

What Matters Most? Money, Relationships, and Visions of Masculinity as Key Correlates of Father Involvement

J. Bart Stykes
Bowling Green State University

Abstract

This research contributes to work on father involvement by examining the influence of human capital and masculine identity on father's verbal interaction with children at ages one, three, and five. Random effects techniques were applied to panel data from the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study and addressed the importance of time-variant indicators of economic capital and relational capital alongside fathers' visions of masculinity at the child's birth. Results indicated that increases in both forms of human capital were positively associated with father involvement--though relational capital was more consequential for involvement than economic capital. Baseline visions of masculinity served as a poor predictor of father involvement net of time-varying indicators of human capital, which suggested masculinities per se did not influence father involvement. Rather masculine identities are arguably fluid constructs that are linked to man's capital. Taken together, findings suggested program and policy initiatives designed to encourage coparenting and healthy relationships with birth mothers might be more effective in bolstering father involvement among disadvantaged fathers rather than educational or training programs.

Recently, scholars and policymakers alike have paid increasing attention to fatherhood and father involvement. The increasing prevalence of nonresident fathers and increases in involvement among resident fathers have been identified as major trends affecting children's development (Cabrera, Tamis-Lemonda, Bradley, Hofferth, and Lamb, 2000). These countervailing trends occur against a backdrop in which the culture of fatherhood has shifted toward the expectation that that good fathers provide emotional support and participate in caregiving tasks in addition to economic provision (e.g. Marsiglio & Pleck, 2005; Sayer, Bianchi, & Robinson, 2004; Townsend, 2002). Federal data collection efforts to include men -- more specifically fathers -- have improved, allowing scholars to ask more detailed questions and consider father involvement's correlates and effects on children's, fathers', and mothers' well-being. Three noteworthy veins of research have emerged in the fathering literatures that are of particular interest. First, research considers characteristics that influenced father involvement. Key correlates included racial/ethnic status (e.g. Cabrera, Hofferth, & Chae, 2011; Edin, Tach, & Mincy, 2009; Hofferth, 2003), maternal gatekeeping (e.g. Fagan & Barnett, 2003; Schoppe-Sullivan, Brown, Cannon, & Mangelsdorf, 2008; Waller & Swisher, 2006), mothers' and fathers' relationship status (e.g. Guzzo, 2009; Manning & Smock, 1999; Tach, Mincy, & Edin, 2010), fathers' economic circumstances (e.g. Coley & Hernandez, 2006; Hofferth & Goldscheider, 2010; Roy, 2004), and resident status (e.g. Garasky, Stewart, Gundersen, & Lohman, 2010; King, 2006; Roy & Dyson, 2010). Second, research acknowledges the effects of father involvement on children's well-being (e.g. Cabrera, Fagan, & Farrie, 2008; Carlson, 2006; King & Sobolewski, 2006). Third, researchers have noted the connection between father involvement and gender ideologies (e.g. Bulanda, 2004; Hofferth & Goldscheider, 2010; Townsend, 2002). This study integrates two veins of research that focus on fathers' economic circumstances and

relational dynamics with their children's mothers by simultaneously modeling time-variant indicators of fathers' economic and relational capital. Further, the relative importance of economic versus relational capital for father involvement is considered. Lastly, I provide a more stringent test of the predictors of father involvement that accounts for stable characteristics and considered fathers' gendered attitudes about their fathering role at the child's birth. The importance of this study is situated around research that linked greater involvement with better child outcomes (i.e. Cabrera et al., 2008) and father involvement's ability to buffer the negative effects of father absence (i.e. Carlson, 2006).

Four broad research questions guide this study. First, do changes in economic and relational capital influence fathers' verbal interactions with their young children once stable characteristics of fathers and mothers are modeled? Second, which type of human capital, economic or relational, is more consequential for father involvement? Third, does a father's vision of fathering at the child's birth influence his verbal interactions with his child over time net of stable characteristics and changes in human capital? Fourth, are changes in human capital contingent on father's visions of masculinity in fathering at the child's birth? Ultimately, three contributions are made to research on father involvement: first, a resident status is treated as a fluid measure that varies over time and better documents cycles of coresidence (see Mott, 1990); second, fathers' visions of masculinity and fathering at the child's birth are allowed to influence levels of involvement; lastly, changes in human capital are modeled as a function of visions of masculinity.

