>Fathers' gender attitudes</u>					
Pro-fathering attitudes	1.30 *	0.73 ***	0.42	0.15 **	0.27 +
Separate spheres attitudes (+ = nontrad)	1.24 *	0.29 +	0.65 +	0.02	0.10
Pro-Maternal employment attitudes	0.15	0.04	0.09	-0.15 *	0.14
<u>Father characteristics</u>					
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	4.36 +	0.50	2.40	0.09	-1.30
Age	-0.19 +	0.00	-0.11	0.00	-0.02
<u>Education</u>					
High school grad (Omitted=<hs)	-0.64	0.05	-1.38	-0.09	0.35
Some college	0.37	-0.36	-0.28	-0.01	-0.37
College grad or higher	-1.07	-0.51	-1.63	0.23	-0.29
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>					
Black (Omitted=white)	-0.37	0.27	-1.32	0.23	0.31
Other Race	-1.40	0.71	-2.84 *	-0.21	1.23
Latino	1.67	0.32	-0.69	-0.35 *	3.44 ***
<u>Attendance at religious services</u>					
Once/week or more (Omitted=Less than 1x/month)	0.92	0.22	-0.44	-0.01	0.89 ***
1-3 times a month	2.71	0.84 +	1.05	0.34 +	0.64 +
<u>Maternal employment</u>					
Part-time (Omitted=Not employed)	0.40	0.25	0.55	0.08	-0.26
Fulltime	0.73	0.33	0.31	0.25 +	-0.28
<u>Child characteristics</u>					
Biologically related to father	5.36 *	0.87	2.39	0.19	1.05
<u>Age</u>					
Preschooler: 2-5 (Omitted=Infant, 0-1)	2.87	0.90	0.22	0.29 **	-0.98 *
School-aged: 6-12	-0.66	-0.23	-1.70	0.13	-1.03 *
Sex: Female	1.14	0.06	0.83	-0.18 +	-0.30
Number of kids in household	-1.41 *	-0.17	-0.66	-0.02	-0.08
N	526	526	526	526	431
R <sup>2</sup>	0.14	0.09	0.12	0.13	0.37

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A5.1. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement: Cross-sectional Models Run on Smaller Fixed Effects Sample of 1997 Data

	Overall Engagement	Physical Care	Play	Achievement- Related Activities	Respon- sibility
Fathers' work hours	-0.07	-0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
<u>Father characteristics</u>					
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	3.27	0.63	1.77	0.27 +	-2.33 **
Age	-0.23 *	-0.02	-0.12	0.00	-0.03
Education					
High school grad (Omitted=<hs)	0.12	0.23	-0.88	-0.06	0.48
Some college	1.77	0.00	0.60	0.06	-0.21
College grad or higher	1.08	0.13	-0.21	0.32	-0.32
Race/Ethnicity					
Black (Omitted=white)	-1.29	0.02	-1.86	0.06	0.21
Other Race	-2.92	-0.40	-3.47 *	-0.39 *	1.40
Latino	1.10	0.36	-1.26	-0.32 *	3.69 ***
Attendance at religious services					
Once/week or more (Omitted=Less than 1x/month)	0.74	0.34	-0.62	0.08	0.93 ***
1-3 times a month	2.32	0.67	0.83	0.33 +	0.58
Occupation: Professional/managerial	-0.38	0.20	-0.89	0.04	0.42
<u>Couple employment characteristics</u>					
Dad works more than mom (Omitted: both fulltime)	-0.42	-0.13	0.02	0.00	0.05
Mom works more than dad	0.29	0.31	0.85	0.78 +	0.61
Neither parent works	-8.95 +	-4.24 **	-1.24	0.17	--
<u>Child characteristics</u>					
Biologically related to father	5.76 *	1.09	2.58 +	0.19	1.15
Age					
Preschooler: 2-5 (Omitted=Infant, 0-1)	2.14	0.66	-0.17	0.21 *	-1.02 *
School-aged: 6-12	-1.63	-0.65	-2.11	0.07	-1.21 *
Sex: Female	1.43	0.16	0.97	-0.14	-0.26
Number of kids in household	-1.29 *	-0.14	-0.60	-0.01 +	-0.08
N	526	526	526	526	431
R <sup>2</sup>	0.12	0.06	0.11	0.13	0.37

