
CHAPTER 1

The Role of the Father

An Introduction

MICHAEL E. LAMB and CATHERINE S. TAMIS-LEMONDA

THE FIRST TWO EDITIONS of *The Role of the Father in Child Development* (Lamb, 1976, 1981c) contained encyclopedic introductory chapters in which Lamb attempted to provide inclusive reviews of the primary and secondary literatures. Such endeavors were no longer possible by the time of the third edition, when the reference list for such a chapter would have occupied more space than any of the chapters in the book! For the same reasons, this fourth edition of the anthology instead includes an introductory chapter in which we attempt to articulate major themes in our contemporary understanding of father-child relationships and paternal influences, while referring readers to the chapters that follow for more detailed reviews of the relevant literature. In this chapter we thus discuss some defining assumptions about fatherhood and recent work on the characteristics, determinants, and effects of paternal behavior, and we then close with summaries of the chapters included in this book.

Substantial progress has clearly been made by scholars over the last 30 years. Hundreds of studies have enriched the empirical literature, while theorists have elaborated and refined the conceptual frameworks designed to elucidate fatherhood, father-child relationships, and paternal roles. When the first edition of this anthology was published in 1976, most social scientists doubted that fathers significantly shaped the experiences and development of their children, especially their daughters. As a result, contributors to the first edition all made concerted and often explicit efforts to demonstrate that fathers (a) indeed had a role to play in child development, (b) were often salient in their children's lives, and (c) affected the course of their children's development, for good as well as for ill. Although somewhat less defensive in tone, contributions to the second edition, published just five years later in 1981, not surprisingly emphasized the same conclusions. By contrast, chapters in the third volume (1997) reflected widespread acceptance of the notion that fathers are often affectively and formatively salient. The contributors' focus was thus placed on more nuanced issues and concerns.

2 THE ROLE OF THE FATHER

Four prominent areas of research dominate the contributions to this volume and thus frame this chapter: (a) discourse on the nature of father involvement, (b) research on fathers' influences, (c) studies focused on the determinants of father involvement, and (d) interest in the synergy between basic research and relevant social policies. Accordingly, current appreciation of the complex, multidimensional roles that fathers play in family life today are explored in the first section. Studies that have helped researchers understand the direct and indirect influences of fathers on children's development are then discussed. In the third section we examine research on the factors that affect the nature and extent of paternal involvement. Because social constructions of fatherhood vary across historical epochs and subcultural contexts, the behaviors and experiences of fathers are viewed within nested ecological contexts in this analysis. The growing need to bridge research and policies in the fatherhood arena is then discussed in the fourth section. Now that researchers have amassed a solid body of evidence regarding the benefits of positive father involvement for children's well-being, researchers, practitioners, and policy makers are eager to link scientific findings to initiatives and programs designed to enhance and support the commitment of fathers to their young children. In the final section we outline the book and indicate how the component chapters address the broad themes introduced in the four preceding sections.

THE NATURE OF FATHER INVOLVEMENT

It seems logical to begin this anthology by examining definitions and descriptions of fathering. How available are fathers to their children? What roles do fathers play in family life today? What taxonomies might effectively characterize fathers' activities with and commitments to their children?

LEVELS OF FATHER INVOLVEMENT

Whether and how much time fathers spend with their children are questions at the heart of much research conducted over the past three decades. In the mid-1970s a number of investigators sought to describe—often by detailed observation and sometimes also through detailed maternal and paternal reports—the extent of paternal interactions with children (Pleck & Masciadrelli, this volume; Lamb & Lewis, this volume). Many of these researchers have framed their research around the three types of paternal involvement (engagement, accessibility, responsibility) described by Lamb, Pleck, Charnov, and Levine (1987). As Pleck and Masciadrelli note, researchers have consistently shown that fathers spend much less time with their children than do mothers. In two-parent families in which mothers are unemployed, fathers spend about one-fourth as much time as mothers in direct interaction or engagement with their children, and about a third as much time being accessible to their children. Many fathers assume essentially no responsibility (as defined by participation in key decisions, availability at short notice, involvement in the care of sick children, management and selection of alternative child care, etc.) for their children's care or rearing, however, and the small subgroup of fathers who assume high degrees of responsibility has not been studied extensively. Average levels of paternal responsibility have increased over time, albeit slowly, and there appear to be small but continuing increases over time in average levels of all types of paternal involvement.

In two-parent families with employed mothers, the average levels of paternal engagement and accessibility are both substantially higher than in families with unemployed mothers. In such families paternal involvement in direct interaction or engagement and accessibility average 33% and 65% of the relevant figures for mothers, respectively. Even when both mothers and fathers are employed 30 or more hours per week, however, many fathers assume little responsibility for child care. In addition, it is worth noting that fathers do not necessarily spend more time interacting with their children when mothers are unemployed; rather, the proportions increase dramatically in large part because mothers are spending less time caring for their children. Thus, fathers are *proportionally* more involved when mothers are employed, even though the extent of their involvement, in absolute terms, increases quite modestly, if at all. Over time, levels of paternal involvement in dual-earner families have increased, but the changes are much smaller than popular accounts often suggest (Pleck & Masciadrelli, this volume).

FATHERS' ROLES

Although descriptive accounts of fathers' relative accessibility to children are informative, they fall short of elucidating *what* fathers do when they are available and *why* they do what they do. In this regard, a fuller conceptualization of fathers' roles and the origins of their presumably prescribed responsibilities is warranted. Historical, cultural, and familial ideologies inform the roles fathers play and undoubtedly shape the absolute amounts of time fathers spend with their children, the activities they share with them, and perhaps even the quality of the father-child relationships.

In earlier times, fathers were viewed as all-powerful patriarchs who wielded enormous power over their families (Knibiehler, 1995), and vestiges of these notions continued until quite recently. According to Pleck and Pleck (1997), for example, White fathers were viewed primarily as moral teachers during the colonial phase of American history. By popular consensus, fathers were primarily responsible for ensuring that their children grew up with an appropriate sense of values, acquired primarily from a study of the Bible and other scriptural texts. Around the time of industrialization, however, primary focus shifted from moral leadership to breadwinning and economic support of the family. Then, perhaps as a result of the Great Depression, which revealed many men as poor providers, social scientists came to portray fathers as sex-role models, with commentators expressing concern about the failures of many men to model masculine behavior for their sons. Throughout the 20th century, fathers were urged to be involved (Griswold, 1993), and following feminist and scholarly critiques of masculinity and femininity, there emerged in the late 1970s a new concern with the new nurturant father, who played an active role in his children's lives. As Elizabeth Pleck explains in this volume, however, popular and scholarly discussions of fatherhood have long dwelled on the importance of involvement—often defined by successful bread winning—and the fear of inadequate fathering. In contrast to earlier conceptualizations of fathers' roles that often focused quite narrowly on breadwinning, researchers, theorists, and practitioners no longer cling to the simplistic belief that fathers fill a unidimensional and universal role in their families and in their children's eyes. Instead, they recognize that fathers play a number of significant roles—companions, care providers, spouses, protectors, models, moral guides, teachers, breadwinners—whose relative importance varies across historical epochs and sub-

cultural groups. Only by considering the fathers' performance of these various roles and by taking into account their relative importance in the socioecological contexts concerned can researchers evaluate fathers' impact on child development. Unfortunately, theorists and social commentators have tended in the past to emphasize only one paternal role at a time, with different functions attracting most attention during different historical epochs.

Although fathers have typically been perceived and judged by their breadwinning or provisioning, fathers fill other roles as well. Much of the early observational and survey data suggested that mothers and fathers engaged in rather different types of interaction with their children, especially in Anglo-Saxon countries like the United States (Lamb, 1981a; Lamb & Lewis, this volume). These studies have consistently shown that fathers tend to specialize in play, whereas mothers specialize in caretaking and nurturance, especially (but not only) in relation to infants.

Although such findings seem quite reliable, the results have often been misrepresented and have led to overly stereotypic and unidimensional portrayals of fathers as play partners. Compared with mothers, fathers indeed spend a greater proportion of their time with children engaged in play, but they still spend a small proportion of their own time in play. In absolute terms, most studies suggest that mothers play with their children more than fathers do, but because play (particularly boisterous, stimulating, and emotionally arousing play) is more prominent in father-child interaction, paternal playfulness and relative novelty may help make fathers especially salient to their children (Lamb, Frodi, Hwang, & Frodi, 1983). This enhanced salience may increase fathers' influence more than would be expected based on the amount of time they spend with their children.

However, comparative studies, in which fathers' interactions are contrasted with those of mothers, typically focus on mean-level differences in parenting activities and often obscure common patterns of parent-child interaction. By highlighting the unique qualities of fathers and mothers, they may promote narrow views of fathers' and mothers' roles, thereby failing to capture similarities in the meaning or degree of influence parents exert on their children. In fact, both fathers and mothers encourage exploration during play with their infants (Power, 1985), alter their speech patterns to infants by speaking slowly and using shorter phrases (Dalton-Hummel, 1982; Golinkoff & Ames, 1979; Rondal, 1980), respond to their infants' cries and smiles (Berman, 1980), are sensitive to their 1-year-olds when preoccupied with a task (Notaro & Volling, 1999), and adjust their behaviors to accommodate developmental changes in their infants' competencies (Belsky, Gilstrap, & Rovine, 1984; Crawley & Sherrod, 1984). Sensitive fathering—responding to, talking to, scaffolding, and teaching and encouraging their children to learn—predicts children's cognitive and linguistic achievements just as sensitive mothering does (e.g., Conner, Knight, & Cross, 1997; Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984; Shannon, Tamis-LeMonda, London, & Cabrera, 2002). Such findings suggest that fathers can and do engage with their children in many different ways, not only as playmates, and that they are more than role models.

SUMMARY

In the last decade scholars have moved beyond unidimensional characterizations of fathers as breadwinners or as persons who are dichotomously absent or present to ac-

knowledging the numerous roles that fathers play in their families. Multidimensional conceptions of father involvement have fostered new theoretical models and empirical testing of the relations among measures of fathering, while raising questions about how and why dimensions of fathering vary across developmental and historical time and how they jointly contribute to the life trajectories of children and families (see Day & Lamb, in press, and Tamis-LeMonda & Cabrera, 2002, for multiple examples of these trends). A broader, more inclusive conceptualization of fathers' roles recognizes the appreciable variation that exists both within and between fathers. Most individual fathers assume numerous roles in their families (including breadwinner, playmate, caregiver), while fathers differ with respect to the relative importance of these diverse roles.