Background

A Theoretical Model of Father Involvement

Lamb, Pleck, Charnov, and Levine (1985) provide a theoretical model of father involvement that has guided most current research on father involvement. The authors acknowledge three components of involvement: engagement, accessibility, and responsibility and identify four factors that influence involvement: skills/self-confidence, social supports, barriers, and motivation. Recent scholarship has suggested Lamb et al.'s framework should revisit definitions of father involvement to acknowledge developmental gradients in children (see Dyer et al., 2013), however, I frame the discussion of focal characteristics that are expected to influence father involvement around Lamb et al.'s predictors of father involvement: economic capital (embodying skills and self-confidence), relational capital and maternal gatekeeping (social support and barriers), and gender ideology (motivation).

Skills & Self-Confidence: Economic Capital and Father Involvement

Contemporary fatherhood comprises more than economic provision (e.g. Marsiglio & Pleck, 2005; Roy & Dyson, 2010; Townsend, 2002) and a pattern toward convergence in mothers' and fathers' time spent in childrearing tasks has emerged (i.e.. Doucet, 2013). However, scholars continue to acknowledge that economic provision remains a central component of successful fathering across class boundaries (e.g. Jarrett, Roy, & Burton, 2002; Landale & Oropesa, 2001; Townsend, 2002). Indeed, Townsend's (2002) interviews highlighted the tension that arose between traditional visions of fatherhood (stressing economic provision) and the increasing expectation that nurturance was a central component of successful fatherhood. There are different ways of measuring financial support among fathers. First, employment status is important. Townsend's (2002) in-depth interviews with relatively advantaged fathers suggested that stable full-time employment was one of four mandatory prerequisites for successful fathering among a predominately white, middle-class, and married sample. Similarly,

Jarrett et al.'s (2002) review of research on urban, disadvantaged fathers found similar themes and echoed Mott's (1990) classic work suggesting economically disadvantaged fathers participated in cycles of engagement and coresidence which were often linked to employment status. More representative quantitative research finds a similar association between employment and father involvement. For instance, Hofferth and Goldscheider (2010) demonstrated that fathers' employment increases their involvement with children. Researchers also find that a father's involvement is conditional on his employment in legal versus illegal sectors. Fathers who were involved in illegal activities were less involved with their children due to heightened maternal gatekeeping, incarceration, or some combination of gatekeeping and incarceration (e.g. Waller & Swisher, 2006; Woldoff & Cina, 2007; Wildeman, 2009).

A second indicator of economic capital is educational attainment. Given the positive association between educational attainment and employment status, it is not surprising that research consistently finds better educated fathers are more involved in their children's lives (e.g. King, Harris, Heard, 2004; Roggman, Boyce, Cook, & Cook, 2002; Yeung, Sandberg, Davis-Kean, & Hofferth, 2001). In sum, I argue that a father's current employment status and gains in educational attainment or training/certification likely bolster his confidence in his identity as a father thus fostering higher levels of involvement.

Social Supports & Barriers: Relational Capital and Father Involvement

Two other factors that influence father involvement, social support and barriers, are related to what I consider relational capital: current relationship status, coresidence with children, and maternal gatekeeping. First and foremost, relationships with either birth mothers or other women likely influence father involvement. For instance, Townsend (2002) suggests that a "successful" father must be married to the child's mother. Some suggested that the either the

institutional nature of marriage or the negative selection of fathers into cohabitation resulted in higher levels of involvement among married rather than cohabiting fathers (e.g. Hofferth & Anderson, 2003; Hofferth, 2006; Marsiglio, Day, & Lamb, 2000). However, research on relatively disadvantaged, biological fathers finds differences between marital and cohabiting fathers' levels of involvement are minimal (e.g. Berger, Carlson, & Bzostek, 2008; Jarrett et al., 2002; Hohmann-Marriott, 2011). Even if fathers are not married to their children's mothers, qualitative work among low-income groups suggests that fathers who remain romantically involved with the birth mother are more involved with their children than those whose relationship has ended (e.g. Edin & Kefalas, 2005; Jarrett et al., 2002). A second component of relational capital, child coresidence, is likely linked to a father's relationship status to the birth mother. However, given flexibility and diversity in contemporary custody arrangements (see Cancian & Meyer, 2011), I suggest child coresidence should be considered as a distinct indicator in addition to relationship to the child's birth mother. Scholarship on father involvement consistently demonstrates that fathers who do not live with their children are less involved (e.g. Carlson, 2006; Jarrett et al., 2002; Nelson, 2004; Tach et al., 2010).