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A5.2. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement with Interactions between Work Hours and Fathering Attitudes: Cross-sectional Models, 1997

	Overall Engagement	Physical Care	Play	Achievement- Related Activities	Respon- sibility
Father work hours	-0.11	-0.05 +	-0.06	0.00	0.02
Most nontraditional fathering attitudes	-2.35	-1.34	-0.40	0.79	0.77
Middle 50% fathering attitudes	-0.42	0.09	-1.15	0.45	2.53 **
Nontrad'l attitudes x father work hours	0.08	0.05	0.01	-0.01	0.01
Middle attitudes x father work hours	0.02	0.01	0.04	-0.01	-0.05 *
<u>Father characteristics</u>					
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	3.39 *	0.03	2.49 *	0.12	-0.52
Age	-0.13 +	0.00	-0.10 +	-0.01	-0.03 +
Education					
High school grad (Omitted=<hs)	-0.68	0.11	-1.13	-0.23 *	0.07
Some college	-0.85	-0.22	-1.04	-0.04	-0.29
College grad or higher	-1.42	-0.10	-1.88 +	0.13	-0.54
Race/Ethnicity					
Black (Omitted=white)	-1.39	-0.20	-2.09 **	0.06	0.12
Other Race	-1.59	0.10	-2.00	-0.23 *	2.19 **
Latino	0.50	0.12	-1.89 +	-0.25 *	2.61 ***
Attendance at religious services					
Once/week or more (Omitted=Less than 1x/month)	1.92 *	0.32	0.34	-0.01	0.67 **
1-3 times a month	1.10	0.51	0.07	0.11	0.65 *
Occupation: Professional/managerial	0.55	0.28	-0.08	0.07	0.14
<u>Couple employment characteristics</u>					
Dad works more than mom (Omitted: both fulltime)	-0.73	-0.10	-0.19	0.08	0.00
Mom works more than dad	-0.89	-0.09	-1.04	0.69 *	0.97
Neither parent works	-2.86	-1.80 +	-0.14	0.17	2.81 *
<u>Child characteristics</u>					
Biologically related to father	4.46 **	0.95 *	1.49	0.27 **	0.77 +
Age					
Preschooler: 2-5 (Omitted=Infant, 0-1)	2.19 +	0.53	0.27	0.30 ***	-0.16
School-aged: 6-12	-2.05	-0.72 *	-2.40 *	0.33 **	-0.06
Sex: Female	-0.08	0.24	-0.08	-0.17 *	-0.18
Number of kids in household	-1.49 ***	-0.09	-0.84 **	-0.04 +	0.09
N	1126	1126	1126	1126	954
R <sup>2</sup>	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.26

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A5.3. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement with Interactions between Work Hours and Fathering Attitudes: Fixed Effects Models, 1997-2002

	Overall Engagement	Physical Care	Play	Achievement- Related Activities	Respon- sibility
Fathers' work hours	-0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.03
Most nontraditional fathering attitudes	3.22 *	1.13 **	0.92	0.26	0.07
Middle 50% fathering attitudes	1.11	-0.14	0.38	0.23	-0.34
Nontrad'l attitudes x father work hours	-0.32 **	-0.08	-0.14 +	0.00	0.03
Middle attitudes x father work hours	-0.29 *	-0.06	-0.15 +	0.00	0.04
<u>Father characteristics</u>					
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	2.46	-0.40	3.40	-0.07	-1.32
Father age	-0.92 **	-0.13	-0.58 *	-0.04	0.12
Attendance at religious services					
Once/week or more (Omitted=less than 1x/month)	-1.28	-0.34	-0.17	0.05	-0.17
1-3 times per month	1.39	0.90 +	0.26	0.42 **	-0.31
Occupation: Professional/managerial	0.42	-1.24 +	1.38	0.12	-0.03
<u>Couple employment characteristics</u>					
Dad works more than mom (Omitted: both fulltime)	1.91	0.62 +	1.00	0.03	-0.12
Mom works more than dad	4.39	2.15 +	2.35	0.85 +	-0.50
<u>Child characteristics</u>					
Focal child age	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.01 **	0.00
Number of kids in hh	-1.27	0.11	-1.63 *	-0.08	-0.37
N	516	516	516	516	420
R <sup>2</sup>	0.07	0.11	0.05	0.06	0.11