FATHERS' INFLUENCES ON CHILDREN

A second line of research on fatherhood examines fathers' effects on children and the pathways through which those effects are exerted. Which aspects of child development were influenced most, at what ages, under which circumstances, and why? Three types of studies have been designed to explore this topic: correlational studies, studies of father absence and divorce, and studies of involved fathers. Here, we review these research methods and then examine direct and indirect effects of fathering on child development.

CORRELATIONAL STUDIES

Many of the earliest studies of paternal influences were designed to identify correlations between paternal and filial characteristics. The vast majority of these studies were conducted between 1940 and 1970 when the father's role as a sex-role model was considered most important; as a result, most studies were focused on sex-role development, especially in sons (for reviews, see Biller, 1971, 1993; Lamb, 1981b). The design of these early studies was quite simple: Researchers assessed masculinity in fathers and sons and then determined how strongly the two sets of scores were correlated. To the great surprise of most researchers, however, there was no consistent correlation between the two constructs, a puzzling finding because it seemed to violate a guiding assumption about the crucial function served by fathers. If fathers did not make their boys into men, what role did they really serve?

It took a while for psychologists to realize that they had failed to ask, Why should boys want to be like their fathers? Presumably they should only want to resemble fathers whom they liked and respected and with whom their relationships were warm and positive. In fact, the quality of father-son relationships proved to be a crucial mediating variable: When the relationships between masculine fathers and their sons were good, the boys were indeed more masculine. Subsequent research even suggested that the quality of the father-child relationships was more important than the masculinity of the father (Mussen & Rutherford, 1963; Payne & Mussen, 1956; Sears, Maccoby, & Levin, 1957). Boys seemed to conform to the sex-role standards of their culture when their relationships with their fathers were warm, regardless of how masculine the fathers were, even though warmth and intimacy have traditionally been seen as feminine characteristics. A similar conclusion was suggested by research on

other aspects of psychosocial adjustment and on achievement: Paternal warmth or closeness appeared beneficial, whereas paternal masculinity appeared to be irrelevant (Biller, 1971; Lamb, 1981b; Radin, 1981). The same characteristics are important with regard to maternal influences, suggesting that fathers and mothers influence children in similar ways by virtue of nurturant personal and social characteristics. Research summarized in this volume by Patterson goes even further, indicating that the sexual orientation of homosexual fathers does not increase the likelihood that their children will be homosexual, effeminate, or maladjusted.

In sum, as far as influences on children are concerned, very little about the gender of the parent seems to be distinctly important. The characteristics of the father as a parent rather than the characteristics of the father as a man appear to be most significant, although it is impossible to demonstrate that the father's masculine characteristics are of no significance. Some scholars continue to underscore the crucial importance of distinctive maternal and paternal roles (Biller, 1994; Biller & Kimpton, 1997), however, and these themes are central to the claims of social commentators like Blankenhorn (1995) and Popenoe (1996) as well.

STUDIES OF FATHER ABSENCE AND DIVORCE

While this body of correlational research was burgeoning in the 1950s, another body of literature, comprising studies in which researchers tried to understand the father's role by examining families without fathers, was developing in parallel. The assumption was that by comparing the behavior and personalities of children raised with and without fathers, one could—essentially by a process of subtraction—estimate what sort of influence fathers typically had on children's development. The early father-absence and correlational studies were conducted in roughly the same era; it is not surprising, therefore, that the outcomes studied were very similar and that the implications were similar and consistent with popular assumptions as well (for reviews, see Adams, Milner, & Schrepf, 1984; Biller, 1974, 1993; Blankenhorn, 1995; Herzog & Suddia, 1973; Whitehead, 1993). As indicated by Hetherington and Stanley-Hagan (1997) children (especially boys) growing up without fathers seemed to have problems in the areas of sex-role and gender-identity development, school performance, psychosocial adjustment, and perhaps in the control of aggression.

Two related issues arising from the father-absence research must be addressed when evaluating these conclusions. First, even when researchers accept the conclusion that there are differences between children raised in families with the father present and those raised in families with the father absent, they must ask why those differences exist and how they should be interpreted. Second, it is important to remember that the existence of differences between groups of children growing up with and without fathers does not mean that every child growing up without a father has problems in the aspect of development concerned or that all children whose fathers live at home develop appropriately. One cannot reach conclusions about the status of individuals from data concerning groups simply because there is great within-group heterogeneity. This again forces us to ask why such heterogeneity exists among children in father-absent families: Why do some children appear to suffer deleterious consequences as a result of father absence, while others do not? More broadly, the question is, What is it about the context that makes for group differences between children in father-absent and father-present contexts, and what accounts for the impressive within-group variance?

Researchers and theorists first sought to explain the effects of father absence on boys by noting the absence of male sex-role models in single-parent families. In the absence of a male parental model, it was assumed that boys could not acquire strong masculine identities or sex roles and would not have models of achievement with which to identify (Biller, 1974, 1993). The validity of this interpretation is weakened by the fact that many boys without fathers seem to develop quite normally so far as sex-role development and achievement are concerned. Clearly, some factors other than the absence of a male sex-role model may be at least as important as (if not more important than) the availability of a sex-role model in mediating the effects of father absence on child development. What might these factors be?

In a conceptual and empirical extension of research on the effects of father absence, many researchers initiated studies in the early 1980s designed to explore more carefully the ways in which divorce and the transition to fatherlessness might influence children's development. The results of these studies have underscored the many ways in which paternal absence influences children (Hetherington & Kelly, 2002). First, there is the absence of a coparent—someone to help out with child care, perhaps participate in tough decisions, and take over when one parent needs a break from the incessant demands of child care. Following divorce, children consistently do better when they are able to maintain meaningful relationships with both parents unless the levels of interparental conflict remain unusually high (Kelly, 2000). Second, there is the economic stress that frequently accompanies single motherhood (Pearson & Thoennes, 1990). The median and mean incomes of single women who head households are significantly lower than in any other group of families, and the disparity is even larger when one considers per capita income rather than household income (Glick & Norton, 1979; Horn, 1995; O'Hare, 1995). Third, the tremendous economic stress experienced by single mothers is accompanied by emotional stress occasioned by a degree of social isolation and continuing (though diminished) social disapproval of single or divorced mothers and children (Hetherington et al., 1982). Fourth, children of divorce are often affected by the perceived, and frequently actual, abandonment by one of their parents (Kelly & Lamb, 2000; Lamb, 1999; Thompson & Laible, 1999). Last, there are the cancerous effects of predivorce and postdivorce marital conflict (Cummings, Goeke-Morey, & Raymond, this volume; Kelly, 2000). Because most single-parent families are produced by divorce and because divorce is often preceded and accompanied by periods of overt and covert spousal hostility, parental conflict may play a major role in explaining the problems of fatherless children.

In sum, the evidence suggests that father absence may be harmful not necessarily because a sex-role model is absent but because many paternal roles—economic, social, emotional—go unfilled or inappropriately filled in these families. Once again, the evidence suggests that recognition of the father's multiple roles as breadwinner, parent, and emotional partner is essential for understanding how fathers influence children's development.

RESEARCH ON INVOLVED FATHERS

In the 1980s several researchers sought to identify the effects of increased paternal involvement on children. In most of these studies researchers compared the status of children in more traditional families with that of children whose fathers either shared or took primary responsibility for child care (Lamb, Pleck, & Levine, 1985; Radin, 1994;

Russell, 1983, 1986); other researchers examined the correlates of varying levels of paternal engagement (Koestner, Franz, & Weinberger, 1990; Mosely & Thomson, 1995). The effects of increased paternal involvement have been addressed in several major studies, and the results have been remarkably consistent. Children with highly involved fathers were characterized by increased cognitive competence, increased empathy, less sex-stereotyped beliefs, and a more internal locus of control (Pleck, 1997; Pruett, 1983, 1985; Radin, 1982, 1994). Again the question that has to be asked is, Why do these sorts of differences occur?

Three factors are probably important in this regard (Lamb et al., 1985). First, when parents assume less sex-stereotyped roles, their children have less sex-stereotyped attitudes themselves about male and female roles. Second, particularly in the area of cognitive competence, these children may benefit from having two highly involved parents rather than just one. This ensures them the diversity of stimulation that comes from interacting with people who have different behavioral styles. A third important issue relates to the family context in which these children are raised. In each of the studies just cited, a high degree of paternal involvement made it possible for both parents to do what was rewarding and fulfilling for them. It allowed fathers to satisfy their desires for closeness to their children while permitting mothers to have adequately close relationships with their children and to pursue career goals. In other words, increased paternal involvement may have made both parents feel much more fulfilled. As a result, the relationships were probably much warmer and richer than might otherwise have been the case. One can speculate that the benefits obtained by children with highly involved fathers is largely attributable to the fact that high levels of paternal involvement created family contexts in which the parents felt good about their marriages and the child care arrangements they had been able to work out.

In all of these studies fathers were highly involved in child care because both they and their partners desired this. The effects on children appeared quite different when fathers were forced to become involved, perhaps by being laid off from work while their partners were able to obtain or maintain their employment (Johnson & Abramovitch, 1985). In such circumstances, wives may have resented the fact that their husbands could not support their families, while the husbands resented having to do "women's work" instead of providing for their families financially (Johnson & Abramovitch, 1988; Russell, 1983). It is not surprising that this constellation of factors appeared to have adverse effects on children, just as the same degree of involvement had positive effects when the circumstances were more benign. Evidently, the extent of paternal involvement may have been much less significant (so far as the effects on children are concerned) than the reasons for high involvement and the parents' evaluations thereof.

DIRECT AND INDIRECT EFFECTS

Research on paternal influences has also moved beyond correlational studies and studies of absence and divorce to explore the pathways through which fathers ultimately affect their children. Fathers affect their children directly and indirectly, and both pathways are key to a comprehensive understanding of fatherhood.