The third component of relational capital I consider, maternal gatekeeping, is considered a barrier to father involvement. Prior research on maternal gatekeeping considered mothers' reluctance to relinquish parenting tasks in light of gender ideology (Allen & Hawkins, 1999) whereas more recent research emphasizes maternal satisfaction with fathers' performance in fathering roles (e.g. Fagan & Barnett, 2003; Schoppe-Sullivan, et al., 2008) as well as fathers' risky behaviors (e.g. Roy & Dyson, 2005; Waller & Swisher, 2006). Taken together, this research suggests that mothers influence fathers' involvement either by actively encouraging or discouraging father involvement. Indeed, Townsend (2002) describes fathering as an indirect act

that is largely mediated by mothers. In sum, I argue two indicators associated with relational capital have both positive and implications for father involvement. Remaining romantically involved with the child's birth mother and living with the child likely increase father involvement whereas living with another woman, being single, or living away from the child decrease involvement. Similarly, I expect mothers' satisfaction with fathering fosters higher involvement whereas dissatisfaction with fathering discourages involvement.

Motivation: Masculinities & Fathering

Both scholars and advocates for responsible fatherhood acknowledge a general shift in the culture of fatherhood that encourages emotional attachment, caregiving, and nurturance in addition to economic provision (e.g. Doucet, 2013; Gavanoas, 2002; Marsiglio & Pleck, 2005; Townsend, 2002). However, research documents considerable heterogeneity in men's gendered roles as fathers (e.g. Hearn, 2002; Roy, 2004). Research suggests masculinities emerge in response to structural factors that influence men's capacity to provide either economic support or direct care (e.g. Connell, 1987; Morgan, 2002). For instance, Roy's (2004) analyses suggested that men with stable employment placed greater emphasis on economic provision whereas men who were marginally employed stressed the importance of simply "being there" for their children. Interviews with upper-middle and working class married fathers find additional evidence of class differences in father involvement. Specifically, wealthier fathers were less likely to engage in private fathering (e.g. assisting with homework or providing direct care) and more likely to engage in public fathering (e.g. attendance at sporting events and school events) compared to working-class fathers (Shows & Gerstel, 2009). Lastly, Doucet (2004) considered masculinities and fatherhood in a unique context by considering stay-at-home fathers. Her work suggested that the association between masculinities and fatherhood was complex in that fathers

attempted to affirm their masculinity and challenged some of the traditional components of hegemonic masculinity simultaneously (Doucet, 2004).

Research on traditional gender ideology and father involvement suggests that the association between gender attitudes and father involvement is complicated. For instance, some work suggested that resident fathers with less traditional gender values were more involved in caregiving tasks (e.g. Bulanda, 2004; DeMaris, Mahoney, & Pargament, 2011; Gaertner, Spinrad, Eisenberg, & Greving, 2007). However, others have found that fathers with more traditional gender roles reported higher levels of involvement (i.e. Hofferth & Goldscheider, 2010). Further, research has found the effects of employment status were conditional on men's gender ideologies (Hofferth & Goldscheider, 2010). I consider an indicator of traditional gender ideology that might be more consequential for father involvement by situating a man's gender ideology around his vision of his most important role as a father. I expect that fathers who stress the importance of economic provision, protection, and disciplining their children rather than being there, loving, or providing direct care are less involved with their children. In addition, I follow Hofferth and Goldscheider's (2010) lead and allow the effects of changes in human capital to vary depending on a father's vision of masculinity.

Current Study and Hypotheses

In sum, I argue that a father's economic capital, relational capital, and vision of masculinity in fathering influence his level of involvement with his children. A wealth of research considers the correlates that influenced father involvement. In a separate vein others explore the connection between the fathering role and man's masculinity. I link these veins of research and consider both human capital and gendered attitudes about fathering as predictors of father involvement (specifically verbal interaction). This study focuses on verbal interaction as

developmental psychologists have demonstrated fathers' verbal interaction has substantial effects on children's cognitive development that are independent of mothers' involvement (i.e. Tamis-LeMonda, Shannon, Cabrera, & Lamb, 2004). Specifically, I answer four research questions. First, do changes in economic and relational capital influence fathers' verbal interactions with their young children once stable characteristics of fathers and mothers are modeled? More specifically, are increases in capital associated with increases in fathers' involvement? Second, which type of human capital, economic or relational, is more consequential for father involvement? Third, does a father's vision of fathering at the child's birth influence his verbal interactions with his child over time once stable characteristics and changes in human capital are modeled? Lastly, are changes in human capital a function of fathers' visions of masculinity at the child's birth. Based on prior research and theory, five hypotheses are tested. First, *fathers who reported higher levels of economic capital report higher levels of involvement*. Second, *fathers who reported higher levels of relational capital report greater involvement with their children*. Third, *relational capital is more consequential for a father's involvement than economic capital*, due in part to the salience of children's coresidence for father involvement. Fourth, *fathers who hold traditional views of their role as fathers at the birth report lower levels of involvement*. Finally, *increases in economic capital are more pronounced for fathers who report a traditional vision of masculinity at the child's birth whereas increases in relational capital are more pronounced for fathers who do not report a traditional vision of fathering*.