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A5.4. OLS Coefficients Showing the Effect of Fathers' Work Hours on Father Involvement by Fathering Attitudes: Cross-sectional Models Run on Smaller Fixed Effects Sample of 1997 Data

Dependent Variable	Most Traditional			Most Nontraditional			Significant difference?
	Estimate	N	R <sup>2</sup>	Estimate	N	R <sup>2</sup>	
Overall Engagement	-0.17	136	0.21	0.02	138	0.23	n.s.
Physical Care	-0.02	136	0.17	0.00	138	0.13	n.s.
Play	-0.07	136	0.21	0.01	138	0.25	n.s.
Achievement-related Activities	0.01	136	0.20	-0.01	138	0.20	n.s.
Responsibility	0.00	104	0.58	0.04	124	0.51	n.s.

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include all previously described covariates, although not shown here. Difference in effect of work hours on father involvement is determined by the significance of an interaction term analysis of work hours and attitude quartiles run on the full sample. Full results from that model available in Appendix Table A5.6.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A5.5. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement, by Fathering Attitudes: Cross-sectional Models, 1997

	Overall Engagement		Physical care		Play		Achievement-Related Activities		Responsibility	
	Trad'l	Nontrad'l	Trad'l	Nontrad'l	Trad'l	Nontrad'l	Trad'l	Nontrad'l	Trad'l	Nontrad'l
Father work hours	-0.18	-0.03	-0.07 **	0.01	-0.14 ***	-0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03
<u>Father characteristics</u>										
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	3.70	5.93 *	1.24	1.34	0.17	3.28 +	0.21	-0.11	-2.34 *	-0.55
Age	-0.12	-0.28 *	-0.03	0.02	-0.09	-0.18 *	-0.02 +	-0.02	-0.09 *	0.04
Education										
High school grad (Omitted=<hs)	1.06	0.17	0.84	-0.31	-1.28	1.26	-0.21	0.02	0.54	0.09
Some college	-0.91	-1.21	0.15	-0.90	-1.40	-0.14	-0.01	0.21	0.28	-1.25
College grad or higher	-2.09	1.29	0.50	-0.98	-4.02 *	1.54	-0.15	0.37	-0.21	-0.95
Race/Ethnicity										
Black (Omitted=white)	2.17	0.21	1.09	-0.35	-1.48	-1.79	0.03	-0.13	0.60	-1.10
Other Race	0.67	-0.75	-0.23	0.56	-3.43 +	-2.86 *	0.04	-0.30	1.91	1.35
Latino	2.66	-1.61	1.26	-0.40	-1.73	-2.69	0.23	-0.34 +	2.49 *	3.38 *
Attendance at religious services										
Once/week or more (Omitted=Less than 1x/month)	3.16 +	-0.42	0.24	0.21	-0.02	-0.89	0.14	-0.35	0.20	1.24 **
1-3 times a month	-1.21	0.91	-0.66	0.44	-1.15	0.53	-0.02	-0.15	-0.49	1.77 **
Occupation: Professional/managerial	1.32	0.04	0.09	0.12	2.05	-0.59	0.27 *	0.18	0.18	-0.46
<u>Couple employment characteristics</u>										
Dad works more than mom (Omitted: both fulltime)	0.58	-3.07 +	0.21	-0.50	0.72	-1.47	0.02	0.35 +	0.54	-0.64
Mom works more than dad	-10.46 +	-0.19	-2.16	0.74	-8.43 ***	-0.43	0.14	1.25	0.68	1.78 *
Neither parent works	-0.76	-15.67 *	-3.31	-3.82 +	-0.08	-8.37 **	-0.10	0.37	1.98	1.11
<u>Child characteristics</u>										
Biologically related to father	5.66 *	-1.25	0.96	-0.71	1.31	-2.43	0.17 +	0.63	1.15 +	0.87
Age										
Preschooler: 2-5 (Omitted=Infant, 0-1)	0.15	3.36 *	0.57	0.32	-2.00	0.90	0.11	0.39 *	0.87 *	-0.70 +
School-aged: 6-12	-0.23	-0.50	0.33	-2.25 **	-2.69 *	-0.64	0.11	0.67 *	1.08 **	-0.62
Sex: Female	-1.82	0.44	-0.15	0.35	-1.38 +	0.97	0.00	-0.48 *	-0.19	-0.26
Number of kids in household	-2.13 **	-0.41	-0.22	-0.04	-0.98 *	-0.16	-0.04	-0.02	-0.20	0.20
N	298	289	298	289	298	289	298	289	246	259
R <sup>2</sup>	0.21	0.23	0.17	0.13	0.21	0.25	0.20	0.20	0.58	0.51