Fathers influence their children directly through their behavior and the attitudes and messages they convey. The direct effects of fathering are especially salient when fathers' and mothers' interactions differ. Because fathers typically spend less time

with their children, for example, many are less familiar with their children's language competencies and thus more likely to speak in ways that challenge children's linguistic and pragmatic abilities. Specifically, when talking to their young children, fathers use more directives, requests for clarification, *wh*-questions, references to past events, imperatives, and contentless utterances than mothers do (e.g., Bellinger & Gleason, 1982; Fash & Madison, 1981; Kavanaugh & Jirkovsky, 1982; Leaper, Anderson, & Sanders, 1998; McLaughlin, White, McDevitt, & Raskin, 1983; Tomasello, Conti-Ramsden, & Ewert, 1990). Because these more complex forms of speech place greater linguistic demands on children, fathers are thought to serve as a bridge to the outside world (Ely, Gleason, Narasimhan, & McCabe, 1995; Gleason, 1975). Thus, fathers' unique communicative styles directly teach children about the linguistic and communicative demands of social exchanges.

Much of the research described in this book is concerned with the ways in which children are directly affected by caretaking, teaching, play, maltreatment, and neglect by their fathers, even though fathers obviously play multiple roles and affect their children's development in many ways other than via direct interaction. Fathers affect children indirectly through their effects on other people and social circumstances that bear on children's development. For example, economic support of the family constitutes an indirect but important way in which fathers contribute to the rearing and emotional health of their children. Furthermore, economic support (or the lack of it) is one of the ways in which noncustodial fathers influence their children's development (Amato & Sobolewski, this volume; Hetherington & Stanley-Hagan, 1997).

A second important, indirect source of influence stems from the father's role as a source of emotional and instrumental support to the other people, principally mothers, involved in the direct care of children (Parke, Power, & Gottman, 1979). The father's function as a source of emotional support tends to enhance the quality of mother-child relationships and thus facilitate positive adjustment by children. Conversely, when fathers are unsupportive and marital conflict is high, children may suffer (Cummings, Goeke-Morey, & Raymond, this volume; Cummings & O'Reilly, 1997). Fathers can also affect the quality of family dynamics by being involved in child-related housework, thus easing the mothers' workloads (Pleck, 1983, 1984). Paternal involvement in housework exemplifies another manner in which fathers influence children: by providing models of behavior that children can either emulate or eschew. Many of the behavior patterns acquired in childhood are the result of lessons derived from observing others and adjusting one's behavior accordingly.

Recognition that indirect patterns of influence are pervasive and perhaps more important than direct learning represents another of the major conceptual revolutions marking the 30 years of scholarship since the first edition of this anthology was prepared. Whereas some contributors to the first edition provocatively proposed that some paternal influences might be mediated indirectly (the chapter by Lewis & Weinraub, 1976, was especially noteworthy in this regard), the extraordinary importance of indirect influences is now recognized universally. Indeed, almost every contributor to this volume underscores the extent to which fathers and children must be viewed as parts of complex social systems (notably the family) in which each person affects each other reciprocally, directly, and indirectly. From this vantage point, of course, appraising the father's impact is much more difficult, both conceptually and statistically, but the newer perspectives promise much greater validity and, ultimately, generalization.

Also of importance in the quest for understanding direct and indirect pathways is

a focus on how different aspects of father involvement codetermine developmental outcomes in children. At this time, researchers have done a better job of exploring single paths of influence than of modeling interrelations among multiple aspects of fathering and child outcomes (Tamis-LeMonda & Cabrera, 2002). For example, Graham and Beller (2002) attempted to disentangle the beneficial effects of child support payments and other potential influences on children's academic achievement. They noted that child support dollars predicted child outcomes better than did other sources of income did but did not account for all of the variance, suggesting that the payment of child support does not simply have a direct impact on child development. Rather, fathers who pay child support may be more committed or dedicated to their children, may have better relationships with their children's mothers, may visit their children more often, or may have the capacity and therefore the tendency to support them. Only by exploring these potential pathways will researchers be able to explain better when, why, and how fathers matter to their children and families.

SUMMARY

Viewed together, the schools of research summarized here have all advanced our understanding of paternal influences. First, fathers and mothers seem to influence their children in similar rather than dissimilar ways. Contrary to the expectations of many developmental psychologists, the differences between mothers and fathers appear to be much less important than the similarities. Not only does the description of mothering largely resemble the description of fathering (particularly the version of involved fathering that has become increasingly prominent in the late 20th century), but the mechanisms and means by which fathers influence their children also appear very similar to those that mediate maternal influences on children. Stated differently, students of socialization have consistently found that parental warmth, nurturance, and closeness are associated with positive child outcomes regardless of whether the parent involved is a mother or a father. The important dimensions of parental influence are those that have to do with parental characteristics rather than gender-related characteristics.

Second, as research has unfolded, psychologists have been forced to conclude that the characteristics of individual fathers—such as their masculinity, intellect, and even their warmth—are much less important, formatively speaking, than are the characteristics of the relationships that they have established with their children. Children who have secure, supportive, reciprocal, and sensitive relationships with their parents are much more likely to be well adjusted psychologically than are individuals whose relationships with their parents (mothers or fathers) are less satisfying. Likewise, the amount of time that fathers and children spend together is probably much less important than what they do with that time and how fathers, mothers, children, and other important people in their lives perceive and evaluate the father-child relationship.

Third, we have come to see that the family context is often at least as important as the individual relationships within the family. Fathers must thus be viewed in the broader familial context; positive paternal influences are more likely to occur not only when there are supportive father-child relationships but when the fathers' relationships with their partners, ex-partners, and presumably other children establish a pos-

itive familial context. Marital harmony is a consistent correlate of child adjustment, whereas marital conflict is a consistent and reliable correlate of child maladjustment.

Fourth, these factors all underscore the fact that fathers play multiple roles in the family and that their success in these diverse roles influences the ways in which they affect their children's development and adjustment. Fathers have beneficial effects on their children when they have supportive and nurturant relationships with them as well as with their siblings, when they are competent and feel fulfilled as breadwinners, when they are successful and supportive partners, and so on.

Fifth, the nature of paternal influences may vary substantially depending on individual and cultural values. A classic example of this can be found in the literature on sex-role development. As a result of cultural changes, the assumed sex-role goals for boys and girls have changed, and this has produced changes in the effects of fathers' involvement on children. In the 1950s gender-appropriate masculinity or femininity was the desired goal; today, sex-role flexibility is desired. And whereas father involvement in the 1950s seemed to be associated with greater masculinity in boys, it is associated today with less sex-stereotyped sex-role standards in both boys and girls. Influence patterns also vary substantially depending on social factors that define the meaning of father involvement for children in particular families in particular social milieus. More generally, this underscores that the relative importance of the different paternal functions or roles varies across familial, subcultural, cultural, and historical contexts. There is no single father's role to which all fathers should aspire. Rather, a successful father, as defined in terms of his children's development, is one whose role performance matches the demands and prescriptions of his sociocultural and familial context. This means that high paternal involvement may have positive effects in some circumstances and negative effects in others. The same is true of low paternal involvement.

DETERMINANTS OF FATHER INVOLVEMENT

Although paternal behavior is multifaceted, embracing not only what fathers do but also how much of it they do, the existing literature on factors influencing paternal behavior is focused primarily on variations in direct paternal involvement, ironically ignoring much of what fathers do *for* their children by way of economic and emotional support within the family. This focus perhaps reflects the widespread assumptions that the extent of direct father-child interaction is of primary importance (for interventionists as well as for researchers) and that involvement and parent-child closeness are intimately associated, even though most studies of paternal involvement ignore the emotional quality of father-child relationships or find the quality and quantity of interaction to be unrelated (Grossman, Pollack, & Golding, 1988; Radin, 1994).

Nonetheless, there is consensus that father involvement is affected by multiple interacting systems operating at different levels over the life course, including psychological factors (e.g., motivation, skills, self-confidence), the children's individual characteristics (e.g., temperament, gender), social support (e.g., relationships with partners and extended family members), community and cultural influences (e.g., socioeconomic opportunity, cultural ideologies), and institutional practices and public policies (e.g., welfare support, child support enforcement). These reciprocally interacting levels can be viewed as a hierarchy of factors influencing paternal behavior. As

explained in this section, favorable conditions must exist at each level if increased paternal involvement and broadened paternal behavior are to be possible and beneficial.

MOTIVATION

Although researchers such as the Cowans (C. P. Cowan et al., 1985; P. A. Cowan, Cowan, & Kerig, 1993) and Grossman (Grossman et al., 1988) have made careful efforts to identify psychological or individual characteristics that influence the nature and extent of paternal behavior, most researchers have implicitly assumed that variations in the definition of fatherhood are determined by subcultural and cultural factors more than individual characteristics (see also Jacobs, 1995). Many men set their goals depending on recollections of their own childhood, choosing either to compensate for their fathers' deficiencies or to emulate them. Many also express enjoyment of the time spent with children—even adolescents (Larson & Richards, 1994). Indeed, survey data long ago suggested that 40% of fathers would like to spend more time with their children than they were able (Quinn & Staines, 1979). This implies that a substantial number of men may want to be more involved in relationships with their children although there is no unanimity about the desirability of increased paternal involvement. In addition, the identification of fatherhood with breadwinning serves to limit male involvement in child care at least as much as do the constraints imposed by actual work time (Gerson, 1993). A powerful underlying assumption proposes that men are first and foremost workers and breadwinners, while women are the primary nurturers.

Changes in the level of paternal motivation have taken place in the last few decades, however, and can be attributed primarily to the women's movement and the questions it raises about traditional male and female roles. In addition, media hype about the new father has also affected motivation levels. The most impressive official program yet undertaken was initiated by the Swedish government in the early 1970s in an attempt to encourage men to become more involved in child care and overcome fears that active parenting and masculinity are incompatible (Haas, 1992; Lamb & Levine, 1983; Russell & Hwang, this volume). Continuing fears of this sort help explain why some motivational shifts have been so slow, and particularly why the number of fathers who take a major role in child care has not increased very much (nationally or internationally) despite tremendous changes in female employment patterns. It is interesting, however, that researchers have not substantiated initial predictions that the levels and types of paternal involvement would be associated with measures of the men's masculinity or androgyny (see Pleck, 1997). In addition, institutional and cultural barriers, not only personality and motivational barriers, slow the pace of change and reduce average levels of paternal involvement. One indication of this can be found in the evidence of greater flexibility regarding the types of activities in which fathers engage, despite modest changes in the amounts of time fathers spend with their children. Many fathers no longer avoid the messy child care activities they used to disparage and instead become coparents across a broad array of tasks.