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

Table A5.6. OLS Coefficients Predicting Father Involvement with Interactions between Work Hours and Fathering Attitudes: Cross-sectional Models Run on Smaller Fixed Effects Sample of 1997 Data

	Overall Engagement	Physical Care	Play	Achievement- Related Activities	Respon- sibility
Father work hours	0.01	-0.01	0.05	0.01	0.02
Most nontraditional fathering attitudes	3.61	1.97	2.15	1.09	0.27
Middle 50% fathering attitudes	7.89	1.71	4.86	0.87	1.51 +
Nontrad'l attitudes x father work hours	-0.04	-0.01	-0.05	-0.02	0.01
Middle attitudes x father work hours	-0.14	-0.02	-0.08	-0.02 +	-0.04 *
<u>Father characteristics</u>					
Married (Omitted=Cohabiting)	3.13	0.68	1.35	0.27 +	-2.11 **
Age	-0.19	0.00	-0.07	0.00	-0.02
Education					
High school grad (Omitted=<chs)	0.00	0.22	-0.64	-0.07	0.32
Some college	1.20	-0.25	0.51	-0.01	-0.36
College grad or higher	0.30	-0.20	-0.55	0.22	-0.37
Race/Ethnicity					
Black (Omitted=white)	-1.76	-0.07	-2.10 +	0.03	0.16
Other Race	-2.86	-0.06	-3.55 *	-0.36 +	1.44
Latino	0.99	0.20	-1.19	-0.33 *	3.55 ***
Attendance at religious services					
Once/week or more (Omitted=Less than 1x/month)	0.57	0.14	-0.62	0.06	0.84 **
1-3 times a month	2.29	0.72	0.73	0.33 +	0.58 +
Occupation: Professional/managerial	-0.35	0.13	-0.77	0.03	0.28
<u>Couple employment characteristics</u>					
Dad works more than mom (Omitted: both fulltime)	-0.61	-0.17	-0.21	-0.02	0.09
Mom works more than dad	0.64	0.36	0.80	0.84 +	0.82
Neither parent works	-12.63 *	-4.64 **	-3.52	-0.06	--
<u>Child characteristics</u>					
Biologically related to father	5.48 *	0.82	2.61 +	0.16	1.01
Age					
Preschooler: 2-5 (Omitted=Infant, 0-1)	2.20	0.89	-0.18	0.24 *	-0.89 *
School-aged: 6-12	-1.65	-0.10	-1.87	0.11	-0.99 *
Sex: Female	1.51	0.18	0.96	-0.14	-0.19
Number of kids in household	-1.35 *	-0.22	-0.68	-0.02	-0.12
N	526	526	526	526	431
R <sup>2</sup>	0.13	0.09	0.12	0.14	0.39

Note: Results are weighted. Models also include control variables for missing data on religious service attendance and occupation.

+ p<0.10 \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001

## References

- Aldous, J., G. M. Mulligan, and T. Bjarnason. (1998). "Fathering over Time: What Makes the Difference?" Journal of Marriage and Family 60(4): 809-820.
- Almqvist, A.-L. (2008). "Why Most Swedish Fathers and Few French Fathers Use Paid Parental Leave: An Exploratory Qualitative Study of Parents." Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers 6(2): 192-200.
- Amato, P. and F. Rivera (1999). "Paternal involvement and children's behavior problems." Journal of Marriage and the Family 61(2): 375-384.
- Anderson, S.J. and J.T. Johnson. (2003). "The who and when of "gender-bling" attitudes: Predictors of gender-role egalitarianism in two different domains." Sex Roles 49(9-10):527-532.
- Beitel, A. H. and R. D. Parke (1998). "Paternal involvement in infancy: The role of maternal and paternal attitudes." Journal of Family Psychology 12(2): 268-288.
- Bianchi, S. and S. Raley (2005). Time Allocation in Families. Work, Family, Health, and Well-Being. S. Bianchi, L. Casper and R. King. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum: 21-42.
- Bianchi, S. M. (2000). "Maternal Employment and Time with Children: Dramatic Change or Surprising Continuity." Demography 37: 401-414.
- Bianchi, S. M., J. P. Robinson, and M. A. Milkie. (2006). Changing Rhythms of American Family Life. New York, Russell Sage.
- Biggart, L. and M. O'Brien. (2010). "UK fathers' long work hours: Career stage or fatherhood?" Fathering 8(3):341-361.

- Bittman, M. (2004). "Parenting and employment: What time-use surveys show."  
Family Time: The Social Organization of Care. N. F. a. M. Bittman. New York,  
Routledge: 152-170.
- Bittman, M., L. Craig, and N. Folbre. (2004). "Packaging Care: What Happens with  
Children Receive Nonparental Care?" Family Time: The Social Organization of  
Care. N. F. a. M. Bittman. New York, Routledge: 133-151.
- Bittman, M., P. England, L. Sayer, N. Folbre, and G. Matheson. (2003). "When Does  
Gender Trump Money? Bargaining and Time in Household Work." American  
Journal of Sociology 109(1): 186-214.
- Blau, F. D., M. A. Ferber, and A. E. Winkler. (2006). The Economics of Women, Men,  
and Work. Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall.
- Bonney, J. F., M. L. Kelley, and R. F. Levant. (1999). "A model of fathers' behavioral  
involvement in child care in dual-earner families." Journal of Family Psychology  
13(3): 401-415.
- Brayfield, A. (1995). "Juggling Jobs and Kids: The Impact of Employment Schedules on  
Fathers' Caring for Children." Journal of Marriage and the Family 57(2): 321-32.
- Brines, J. (1994). "Economic Dependency, Gender, and the Division-of-Labor at Home."  
American Journal of Sociology 100(3): 652-688.
- Bronte-Tinkew, J., J. Carrano, A. Horowitz, and A. Kinukawa. (2008). "Involvement  
Among Resident Fathers and Links to Infant Cognitive Outcomes." Journal of  
Family Issues 29(9): 1211-1244.
- Bulanda, R. E. (2004). "Paternal Involvement with Children: The Influence of Gender  
Ideologies." Journal of Marriage & Family 66(1): 40-45.

- Christiansen, S. L. and R. O. B. Palkovitz (2001). "Why the "Good Provider" Role Still Matters: Providing as a Form of Paternal Involvement." Journal of Family Issues 22(1): 84-106.
- Cohen, T. F. (1993). What do father's provide? Reconsidering the economic and nurturing dimensions of men as parents. Men, Work, and Family. J. Hood. Newbury Park, CA, Sage Publications.
- Coltrane, S. (1996). Family Man: Fatherhood, Housework, and Gender Equity. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Cooksey, E. and M. Fondell (1996). "Spending time with his kids: Effects of family structure on fathers' and children's lives." Journal of Marriage and the Family 58(3): 693-707.
- Crouter, A. C. and S. M. McHale (2005). The Long Arm of the Job Revisited: Parenting in Dual-Earner Families. Parenting: An Ecological Perspective. L. a. Okagaki. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: 275-296.
- Darling-Fisher, C. and L. Tiedje (1990). "The impact of maternal employment characteristics on fathers' participation in child care." Family Relations 39: 20-26.
- Dermott, E. (2006). "What's parenthood got to do with it?: men's hours of paid work." British Journal of Sociology 57(4): 619-634.
- Dermott, E. (2008). Intimate Fatherhood: A Sociological Analysis. New York, Routledge.
- Deutsch, F. (1999). Halving It All: How Equally Shared Parenting Works. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.