SKILLS AND SELF-CONFIDENCE

Motivation alone cannot ensure increased involvement: Skills and self-confidence are also necessary. Ostensibly motivated men often complain that a lack of skills (exem-

plified by ignorance or clumsiness) prevents increased involvement and closeness. These complaints can constitute excuses, but they can also reflect a very real fear of incompetence and failure. The relevant skills can be obtained through participation in a growing number of formal skill-development programs (Levine & Pitt, 1995) or more informally through involvement in activities that children and fathers enjoy doing together. Such activities foster self-confidence and enjoyment, thereby promoting both further involvement and sensitivity. Sensitivity, which involves being able to evaluate a child's signals or needs and respond appropriately, is also crucial with respect to both closeness and positive impact (Kelly & Lamb, 2000; Van IJzendoorn & DeWolff, 1997). Both sensitivity and self-confidence are probably much more important than specific skills where paternal behavior and influence are concerned. Many of the studies concerned with paternal influences show that the closeness of the father-child relationship—itsself a consequence of sufficiently extensive and sensitive interactions—is a crucial determinant of the fathers' impact on child development and adjustment (see Lamb & Lewis, this volume).

SOCIAL SUPPORT

Paternal behavior is undoubtedly affected by members of a father's social networks, particularly his relationships with the mother of his child. The roles that fathers play in family life and whether or not they reside with mothers or their children often depend on mothers' attitudes and expectations (Allen & Hawkins, 1999). Mothers are gatekeepers when it comes to nonresidential fathers' access to children, and they frequently constrain and define the roles and responsibilities of both residential and nonresidential fathers. Mothers communicate their expectations of their partners by handing over their babies for diapering, instead of diapering the baby themselves, for example. Likewise, subtle maternal grimaces when fathers fail to console their crying infants may lead them to "leave the nurturing to mom." In other cases, mothers may use children as bait to get what they want (money, sexual interest) from their partners.

Like paternal attitudes, women's attitudes toward paternal involvement have changed slowly over the last two decades (Pleck, 1982; Polatnick, 1973–1974). The same surveys that show a majority of men wanting to be more involved show that a majority of women do not want their husbands to be more involved than they currently are (Pleck, 1982; Quinn & Staines, 1979). This suggests that although many mothers are heavily overburdened by their responsibilities and would like their partners to do more, a substantial majority are quite satisfied with the status quo, with respect not only to the extent of paternal involvement but also to the ranges and types of activities in which fathers involve themselves (Hochschild, 1995). On the other hand, women overwhelmingly view breadwinning as a crucial role for husbands and fathers (O'Hare, 1995).

There may be many reasons for maternal hesitations about changing paternal roles. Some mothers may feel that their husbands are incompetent or fear that increased paternal involvement may threaten fundamental power dynamics within the family (Polatnick, 1973–1974). The roles of mother and manager of the household are the two roles in which women's authority has not been questioned; together they constitute the one area in which women have traditionally enjoyed real power and control. Increased paternal involvement may threaten this power and preeminence. The tradeoff

has dubious value because although many women have entered the work force in the last three decades, many occupy low-paying, low-prestige positions with little prospect of advancement. Many women apparently prefer to maintain authority in the child-care arena even if that means physical and mental exhaustion. Their resistance is likely to persist until fundamental changes within society at large change the basic distribution of power. Economic conditions seem unlikely to reduce the need for both parents to obtain employment, and women continue to emphasize the need for husbands and fathers to be family breadwinners (O'Hare, 1995).

Within individual families, agreement between mothers and fathers regarding paternal roles may be of crucial importance. As mentioned earlier, family dynamics are formatively significant because fundamental conflicts between the parents have adverse effects on children's development. In this regard, it may be significant that in two longitudinal studies of high father involvement (Radin, 1994; Radin & Goldsmith, 1985; Russell, 1983), a remarkably high rate of family dissolution was evident when families were later relocated. Thus, despite initial harmony, substantial and fundamental problems concerning roles and responsibilities may arise later, particularly in times of ambivalence and confusion.

INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES

As Russell and Hwang point out in this volume, institutional practices also affect paternal involvement, with the barriers imposed by the workplace ranking among the most important reasons given by fathers to explain low levels of paternal involvement (e.g., Haas, 1992; Yankelovich, 1974). Clearly this is an important issue for many men, and it will remain important as long as men take on and are expected to assume primary breadwinning roles. It is also true, however, that men do not trade work time for family time in a one-to-one fashion. Survey data have shown that women translate each extra hour of nonwork time into an extra 40 to 45 minutes of family work, whereas for men, each hour not spent in paid work translates into less than 20 minutes of family work (Pleck, 1983). Thus, while the pressure of work have a significant effect on parental involvement, the effects are somewhat different for men and women.

Paternity leave is the most frequently discussed means of enhancing paternal involvement, although flexible time scheduling would certainly be of greater value to employed fathers and mothers (Pleck, 1986). Two early studies showed that both mothers and fathers take advantage of flextime to spend more time with their children (Lee, 1983; Winett & Neale, 1980), but flextime remains an option open to relatively few workers. Russell and Hwang (this volume) discuss these issues more fully.

Like the workplace, institutions such as child care and educational institutions have traditionally made little effort to include fathers and have often acted in ways that exclude them or include them only in gender-typed ways (Klinman, 1986; Levine, Murphy, & Wilson, 1993).

CULTURAL ECOLOGY

Scholars are slowly (and not consistently) recognizing the diverse array of family types and sociocultural expectations and demands that shape paternal roles, family processes, and child development. In practice, this means that fathers play differing roles in different subcultural contexts and that various groups hold contrasting views

of what constitutes the good father (Hochschild, 1995). For example, breadwinning (and the indirect effects of financial security) may be of paramount importance in some contexts (as when the child was conceived outside of an enduring relationship), while moral guidance may be quite unimportant. For other families and communities, financial support may be unimportant, direct care and supervision crucial, and emotional support invaluable. Such variations in the relative salience of different aspects of fatherhood further complicate attempts to conceptualize and assess paternal roles and influences, but when appropriately recognized, these promise to permit more valid and generalizable research on father-child relationships, even though the generalizability of many findings may be much narrower than researchers initially hoped.

Careful attempts to describe father-child relationships in diverse cultural contexts certainly help build the database needed for further progress in our understanding of father-child relationships. Many of the contributors to earlier editions of this anthology addressed primarily models of paternity, fatherhood, and father-child relationships that dominate White, North American, middle-class society. Reflecting the progress made to date in understanding the impact of sociocultural factors, however, several contributors to this volume discuss fathers in other cultural contexts, including African American and African Caribbean households (Roopnarine); Hispanic and Latino families (Cabrera & Garcia Coll); parts of the European Economic Union (O'Brien); Japan, Korea, and China (Schwalb, Nakazawa, Yamamoto, & Hyun); and nonindustrial cultures (Hewlett).

SUMMARY

The daunting question of why fathers do what they do lies at the heart of research on fathering. Father involvement is determined by many reciprocally interacting factors. Different configurations of predictors are likely to be more or less salient for different individuals at different stages of children's and fathers' development. To date, researchers have emphasized the centrality of motivation, skills and confidence, social supports, institutional policies, and cultural ideologies in shaping fathers' engagement with their children and their roles in family life. In the future, researchers will need to understand how these levels of influence jointly and interactively affect fathering and are themselves altered by the fathering experience.

POLICY APPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH ON FATHERS AND FATHERHOOD

Over the past two decades there has been a shift in the balance between basic and applied research goals in fatherhood studies. Earlier interest in fathers was driven by an overwhelming desire to acquire basic knowledge in a relatively new area of scientific inquiry. Currently, the quest for basic knowledge on the nature, antecedents, and consequences of father-child relationships is paralleled by growing interest in the translation of research findings into effective programs and policies that support and promote positive father-child relationships (Cabrera, Tamis-LeMonda, Bradley, Hofferth, & Lamb, 2000; Tamis-LeMonda & Cabrera, 1999, 2002). The research-to-policy link on fathers is bidirectional: Political emphasis on the importance of fathers fosters the research agenda just as evidence regarding paternal impact influences social policies and program initiatives.

PROMOTING RESEARCH ON UNDERREPRESENTED FATHERS

The growing interest of policy makers in what the experts have to say about fathers has spotlighted, in positive ways, much of what has been learned about fathers over the past three decades. Policy debates on welfare reform, child support, paternity establishment, immigration, and child custody have also unearthed alarming gaps in what is known about certain groups of fathers, however. It is not surprising that most attempts to describe and quantify the nature and extent of paternal behavior have focused on children living in two-parent families. Ironically, however, the focus on parental behavior and parent-child relationships in such families has taken place at a time when these families have become increasingly uncommon. More than half the children in the United States now spend part of their childhood in single-parent families, and similar trends are evident in other industrialized countries. Fatherlessness is particularly marked in impoverished African American communities, and considerable concern has been expressed about effects on mothers and children in these families (Blankenhorn, 1995; Popenoe, 1996; Whitehead, 1993). To date, social scientists have been remarkably unsuccessful in their efforts to understand why so many men have removed themselves or allowed themselves to be excluded from their children's lives, although the adverse effects of absent fathers on child development have been well documented (see Amato & Sobolewsky, this volume). Political concern about the growing number of fatherless families has stimulated much of the current research on fathers, which promises to advance our understanding of the factors that support sustained, positive father-child relationships.

Only recently have scholars ventured to explore the roles and influences of unmarried fathers, stepfathers, nonresidential fathers, low-income fathers, minority fathers, and immigrant fathers, although considerable information informs the chapters in this volume by Roopnarine, Cabrera and Garcia Coll, and McLanahan and Carlson. National studies of men and fathers have generally excluded homeless men, men with unstable housing, or those who do not live with their families. Until recently, little was known about nonresident fathers, for example, in part because most national household surveys did not collect information from fathers who were uncounted, incarcerated, or in the military (Hernandez & Brandon, 2002). This male undercount calls into question the accuracy of many social statistics concerning fathers (Tamis-LeMonda & Cabrera, 1999). Moreover, small-scale studies of underrepresented men have focused largely on negative aspects of behavior, such as the failure to pay child support, and on adverse effects on children. Research on potential strengths in less advantaged families is much needed and lies at the core of recent national research initiatives, including the Early Head Start evaluation, Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study, the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study–Birth Cohort, and the welfare studies. Together, these studies promise to address many of the shortcomings of prior research by focusing on fathers from diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds while exploring how and why their roles change as their children grow up.