- Deutsch, F. M., J. B. Lussier, and L. J. Servis. (1993). "Husbands at home: Predictors of paternal participation in childcare and housework." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 65(6): 1154-1166.
- Eggebeen, D. J. and C. Knoester (2001). "Does Fatherhood Matter for Men?" Journal of Marriage and the Family 63(2): 381-393.
- Furstenberg, F. F. (1988). Good Dads-Bad Dads: The Two Faces of Fatherhood. The Changing American Family and Public Policy. A. J. Cherlin. Washington, DC, The Urban Institute.
- Galinsky, E., K. Aumann, and J. Bond. (2008). "Times are changing: Gender and generation at work and at home." New York, NY, Families and Work Institute.  
[http://familiesandwork.org/site/research/reports/Times\\_Are\\_Changing.pdf](http://familiesandwork.org/site/research/reports/Times_Are_Changing.pdf)  
Accessed 6 July 2010.
- Gaunt, R. (2006). "Biological Essentialism, Gender Ideologies, and Role Attitudes: What Determines Parents' Involvement in Child Care." Sex Roles 55(7/8): 523-533.
- Gauthier, A. H., T. M. Smeeding, and F. F. Furstenberg, Jr. (2004). "Are Parents Investing Less Time in Children? Trends in Selected Industrialized Countries." Population and Development Review 30(4): 647-671.
- Gerson, K. (1993). No Man's Land: Men's Changing Commitments to Family and Work, BasicBooks.
- Gerson, K. (2010). The Unfinished Revolution: How a New Generation is Reshaping Family, Work, and Gender in America. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Gibson-Davis, C. M. (2008). "Family structure effects on maternal and paternal parenting in low-income families." Journal of Marriage and Family 70(May): 452-465.

- Goldscheider, F. K. (2000). "Men, children and the future of the family in the third millennium." Futures 32(6): 525-538.
- Goldscheider, F., L.S. Olah, and A. Puur. (2010). "Reconciling studies of men's gender attitudes and fertility: Response to Westoff and Higgins." Demographic Research 22(8):189-198.
- Goldscheider, F. K. and L. J. Waite (1991). New families, no families? Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- Haas, L. (2003). "Parental Leave and Gender Equality: Lessons from the European Union." Review of Policy Research 20(1): 89-114.
- Haas, L. and C. Hwang (2009). "Is Fatherhood Becoming More Visible at Work? Trends in Corporate Support for Fathers Taking Parental Leave in Sweden." Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers 7(3): 303-321.
- Haas, L. and M. O'Brien. (2010). "New Observations on How Fathers Work and Care: Introduction to the Special Issue--Men, Work and Parenting--Part I." Fathering 8(3):271-275.
- Harrington, B., F. V. Deusen, and J. Ladge. (2010). "The New Dad: Exploring Fatherhood within a Career Context. Boston, MA, Boston College Center for Work & Family." [http://www.bc.edu/centers/cwf/meta-elements/pdf/BCCWF\\_Fatherhood\\_Study\\_The\\_New\\_Dad.pdf](http://www.bc.edu/centers/cwf/meta-elements/pdf/BCCWF_Fatherhood_Study_The_New_Dad.pdf) Accessed 6 July 2010.
- Harris, K., F. Furstenberg, and J. Marmer. (1998). "Paternal involvement with adolescents in intact families: The influence of fathers over the life course." Demography 35(2): 201-216.

- Harris, K. M. and S. P. Morgan (1991). "Fathers, sons, and daughters: Differential paternal involvement in parenting." Journal of Marriage and Family 53: 531-544.
- Hochschild, A. R. with A. Machung. (1989). The Second Shift. New York: Viking.
- Hofferth, S. (2003). "Race/ethnic differences in father involvement in two-parent families: Culture, context, or economy?" Journal of Family Issues 24(2): 185-216.
- Hofferth, S. and K. Anderson (2003). "Are all dads equal? Biology versus marriage as a basis for paternal investment." Journal of Marriage and Family 65(1): 213-232.
- Hofferth, S., N. Cabrera, M. Carlson, R. L. Coley, R. Day, and H. Schindler. (2007). "Residential Father Involvement and Social Fathering." Handbook of Measurement Issues in Family Research. Sandra L. Hofferth and Lynne M. Casper (Eds.). Mahwah, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Hofferth, S. L., P. Davis-Kean, and J. Finkelstein. (1999). "1997 User Guide: The Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics." Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.
- Hofferth, S. L. and F. Goldscheider (2010). "Does Change in Young Men's Employment Influence Fathering?" Family Relations 59: 479-493.
- Hook, J. L. and C. M. Wolfe (2010). "New Fathers? Residential Fathers' Time with Children in Four Countries." Paper presented at the 2010 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America. Dallas, TX.
- Hyde, Essex, and Horton. (1993). "Fathers and Parental Leave: Attitudes and Experiences." Journal of Family Issues 14: 616-638.

- Hynes, K. and Greene (2009). "Differences between Single- and Dual-Earner Families in Fathers' Time with Children." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America. Detroit, MI.
- Ishii-Kuntz, M. and S. Coltrane (1992). "Predicting the Sharing of Household Labor: Are Parenting and Housework Distinct?" Sociological Perspectives 35(4): 629-647.
- Kaufman, G., C. Lyonette, and R. Crompton. (2010). "Post-birth employment leave among fathers in Britain and the United States." Fathering 8(3):321-340.
- Kaufman and Uhlenberg (2000). "The influence of parenthood on the work effort of married men and women." Social Forces 78(3): 931.
- King, L.A., D.W. King, D.M. Gudanowski, and C.T. Taft. (1997). "Latent structure of the sex-role egalitarianism scale: Confirmatory factor analyses." Sex Roles 36(3-4):221-234.
- King, V. (2003). "The Influence of Religion on Fathers' Relationships with their Children." Journal of Marriage and Family 65:382-395.
- Lamb (2000). The History of Research on Father Involvement: An Overview. Fatherhood: Research, Interventions, and Policies. H. E. P. a. R. D. Day, Haworth Press: 23-42.
- Lamb. (2004). The Role of the Father in Child Development. Hoboken, NJ, Wiley.
- Lamb, M. E. and C. S. Tamis-Lemonda (2004). "The Role of the Father: An Introduction." The role of the father in child development. Lamb. Hoboken, NJ, Wiley: 1-31.

- Lammi-Taskula, J. (2008). "Doing Fatherhood: Understanding the Gendered Use of Parental Leave in Finland." Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers 6(2): 133-148.
- LaRossa, R. (1988). "Fatherhood and Social Change." Family Relations 37(4): 451-457.
- Lundberg, S., S. McLanahan, and E. Rose. (2005). "Child gender and father involvement in Fragile Families." Demography 44: 79-92.
- Marsiglio, W. (1991). "Paternal Engagement Activities with Minor Children." Journal of Marriage and the Family 53: 973-986.
- Maume, D. J. (2006). "Gender Differences in Restricting Work Efforts Because of Family Responsibilities." Journal of Marriage & Family 68(4): 859-869.
- Maume, D. J. (2008). "Gender Differences in Providing Urgent Childcare among Dual-earner Parents." Social Forces 87(1): 273-297.
- McDonald, P. (2000). "Gender equity in theories of fertility transition." Population and Development Review 26(3):427-439.
- McKay, L. and A. Doucet. (2010). "'Without taking away her leave': A Canadian case study of couples' decisions on fathers' use of paid parental leave." Fathering 8(3):300-320.
- Nock, S. L. and P. W. Kingston (1988). "Time With Children: The Impact of Couples' Work-Time Commitments." Social Forces 67(1): 59.
- Nomaguchi, K. M. (2009). "Change in Work-Family Conflict Among Employed Parents Between 1977 and 1997." Journal of Marriage and Family 71(1): 15-32.
- Palkovitz, R. (1984). "Parental attitudes and fathers' interactions with their 5-month-old infants." Developmental Psychology 20(6): 1054-1060.

- Palkovitz, R. (1997). "Reconstructing "involvement": Expanding conceptualizations of men's caring in contemporary families." In A.J. Hawkins & D.C. Dollahite (Eds.), Generative Fathering: Beyond Deficit Perspectives (pp.200-216). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Perry-Jenkins, M., A. E. Goldberg, C. P. Pierce, and A. G. Sayer. (2007). "Shift Work, Role Overload, and the Transition to Parenthood." Journal of Marriage & Family 69(1): 123-138.
- Perry-Jenkins, M., R. L. Repetti, and A. C. Crouter. (2000). "Work and Family in the 1990s." Journal of Marriage & Family 62(4): 981-998.
- Pleck, J. H. (1997). Paternal involvement: Levels, sources, and consequences. The role of father in child development. M. E. Lamb. New York, Wiley: 66-103.
- Pleck, J. H. and B. Masciadrelli (2004). Paternal involvement in U.S. residential fathers: Levels, sources, and consequences. The role of the father in child development. M.E.Lamb. New York, Wiley: 222-271.
- Pleck, J.H., F.L. Sonenstein, and L.C. Ku. (1994). "Attitudes toward male roles among adolescent males: A discriminant validity analysis." Sex Roles 30(7-8):481-501.
- Presser, H. B. (2004). Chapter 3: Employment in a 24/7 Economy: Challenges for the Family. Fighting for Time: Shifting Boundaries of Work and Social Life. C. F. E. a. A. L. Kalleberg. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Raley, S. and S. Bianchi (2006). "Sons, Daughters, and Family Processes: Does Gender of Children Matter?" Annual Review of Sociology 32: 401-421.
- Ranson, G. (2001). "Men at Work: Change--or No Change?--in the Era of the "New Father"." Men and Masculinities 4(1): 3-26.