REACHING OUT TO FATHERS AND FAMILIES

Current demographic trends suggest that fewer fathers may be participating in their children's lives today than in any period since the United States began keeping reli-

able statistics. Unfortunately, researchers, policy makers, and practitioners have made limited progress in attempts to design programs that address the explicit and unspoken needs of many fathers and families (Tamis-LeMonda & Cabrera, 2002). For example, public policies focus mainly on the economic provisioning of nonresident fathers, assuming that these men are able to pay but choose not to. Indeed, some fathers refuse to pay child support despite the ability to do so and absent themselves both financially and emotionally from their children. On the other hand, many fathers who would like to support their children are unable to do so because of their circumstances (e.g., unemployment, maternal gatekeeping). Social policies do not distinguish between these groups of men and often fail to nurture the continued investment of fathers who are emotionally attached to their children yet unable to provide for them financially.

The limited impact of programs on low-income fathers cannot be blamed wholly on the lack of programs and initiatives. Indeed, the past 20 years have witnessed geometric increases in the number of programs offering services to targeted groups of fathers (Tamis-LeMonda & Cabrera, 2002), yet many of these programs have had little impact at high cost (Mincy & Pouncy, 2002). In part, these disappointing results reflect the failure to begin programs that are broad enough and reach out to fathers early enough in their parenting trajectories to affect many fathers.

Preliminary findings from the Fragile Families and Early Head Start studies indicate that initiatives aimed at fathers should begin at birth, when many fathers are highly motivated to remain involved in their infants' lives (McLanahan & Carlson, this volume). Despite their early commitment, however, many fathers in fragile families drift out of their children's lives over time. Fatherhood programs should thus take a preventive approach by providing services to new fathers well before they distance themselves from their children (Tamis-LeMonda & Cabrera, 1999, 2002).

Programs also need to address the needs of multiple family members, to expand parents' educational and employment opportunities, to support and develop parenting skills, and to intervene effectively even when there are substance abuse or mental health problems (Carlson & McLanahan, 2002; Roggmann et al., 2002). A narrow focus on motivated fathers may prompt resistance from mothers who want nothing to do with their former partners and might want to block fathers' access to their children.

Finally, the effectiveness of fatherhood programs and their components need to be evaluated systematically (McBride and Lutz, this volume). Few researchers have examined the effects of fatherhood programs on either the men's behavior or the well-being of their children, and even the Fathers at Work and Fragile Families projects do not include controlled, experimental evaluations (Mincy & Pouncy, 2002). As a result, researchers, practitioners, and policy makers remain unable to pinpoint whether, how, and why different types of programs affect men, families, and children.

SUMMARY

Researchers, policy makers, and practitioners alike must be mindful of the ways in which knowledge about father involvement and well-targeted policy and program initiatives together help support all family members, most notably children (Cabrera et al., 2000; Carlson & McLanahan, 2002; Tamis-LeMonda & Cabrera, 1999). Researchers should attend to constructs and variables that have theoretical relevance for

policy and practice, that can be translated and incorporated readily into policy initiatives, and that might be used in evaluations of service delivery models.

Policy debates on topics relevant to fathering, such as child custody and welfare reform, have identified the narrow focus of many researchers on fathers in middle-income groups. These limitations are currently being addressed through data collection efforts involving fathers from low-income, ethnically diverse backgrounds. Findings from these studies will undoubtedly yield a better understanding of fathering in underrepresented groups.

Two heated questions remain central to work at the intersection of basic and applied research: Which current policies benefit fathers and families, and which instead lead some fathers to drift out of the lives of their children? Why, after decades of costly fatherhood programs, have we been unsuccessful in effectively supporting and enhancing fathers' commitments to their children and families? Answers to both of these questions will be possible only through the collaboration of policy makers, researchers, and practitioners.

OUTLINE OF THE VOLUME

The questions and issues articulated in the previous sections animate each of the chapters that appear in this volume. In this section we briefly introduce each of the chapters and summarize their contribution to our understanding of fatherhood, father-child relationships, patterns of paternal influence, and the effects of institutional policies and practices.

HISTORY OF FATHERHOOD

In the second chapter, Elizabeth H. Pleck presents an intriguing account of the good dad–bad dad complex, tracing its origins to colonial America and following through to the present day. Documented laws, punitive actions against men, and entries in journals, diaries, and letters are assembled to weave a story of favorable and unfavorable images of fathers, changing standards about good fathering, and acceptable roles for men. Pleck's chapter illustrates how perceptions of good and bad fathering are shaped by social change and historical events (e.g., wars and the Industrial Revolution) and their effects on men's economic circumstances. In colonial America, for example, standards of good fathering for middle-class men differed from those imposed on slaves and immigrants. Economic and educational constraints precluded slaves and immigrants from being involved fathers, much in the same way that poverty constrains opportunities for many men today. For much of history, standards of good fathering demanded that fathers promote and prolong gender asymmetry by reinforcing masculinity in sons and femininity in daughters, whereas recent social values emphasize gender equality. As a result, good fathers are now expected to be nurturant and to spend time caring for their children. Definitions of deadbeat dads, in contrast, have remained unchanged. Historically, deadbeat dads have been those who fail to fulfill their breadwinner responsibilities, and societal reactions to such fathers have consistently included moral condemnation and punishment. According to Pleck, efforts to make fathers pay reflect longstanding core beliefs about family life and the economic dependence of women and children on fathers' income. The persistence of

these beliefs over three centuries of U.S. history poses a conundrum in the face of recent revolutionary changes in mothers' and fathers' family roles.

CULTURAL VARIATIONS IN THE NATURE OF FATHERHOOD

Just as some values and practices have changed over time in the United States, of course, so do perceptions and expectations of fathers vary across cultural contexts, both within the United States and around the world. The next five chapters thus explore some such facets of cross-cultural variability. Jaipaul Roopnarine's chapter on fathering by African American and African Caribbean men highlights the ways in which the economic and social histories of different ethnic groups infuse family structure and father-child relationships. Roopnarine documents parallels between African American and African Caribbean patterns of marital union, residency and caregiving arrangements, poverty, and histories of slavery and oppression, while noting the markedly different social, political, and economic contexts of life in the United States and the developing Caribbean. These differences have shaped conceptions and enactments of fathering in the two admittedly heterogeneous groups. As Roopnarine observes, there exists considerable intragroup variation in the way African American men perceive and enact their fathering roles, with many of these differences rooted in economic and educational circumstances. Although a disproportionate number of African American men do not reside with their children, their levels of social-intellectual and emotional investments in their children vary enormously. African Caribbean fathers also vary with respect to their commitments to family and children; these commitments often depend on a father's own status in the marital career process (Rodman, 1971). Progressive mating is the norm for Caribbean fathers: Fatherhood occurs in visiting, then common law, then marital unions, with marriage involving the highest levels of commitment to children. Traditional beliefs about male dominance and early sexuality as markers of manhood in African Caribbean communities combine with limited economic opportunities to impede men's participation in children's lives and to place children at increased risk of academic and social difficulties. Underscoring these historical and contemporary realities, Roopnarine invites researchers to identify the ways in which fathers from different family arrangements and economic circumstances can be positively and consistently involved in their children's lives.

Natasha Cabrera and Cynthia Garcia Coll's analysis of Latino fathers in Chapter 4 is especially timely considering that Latinos will comprise a quarter of the U.S. population only a few decades from now. Cabrera and Garcia Coll underscore the vast challenges scholars confront when attempting to describe and understand Latino fathers. Two are particularly noteworthy. First, Latinos in the United States have diverse cultural, social, and economic histories and immigration patterns. Although they share a common language as well as some cultural and family values, the impressive diversity across Latino subgroups renders generalizations about Latinos in general quite complex. Second, it is difficult to develop a model or theory of Latino fathering because so little research has been conducted. Cabrera and Garcia Coll distinguish two phases of research on Latino fathers: studies undertaken between the 1960s and 1980s and studies conducted since 1990. In the early research phase, researchers conducted small, localized studies of families living in poverty that emphasized masculine ide-

ologies and traditional views of authoritarian and patriarchal Latino men. It is not surprising that financial provisioning was deemed important, although later changes in women's labor-force participation have transformed gender roles in Latino families much as they did in Anglo families. More recent studies, again based on relatively small samples, present a more complex picture of Latino fathers, in which middle-class Latino men appear more similar to their Anglo-American peers. This emergent model is characterized by a more egalitarian division of labor, with Latino fathers involved in child care, spending time with their children, and being sources of emotional and moral support to their children. Cabrera and Garcia Coll end with a timely plea for researchers to include Latino fathers in the sampling and design of national studies and to augment large-scale studies with ethnographic techniques that generate hypotheses about the roles and meaning of fatherhood in Latino families.

In Chapter 5, Margaret O'Brien presents a public policy perspective on fatherhood in Western Europe, where fatherhood is currently being redefined just as it is in other parts of the world. In the first half of the chapter, O'Brien interprets this transformation in light of larger social trends across the European Union, including changes to fertility patterns, partnership formations, family structures (e.g., growth in nonmarital unions), and migration and employment patterns. These recent, sweeping demographic trends have dramatically altered the face of fathering and have vital implications for the future of fathering in Europe. Less permanency in fathers' relationships with adult partners and biological children may well characterize future cohorts, posing a unique challenge for children who will have to forge relationships with a diversity of father figures within and across households. In the second half of the chapter, O'Brien describes the parental leave policies that have been adopted by European nations, where women's entry into the workforce has fostered expectations that men should actively coparent their young children. Younger cohorts of Europeans are increasingly endorsing egalitarian models of family life, and European governments have, in response, introduced legal entitlements such as paternity leave for fathers. Individual nations in the European Union have varied in their attention to fathers' issues, and families in each of these nations vary in their responses to the available entitlements. As O'Brien points out, because of the unique economic and social histories of individual nations, the same policy initiatives are realized quite differently in different locales, and similar social policies do not always have the same impact.

David Shwalb, Jun Nakazawa, Toshiya Yamamoto, and Jung-Hwan Hyun thereafter comprehensively review research on fathering in Japanese, Chinese, and Korean cultures—Asian cultures where family roles and expectations differ substantially from those that predominate in the West. The three geographically contiguous ethnic groups are characterized by low fertility rates and cultural histories shaped by Confucian principles. In comparison with their Western counterparts, fathers in these Asian societies spend less time with their children, a tradition that both reflects and shapes images of fathers as hardworking and distant figures. Japan, China, and Korea also boast unique social and economic histories, however, and these have led to intriguing divergences in family life and fathering patterns, parenting styles, gender orientations, and expectations for their children's education, as Shwalb and his colleagues reveal. In the course of describing unique fathering roles in the three societies, these scholars also document significant cultural differences in children's relationships with and perceptions of their fathers. It is interesting that the authors' descriptive accounts of fathers and children in Asian societies emphasize the impact

of fathers' occupational conditions and priorities, just as in the West. Varying emphases on fathers' roles as breadwinners, the importance of work, and the practical realities of demanding work hours differentially constrain fathers' availability and their involvement in their children's everyday activities.

Of course, many fathers in the world live in nonindustrial—especially forager, farmer, and pastoral—cultures, as Barry Hewlett observes in Chapter 7. These cultures are characterized by low population density and less social and economic stratification than the industrial countries discussed in the five preceding chapters. As a result, these heterogeneous cultures offer markedly different insights into the ways in which men can do fatherhood. Such insights may be especially useful because the circumstances described by Hewlett are much more characteristic of the contexts that characterized most of human history than are analyses of global capitalistic principles that have existed for only a few hundred years. As Hewlett notes, whereas men in industrial or class-stratified cultures usually learn about children and child care when their own children are born, men in forager, farmer, and pastoral societies have regular experiences with children while growing up. Cross-cultural studies reviewed by Hewlett indicate that fathers are more involved in child care in forager and matrilineal-matriarchal societies, when parents share many activities, females contribute more to subsistence, and population densities are low, whereas they are less involved in polygamous cultures, when warfare is more common and resources are accumulated. Other ethnographic studies discussed by Hewlett provide poignant and fascinating accounts of paternal behavior in cultures that differ greatly from our own.

FATHERS IN TWO-PARENT ANGLO-SAXON FAMILIES

The next four chapters return attention to the Western industrialized and predominantly Anglo-Saxon cultures that have been the focus of most social scientists. In the first (Chapter 8), Mark Cummings, Marcia Goeke-Morey, and Jessica Raymond examine fathers in the family context, with a particular concern for the effects of marital quality and conflict. Building on the model developed by Cummings and O'Reilly (1997) for the third edition, Cummings and his colleagues propose that fathers affect children and families by way of three major pathways: by direct fathering and father-child relationships, through children's exposure to marital discord, and by virtue of fathers' psychological functioning. All of these pathways are believed to affect children's adjustment through effects on their coping processes and mechanisms, and the authors make special efforts to isolate the specific effects of fathers and fathering, a task made easier by recent methodological advances, which include reliance on multiple sources and types of data. Researchers have well documented the effects of father-child relationships and marital quality on child adjustment, Cummings and his colleagues conclude, though they have not yet explored adequately the role of fathers' psychological functioning.

Joseph Pleck and Brian Masciadrelli then comprehensively examine the nature, determinants, and consequences of father involvement (Chapter 9). They begin by defining positive father engagement, focus on the beneficial ways fathers commit to their children, and analyze the three major components of involvement (accessibility, responsibility, and engagement). Pleck and Masciadrelli discuss several conceptual and methodological issues, including challenges to the definitions of accessibility, responsibility and engagement, ways of assessing each construct, and the various sources of

information about involvement. Although paternal accessibility has increased over the past several decades, fathers are available to children 50% to 65% as much as mothers, and their engagement levels are roughly 25% those of mothers. However, fathers' reports of their involvement converge with those of mothers and children, are stable over time, and exert telling influences on both children and fathers themselves. Positive paternal engagement predicts adaptive social and cognitive outcomes in children and affects men's career success and personality in positive ways. Pleck and Masciadrelli note that individual differences in involvement reflect the combined effects of fathers' motivation, skills, self-confidence, social supports, and institutional policies and practices. Unfortunately, researchers are far from understanding either the dynamics of father engagement or how its antecedents and outcomes vary depending on the family ecology.

In Chapter 10, Michael Lamb and Charlie Lewis discuss current research on the nature and meaning of father-child relationships in two-parent families with children ranging in age from infants to adolescents. Lamb and Lewis begin by describing the distinctive ways in which mothers and fathers engage their infants, noting that fathers often adopt more playful styles than mothers, particularly when there is a clear division of labor. In adolescence, mothers and fathers continue to engage their children in unique ways. Mothers spend more time overall with their adolescents, but fathers spend greater proportions of time engaged in play, recreation, and goal-related activities. These distinct engagement styles suggest that mothers and fathers may differentially affect the development of their children, and different maternal and paternal behaviors (e.g., verbal engagement as opposed to playfulness) may sometimes affect different and sometimes the same aspects of development. Of course, both mothers and fathers engage in academic and school-related activities, provide nurturance to their infants, children, and adolescents, and influence their children's and adolescents' cognitive and psychosocial adjustment, but Lamb and Lewis do more than document these main effects. They examine the antecedents and consequences of positive fathering within the broader constellation of family relationships. Paternal effects on children and adolescents are complex, often operating indirectly through unobserved or unmeasured variables, such as family harmony or maternal behavior, and are also moderated by the parents' employment patterns.

In the final chapter in the series concerned primarily with fathers in two-parent families, Ross Parke, Jessica Dennis, Mary Flyr, Kristie Morris, Colleen Killian, David McDowell, and Margaret Wild employ a systems framework to elucidate fathers' roles in shaping their children's peer relationships. Parke and his colleagues view inter-familial relationships (father-mother, father-child, mother-child), extra-familial relationships (e.g., fathers' relationships with coworkers), and children's peer relationships as interdependent, mutually influencing systems. Within this framework, the authors show that fathers influence children's peer relationships in three ways: through the quality of their relationships with children, through their direct advice and supervision, and by facilitating or limiting the children's opportunities for contact with their peers. Children's regulatory skills and cognitive representations of social relationships mediate associations between fathering and children's peer relationships. It is interesting that the authors' dynamic systems approach underscores the transactional nature of father-child relationships as well as their associations with other aspects of the social context. Specifically, children's own characteristics and behaviors shape pater-

nal behaviors, and fathers' peer-relevant engagements unfold in the context of the marital relationship, the parents' past and present social and friendship networks, and the social capital of the community. Parke and his colleagues also articulate the need for more research, in which fathers and children are viewed in developmental and cultural contexts. How do fathers' roles in peer relationships change as children move from the dependencies of early childhood to the autonomous friendships of adolescence? To what extent does a father's own stage of development affect the way he supports his child's peer relationships? And how do paternal influences on peer relationships vary across cultures?

FATHERS IN NONTRADITIONAL CONTEXTS

The four chapters on fatherhood and father-child relationships in two-parent families are followed by four concerned with fathers with nontraditional characteristics, responsibilities, or roles. In the first of these chapters (Chapter 12), Paul Amato and Julie Sobolewski focus on nonresident fathers and stepfathers as they analyze the effects of divorce on fathers and children. Unlike the authors of many preceding chapters, Amato and Sobolewski are able to draw on an impressive and growing body of studies, many conducted using large, nationally representative samples. Many children now spend at least part of their childhoods separated from their fathers, and a significant portion of them spend some of that time living with stepfathers, so the topic has considerable significance and relevance. As Amato and Sobolewski point out, there is substantial evidence that children with divorced parents score more poorly than do children with married parents with respect to many aspects of psychosocial adjustment and well-being. For many, the crucial factor is loss of social and economic resources provided by their fathers, and these authors discuss both the transmission and withholding of these resources from nonresident and stepfathers to children. Most divorced fathers attempt to provide child support and to stay psychologically connected to their children, but many fail to do so. Even when nonresident fathers have regular contact with their children, furthermore, many do not engage in the type of authoritative parenting that promotes their children's welfare. Unfortunately, stepfathers typically do not develop authoritative relationships with children either, so most of these children are doubly disadvantaged.

Sara McLanahan and Marcia Carlson (Chapter 13) then focus more closely on the one third of children in the United States who are born to unmarried parents in fragile families and are thus at highest risk of the sorts of father absence discussed by Amato and Sobolewski. The term *fragile* reflects the fact that these unions are typically characterized by high economic, educational, and relationship instability. Despite the increasing prevalence of fragile families in the United States, little is known about these families, so McLanahan and Carlson devote their attention to data from the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study, a birth-cohort study of nearly 5,000 children born in 20 cities throughout the United States. When men in these families were interviewed at the time of their infants' births, they claimed to value marriage highly, but fewer than 10% were married a year later, and 20% of the men from these families rarely saw their babies. In large part, McLanahan and Carlson conclude, this is because many fatherhood programs and various tax and transfer policies designed to promote strong families instead often create disincentives for families. Ac-

cordingly, these authors recommend that social policies and programs be restructured and note that because new parents are positively oriented toward marriage and family formation, the infant's birth is an opportune time for entry into the family system. Policy makers and practitioners should thus focus their efforts early if they are to strengthen fathers' capabilities and support the stability of couples' relationships.

Although gay fathers are by no means as common as the nonresident or unmarried fathers discussed by Amato and Sobolewski or McLanahan and Carlson, they have attracted considerable attention in recent years. In Chapter 14, Charlotte Patterson shows that they constitute an extremely heterogeneous group with respect to who they are, how they became parents, and what challenges they face in raising their children. Some gay fathers come out after divorce; some are adoptive or foster parents; and others father biological children with surrogate mothers. Because the group is so heterogeneous, the study of gay fathers is challenging, and as a result the empirical literature is sparse. Children of gay fathers tend to describe their relationships as warm and supportive and are no more likely to be abused or to have difficulty in their own sexual development than are those with heterosexual fathers. In addition, gay fathers appear to have higher self-esteem than do gay men who are not fathers. Nonetheless, despite such optimistic findings, Patterson notes that these children and fathers face great challenges, including health risks such as HIV and stigmatization by educational, religious, and cultural institutions.