- Roeters, A., T. van der Lippe, and E. S. Kluwer. (2009). "Parental Work Demands and the Frequency of Child-Related Routine and Interactive Activities." Journal of Marriage and Family 71(5): 1193-1204.
- Roggman, L., L. Boyce, G. A. Cook, and J. Cook. (2002). "Getting dads involved: Predictors of father involvement in Early Head Start and with their children." Infant Mental Health Journal 23(Special Issue 1-2): 62-78.
- Roxburgh, S. (2006). "'I Wish We Had More Time to Spend Together...': The Distribution and Predictors of Perceived Family Time Pressures Among Married Men and Women in the Paid Labor Force." Journal of Family Issues 27(4): 529-553.
- Russell, G. and C. P. Hwang (2004). "The Impact of Workplace Practices on Father Involvement." The Role of the Father in Child Development. M. Lamb. Hoboken, NJ, Wiley.
- Sandberg, J. (1999). "Modeling Multi-dimensionality of Involvement in Two Parent Families: A Latent Class Analysis of Paternal Responsibility." Unpublished manuscript, McGill University.
- Sandberg, J. F. and S. L. Hofferth (2001). "Changes in Children's Time with Parents: United States, 1981-1997." Demography 38(3): 423-436.
- Schindler, H. S. (2010). "The Importance of Parenting and Financial Contributions in Promoting Fathers' Psychological Health." Journal of Marriage and Family 72(2): 318-332.

- Seward, R. R., D. E. Yeatts, I. Amin, and A. Dewitt. (2006). "Employment Leave and Fathers' Involvement with Children: According to Mothers and Fathers." Men and Masculinities 8(4): 405-427.
- Shelton, B. A. (2000). Understanding the Distribution of Housework between Husbands and Wives. The Ties that Bind: Perspectives on Marriage and Cohabitation. L. Waite. New York, Aldine de Gruyter.
- Townsend, N. W. (2002). The Package Deal: Marriage, Work, and Fatherhood in Men's Lives. Philadelphia, Temple University Press.
- Wall, G. and S. Arnold (2007). "How Involved Is Involved Fathering?: An Exploration of the Contemporary Culture of Fatherhood." Gender Society 21(4): 508-527.
- West, C. and D. H. Zimmerman (1987). "Doing Gender." Gender and Society 1(2): 125-151.
- Wilcox, W. B. (2002). "Religion, Convention, and Paternal Involvement." Journal of Marriage and Family 64:780-792.
- Wilcox, W. B. (2004). Soft Patriarchs, New Men: How Christianity Shapes Fathers and Husbands. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Willets-Bloom, M.C. and S.L. Nock. (1994). "The influence of maternal employment on gender role attitudes of men and women." Sex Roles 30(5-6):371-389.
- Woldoff, R.A. and M.G. Cina. (2007). "Regular work, underground jobs, and hustling: An examination of paternal work and father involvement." Fathering 5(3):153-173.
- Yeung, W., J. Sandberg, P. E. Davis-Kean, and S. L. Hofferth. (2001). "Children's time with fathers in intact families." Journal of Marriage and Family 63(1): 136-154.

Zuo, J. (1997). "The effect of men's breadwinner status on their changing gender beliefs." Sex Roles 37(9-10):799-816.

Zuo, J. and S. Tang. (2000). "Breadwinner status and gender ideologies of men and women regarding family roles." Sociological Perspectives 43(1):29-43.