Unfortunately, fathers in violent families are considerably more common than gay fathers, and their impact on child development is much less likely to be benign, as George Holden and Ted Barker show in Chapter 15. However, as Sternberg (1997) reported in the third edition of this anthology, fathers have traditionally received little attention from researchers, even when they were implicitly assumed to be at the root of their families' problems! They have received considerably more attention from researchers in the ensuing years, according to Holden and Barker, with particular focus on child physical abuse and partner-spouse abuse. These authors describe some of the definitional problems that have impeded research and then discuss recent statistics documenting the incidence of family violence. Thereafter, they examine the characteristics of violent men and pay especially close attention to an issue with great significance to those making decisions regarding child custody: the degree to which fathers who are violent toward their partners are also likely to aggress against their children. As they note, partner abuse vastly increases the risk that children will also be abused, although the majority of children with abused mothers are not themselves abused, making it essential for decision makers to examine individual circumstances. In addition, it is important for researchers to recognize that fathers themselves are sometimes victims of violence. It is not surprising that all forms of family violence expose children to psychological risk, as Holden and Barker point out in the penultimate section of their chapter.

POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The last two chapters in the volume switch focus to applied issues. In the first (Chapter 16), Brent McBride and Mary Lutz document the ways in which demographic trends and changing expectations of fathers have created unprecedented demands for

programs specifically designed to serve fathers, particularly those who are divorced, never married, and from low-income households. Fathers are increasingly expected to develop positive and supportive relationships with their children while sharing in the burdens of childcare, even as many families are confronting the realities of unpredictable and unstable paternal presence. McBride and Lutz observe that parenting programs vary widely with respect to their service delivery models, goals, target populations, documentation, and approaches to program evaluation. Unfortunately, programs for fathers also continue to be quite primitive: most programs are developed and implemented at a local, grassroots level without well-articulated conceptual frameworks guiding their interventions. Likewise, evaluation has been neither systematic nor comprehensive, with most program models undocumented and unexamined. This lack of evaluation and documentation impedes progress because effective strategies are not described to other practitioners interested in adopting or adapting innovative approaches. McBride and Lutz underscore the need for better communication between researchers and practitioners, with research findings used to inform the design of interventions and the findings of successful programs incorporated into the literature.

Finally, in Chapter 17 Graeme Russell and Carl Phillip Hwang draw attention to the dearth of theory and evidence linking factors in the workplace to the quality of parenting. To address this gap, they offer a framework for conceptualizing the direct and indirect effects of workplace policies and practices on father involvement. Their ecological perspective situates workplace policies within broader social, cultural, and political contexts and simultaneously addresses the ways in which individual and family factors mediate and moderate associations between workplace policies and practices on the one hand and actual parenting on the other. Russell and Hwang address three main topics: the role of workplace culture in shaping fathers' access to and utilization of initiatives that promote father involvement (e.g., leave policies and flexible working hours); links between workplace experiences and fathers' levels of engagement with their children; and the extent to which workplaces comprise contexts for education, information, and paternal support. Russell and Hwang offer a detailed description of workplace policies and practices in societies as diverse as the United States, Sweden, and Australia. Clearly, enormous cross-national variations exist with respect to workplace policies and practices, particularly in the areas of paternal leave and flexible work schedules, and many of the questions framed by Russell and Hwang's model remain to be explored empirically.

CONCLUSION

Over the last three decades, fathers have embraced much broader and more diverse definitions of their roles and have been increasingly willing to engage in a broad array of activities typically viewed as components of mothering. These changes have taken place alongside smaller changes in the extent to which fathers devote time to activities with and for their children, as well as surprising resistance to the assumption of parental responsibility. Both the observed changes and their slow pace appear attributable to secular changes, particularly in economic circumstances and maternal employment, as well as to feminist critiques of traditional social structures. In addition, these slow but significant changes in the behavior of men who live with their children

have taken place against a background of dramatic increases in the number of children who have little or no contact with their fathers. Attempts to understand paternal influences on child development must thus consider the roles, functions, and impacts of father-child relationships, the effects on child development of fatherless lifestyles, and the processes that lead to these circumstances.

The multiple roles that fathers are expected to play and the roles that they are actually able to fulfill illustrate the need for researchers to explore multiple dimensions of fathering, fathers' views about aspects of fathering, family decision making and motivation, and the mechanisms through which parents exert influence on children. By elucidating associations among different aspects of fathering and recognizing how and when fathers' attention to certain areas of involvement limits their potential involvement in other ways, researchers will come closer to understanding the unique confluence of factors that affect the course of children's development, as well as the multitude of configurations that characterize positively involved fathers.

REFERENCES

- Adams, P. L., Milner, J. R., & Schrepf, N. A. (1984). *Fatherless children*. New York: Wiley.
- Allen, S. M., & Hawkins, A. J. (1999). Maternal gatekeeping: Mothers' beliefs and behavior that inhibit greater father involvement in family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*, 199–212.
- Bellinger, D. C., & Gleason, J. B. (1982). Sex differences in parental directives to young children. *Sex Roles*, *8*, 1123–1139.
- Belsky, J., Gilstrap, B., & Ravine, M. (1984). The Pennsylvania Infant and Family Development Project: 1. Stability and change in mother-infant and father-infant interaction at one, three, and nine months. *Child Development*, *55*, 692–705.
- Berman, P. W. (1980). Are women more responsive than men to the young? A review of developmental situational variables. *Psychological Bulletin*, *88*, 668–695.
- Biller, H. B. (1971). *Father, child, and sex role*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Biller, H. B. (1974). *Paternal deprivation: Family, school, sexuality, and society*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Biller, H. B. (1993). *Fathers and families*. Westport, CT: Auburn House.
- Biller, H. B. (1994). *The father factor*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Biller, H. B., & Kimpton, J. L. (1997). The father and the school-aged child. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed., pp. 143–161, 348–352). New York: Wiley.
- Blankenhorn, D. (1995). *Fatherless America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cabrera, N., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Bradley, R. H., Hofferth, S., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Fatherhood in the 21st century. *Child Development*, *71*, 127–136.
- Carlson, M. J., & McLanahan, S. S. (2002). Fragile families, father involvement, and public policy. In C. S. Tamis-LeMonda & N. Cabrera (Eds.), *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 461–488). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Conner, D. B., Knight, D. K., & Cross, D. R. (1997). Mothers' and fathers' scaffolding of their 2-year-olds during problem-solving and literacy interactions. *Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *15*, 323–338.
- Cowan, C. P., Cowan, P. A., Heming, G., Garrett, E., Coysh, W. S., Curtis-Boles, H., et al. (1985). Transitions to parenthood: His, hers, and theirs. *Journal of Family Issues*, *6*, 451–481.
- Cowan, P. A., Cowan, C. P., & Kerig, P. K. (1993). Mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters: Gender differences in family formation and parenting style. In P. A. Cowan, D. Field, D. Hansen, A.

- Skolnick, & G. Swanson (Eds.), *Family, self and society: Toward a new agenda for family research* (pp. 165–195). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Crawley, S. B., & Sherrod, R. B. (1984). Parent-infant play during the first year of life. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 7, 65–75.
- Cummings, E. M., & O'Reilly, A. W. (1997). Fathers in family context: Effects of marital quality on child adjustment. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed., pp. 69–65, 315–325). New York: Wiley.
- Dalton-Hummel, D. (1982). Syntactic and conversational characteristics of fathers' speech. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 11, 465–483.
- Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (Eds.). (in press). *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Easterbrooks, M. A., & Goldberg, W. A. (1984). Toddler development in the family: Impact of father involvement and parenting characteristics. *Child Development*, 55, 740–752.
- Ely, R., Gleason, J. B., Narasimhan, B., & McCabe, A. (1995). Family talk about talk: Mothers lead the way. *Discourse Processes*, 19, 201–218.
- Fash, D. S., & Madison, C. L. (1981). Parents' language interaction with young children: A comparative study of mothers and fathers. *Child Study Journal*, 11, 137–153.
- Gerson, K. (1993). *No man's land: Man's changing commitment to family and work*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gleason, J. B. (1975). Fathers and other strangers: Men's speech to young children. In D. P. Dato (Ed.), *Language and linguistics* (pp. 289–297). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Glick, P. C., & Norton, A. J. (1979). Marrying, divorcing, and living together in the U.S. today. *Population Bulletin*, 32(5, whole issue).
- Golinkoff, R. M., & Ames, G. (1979). A comparison of fathers' and mothers' speech with their young children. *Child Development*, 50, 28–32.
- Graham, J. W., & Seller, A. H. (2002). Nonresident fathers and their children: Child support and visitation from an economic perspective. In C. S. Tamis-LeMonda & N. Cabrera (Eds.), *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 431–453). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Griswold, R. L. (1993). *Fatherhood in America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Grossman, F. R., Pollack, W. S., & Golding, E. (1988). Fathers and children: Predicting the quality and quantity of fathering. *Developmental Psychology*, 24, 82–91.
- Haas, L. (1992). *Equal parenthood and social policy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hernandez, D. J., & Brandon, P. D. (2002). Who are the fathers of today? In C. S. Tamis-LeMonda & N. Cabrera (Eds.), *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 33–62). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Herzog, R., & Sudia, C. E. (1973). Children in fatherless families. In B. M. Caldwell & H. N. Ricciuti (Eds.), *Review of child development research* (Vol. 3, pp. 141–232). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hess, R. D., & Camara, K. A. (1979). Post-divorce family relationships as mediating factors in the consequences of divorce for children. *Journal of Social Issues*, 35, 79–96.
- Hetherington, E. M., Cox, M., & Cox, R. (1982). Effects of divorce on parents and children. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *Nontraditional families* (pp. 233–288). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hetherington, E. M., Cox, M., & Cox, R. (1985). Long-term effects of divorce and remarriage on the adjustment of children. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 24, 518–530.
- Hetherington, E. M., & Kelly, J. (2002). *For better or for worse*. New York: Norton.
- Hetherington, E. M., & Stanley-Hagan, M. M. (1997). The effects of divorce on fathers and their children. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed., pp. 191–211, 360–369). New York: Wiley.

- Hochschild, A. R. (1987). *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*. New York: Avon Books.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1995). Understanding the future of fatherhood: The “daddy hierarchy” and beyond. In M. C. P. van Dongen, G. A. B. Frinking, & M. J. G. Jacobs (Eds.), *Changing fatherhood: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 219–230). Amsterdam: Thesis.
- Horn, W. F. (1995). *Father facts*. Lancaster, PA: National Fatherhood Initiative.
- Jacobs, M. (1995). The wish to become a father: How do men decide in favor of parenthood? In M. C. P. van Dongen, G. A. B. Frinking, & M. J. G. Jacobs (Eds.), *Changing fatherhood: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 67–83). Amsterdam: Thesis.
- Johnson, L. C., & Abramovitch, R. (1985). *Unemployed fathers: Parenting in a changing labour market*. Toronto: Social Planning Council.
- Johnson, L. C., & Abramovitch, R. (1988). Parental unemployment and family life. In A. Pence (Ed.), *Ecological research with children and families: From concepts to methodology* (pp. 49–75). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kavanaugh, R. D., & Tirkovsky, A. M. (1982). Parental speech to young children—A longitudinal analysis. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 28, 297–311.
- Kelly, J. B. (2000). Children’s adjustment in conflicted marriage and divorce: A decade review of research. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 39, 963–973.
- Kelly, J. B., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Using child development research to make appropriate custody and access decisions for young children. *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*, 38, 297–311.
- Klinman, D. (1986). Fathers and the educational system. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father’s role: Applied perspectives* (pp. 413–428). New York: Wiley.
- Knibiehler, Y. (1995). Fathers, patriarchy, paternity. In M. C. P. van Dongen, G. A. B. Frinking, & M. J. G. Jacobs (Eds.), *Changing fatherhood: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 201–214). Amsterdam: Thesis.
- Koestner, R., Franz, C., & Weinberger, J. (1990). The family origins of empathic concern: A 26 year longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 709–717.
- Lamb, M. E. (Ed.). (1976). *The role of the father in child development*. New York: Wiley.
- Lamb, M. E. (1981a). The development of father-infant relationships. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (Rev. ed., pp. 459–488). New York: Wiley.
- Lamb, M. E. (1981b). Fathers and child development: An integrative overview. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (Rev. ed., pp. 1–70). New York: Wiley.
- Lamb, M. E. (Ed.). (1981c). *The role of the father in child development* (Third ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Lamb, M. E. (1999). Non-custodial fathers and their impact on the children of divorce. In R. A. Thompson & P. R. Amato (Eds.), *The post-divorce family: Research and policy issues* (pp. 105–125). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lamb, M. E., Frodi, M., Hwang, C. P., & Frodi, A. M. (1983). Effects of paternal involvement on infant preferences for mothers and fathers. *Child Development*, 54, 450–452.
- Lamb, M. E., & Levine, J. A. (1983). The Swedish parental insurance policy: An experiment in social engineering. In M. E. Lamb & A. Sagi (Eds.), *Fatherhood and family policy* (pp. 39–51). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J. H., Charnov, E. L., & Levine, J. A. (1987). A biosocial perspective on paternal behavior and involvement. In J. B. Lancaster, J. Altmann, A. S. Rossi, & L. R. Sherrod (Eds.), *Parenting across the lifespan: Biosocial perspectives* (pp. 111–142). Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.
- Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J. H., & Levine, J. A. (1985). The role of the father in child development: The effects of increased paternal involvement. In B. B. Lahey & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Advances in clinical child psychology* (Vol. 8, pp. 229–266). New York: Plenum.

- Larson, R., & Richards, M. (1994). *Divergent lives: The emotional lives of mothers, fathers, and adolescents*. New York: Basic Books.
- Leaper, C., Anderson, K. J., & Sanders, P. (1998). Moderators of gender effects on parents' talk to their children: A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 3–27.
- Lee, R. A. (1983). Flexitime and conjugal roles. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 4*, 297–315.
- Levine, J. A., Murphy, D. T., & Wilson, S. (1993). *Getting men involved*. New York: Scholastic.
- Levine, J. A., & Pitt, E. (1995). *New expectations: Community strategies for responsible fatherhood*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Lewis, M., & Weinraub, M. (1976). The father's role in the child's social network. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (pp. 157–184). New York: Wiley.
- McLaughlin, B., White, D., McDewitt, T., & Raskin, R. (1983). Mothers' and fathers' speech to their young children: Similar or different? *Journal of Child Language, 10*, 245–252.
- Mincy, R. B., & Pouncy, H. W. (2002). The responsible fatherhood hold: Evolution or goals. In C. S. Tamis-LeMonda & N. Cabrera (Eds.), *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 555–597). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Mosely, J., & Thomson, E. (1995). Fathering behavior and child outcomes: The role of race and poverty. In W. Marsiglio (Ed.), *Fatherhood: Contemporary theory, research, and social policy* (pp. 148–165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mussen, P. H., & Rutherford, E. (1963). Parent-child relations and parental personality in relation to young children's sex-role preferences. *Child Development, 34*, 589–607.
- Notaro, P. C., & Volling, B. L. (1999). Parental responsiveness and infant-parent attachment: A replication study with fathers and mothers. *Infant Behavior and Development, 22*, 345–352.
- O'Hare, W. P. (1995). *KIDS COUNT Data Book*. New York: Annie Casie Foundation.
- Parke, R. D., Power, T. G., & Gottman, J. (1979). Conceptualizing and quantifying influence patterns in the family triad. In M. E. Lamb, S. J. Suomi, & G. R. Stephenson (Eds.), *Social interaction analysis: Methodological issues* (pp. 231–252). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Payne, D. E., & Mussen, P. H. (1956). Parent-child relations and father identification among adolescent boys. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52*, 358–362.
- Pearson, J., & Thoennes, N. (1990). Custody after divorce: Demographic and attitudinal patterns. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 60*, 233–249.
- Pleck, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1997). Fatherhood ideals in the United States: Historical dimensions. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed., pp. 33–48, 314–318). New York: Wiley.
- Pleck, J. H. (1982). *Husbands' and wives' paid work, family work, and adjustment*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.
- Pleck, J. H. (1983). Husbands' paid work and family roles: Current research issues. In H. Lopata & J. H. Pleck (Eds.), *Research in the interweave of social roles: Vol. 3. Families and jobs* (pp. 251–333). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Pleck, J. H. (1984). *Working wives and family well-being*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Pleck, J. H. (1986). Employment and fatherhood: Issues and innovative policies. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father's role: Applied perspectives* (pp. 385–412). New York: Wiley.
- Pleck, J. H. (1997). Paternal involvement: Levels, sources and consequences. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed., pp. 66–103, 325–332). New York: Wiley.
- Polatnick, M. (1973–1974). Why men don't rear children: A power analysis. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 18*, 44–86.
- Popenoe, D. (1989). The family transformed. *Family Affairs, 2*(2–3), 1–5.
- Popenoe, D. (1996). *Life without father*. New York: Free Press.
- Power, T. G. (1985). Mother- and father-infant play. *Child Development, 56*, 1514–1524.

- Pruett, K. D. (1983). Infants of primary nurturing fathers. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 38, 257–277.
- Pruett, K. D. (1985). Children of the fathermothers: Infants of primary nurturing fathers. In J. D. Call, E. Galenson, & R. L. Tyson (Eds.), *Frontiers of infant psychiatry* (Vol. 2, pp. 375–380). New York: Basic Books.
- Quinn, R. P., & Staines, G. L. (1979). *The 1977 Quality of Employment survey*. Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center.
- Radin, N. (1981). The role of the father in cognitive, academic, and intellectual development. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (Rev. ed., pp. 379–428). New York: Wiley.
- Radin, N. (1982). Primary caregiving and role-sharing fathers. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development* (pp. 173–204). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Radin, N. (1994). Primary-caregiving fathers in intact families. In A. E. Gottfried & A. W. Gottfried (Eds.), *Redefining families: Implications for children's development* (pp. 11–54). New York: Plenum.
- Radin, N., & Goldsmith, R. (1985). Caregiving fathers of preschoolers: Four years later. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 31, 375–383.
- Rodman, H. (1971). *Lower-class families: The culture of poverty in Negro Trinidad*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Roggman, L. A., Fitzgerald, H. E., Bradley, R. H., & Rarkes, H. (2002). Methodological, measurement, and design issues in studying fathers: An interdisciplinary perspective. In C. S. Tamis-LeMonda & N. Cabrera (Eds.), *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 1–30). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rondal, J. A. (1980). Fathers' and mothers' speech in early language development. *Journal of Child Language*, 7, 353–369.
- Russell, G. (1983). *The changing roles of fathers?* St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.
- Russell, G. (1986). Primary caretaking and role-sharing fathers. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father's role: Applied perspectives* (pp. 29–57). New York: Wiley.
- Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. (1957). *Patterns of child rearing*. Evanston, IL: Peterson.
- Shannon, J., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., London, K., & Cabrera, N. (2002). Beyond rough and tumble: Low-income fathers' interactions and children's cognitive development at 24 months. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 2, 77–104.
- Sternberg, K. S. (1997). Fathers, the missing parents in research on family violence. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed., pp. 284–308, 392–297). New York: Wiley.
- Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., & Cabrera, N. (1999). Perspectives on father involvement: Research and social policy (with commentary by Ross Thompson). *Society for Research in Child Development, Social Policy Report*, 13(2), 1–26.
- Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., & Cabrera, N. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thompson, R. A., & Laible, D. J. (1999). Noncustodial parents. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *Parenting and child development in "nontraditional" families* (pp. 103–123). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tomasello, M., Conti-Ramsden, G., & Ewert, B. (1990). Young children's conversations with their mothers and fathers: Difference in breakdown and repair. *Journal of Child Language*, 17, 115–130.
- Van Ijzendoorn, M. H., & DeWolff, M. S. (1997). In search of the absent father—Meta-analyses of infant-father attachment: A rejoinder to our discussants. *Child Development*, 68, 604–609.

- Whitehead, B. D. (1993). Dan Quayle was right. *Atlantic Monthly* (April), 47–84.
- Winett, R. A., & Neale, M. S. (1980). Results of experimental study of flexitime and family life. *Monthly Labor Review*, 113(November), 29–32.
- Yankelovich, D. (1974). The meaning of work. In J. Rosow (Ed.), *The worker and the job*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.