Data and Method

This study uses data from the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study (Fragile Families). These data followed approximately 5,000 births over the course of nine years and when weighted are representative of urban, nonmarital births in 2000 (Reichman, Tietler,

Garfinkel, & McLanahan, 2001). Baseline interviews were conducted shortly following the child's birth with follow-up interviews conducted when children were aged one, three, five, and nine. These analyses use information spanning four waves of data (baseline, 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year follow-up interviews). The dependent variable, verbal interaction, was collected at all five follow-up interviews; however, I did not include the 9-year follow-up in analyses due to inconsistency in measurement, concerns of survey attrition, and developmental changes in children (see Dyer et al., 2013). Fragile Families collected detailed measures on parental involvement, economic capital, and characteristics of fathers' relationships with birth mothers at each follow-up wave in addition to a host of demographic characteristics at the baseline. Moreover, both mothers and fathers were interviewed at each wave so I linked mother-father interviews produce couple-level data¹, making these data ideal to test hypotheses.

Analytic Population

Analyses are limited to fathers who answered at least one question about verbal interaction with their children at least two of the follow-up interviews. Fathers who had not seen their child in the last month were not asked questions about verbal interaction. Thus, my analytic population included 2,789 out of the 3,830 fathers (73%) who were interviewed at the baseline interview. Data were transformed into person-year format yielding a total analytic population of 7,803 person-years. Imputation techniques were used to address missing data for independent variables.

Measures

Dependent variable. Verbal interaction is coded as a continuous measure ranging from 0 to 7. Respondents were asked two questions that concerned verbal interaction at the 1-year, 3-

¹ Mother's satisfaction with fathering is the only variable that I constructed from the mothers' data. All other variables are taken from the fathers' data.

year, and 5-year follow-up interviews. Interviewers asked respondents, “How many days a week do you usually (1) read stories to and (2) tell stories to the child?” These items were highly correlated at each wave ($\alpha = 0.72 - 0.81$). Therefore, I took the average of responses to how many days a week fathers read stories and told stories to children and referred to this as a scale of verbal interaction. The scale for verbal interaction was highly correlated with other measures of father involvement such as “play games with,” “sing songs to,” etc. However, I limited analyses to verbal interaction because this was the only item that was asked identically at the 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year follow-up interviews.

Economic capital. I use two indicators of a father’s economic capital: employment status and gains in educational attainment. Employment status was collected at every wave of the interview and was time-varying whereas gains in educational attainment was coded as a time-invariant characteristic taken over all waves of the survey². Employment status was coded into four mutually exclusive, exhaustive categories: regular employment (reference), illegal employment, “other” employment, and no employment. Fragile Families asked respondents if they earned any income in: (1) regular work, (2) “under the table” work, or (3) illegal activities including but not limited to prostitution and hustling. First, I coded respondents who reported any income from illegal employment as having illegal employment. Second, I coded respondents who earned income in regular work but not illegal activities as having regular employment. Third, respondents who reported some other form of employment but not regular or illegal employment were coded as having other employment. Finally, respondents who did not report any sources of income were coding as having no employment. Gains in educational

² At the baseline, 1-year, and 3-year interviews, Fragile Families asked respondents to report their highest level of education (including technical certificates), but in the 5-year interview, they simply asked respondents if they had experienced any increase in education since the previous interview. As such, I limited the measure of gains in educational attainment to a time-invariant categorical variable that flagged each wave where respondents reported an increase in education.

attainment was coded as experiencing: no gains in education, one gain in education (reference), or two or more gains in education over the course of the study.

Relational capital. I used three time-varying indicators of relational capital: relationship status, child coresidence, and maternal gatekeeping. Relationship status was collected at all survey waves and coded into four mutually exclusive, exhaustive categories: married to the child's mother, cohabiting with the child's mother (reference), living with another women³, and not in a coresidential union. Child coresidence and maternal gatekeeping were only collected at the follow-up interviews. Coresidence was coded as a dummy indicator where respondents who reported living with the child all or most of the time were coded as "1" and other fathers coded as "0".⁴ Satisfaction with fathering served as a proxy for maternal gatekeeping was coded into three mutually exclusive, exhaustive categories: pleased with fathering most of the time (reference), pleased with fathering sometimes, and rarely pleased with fathering.

Vision of Masculinity. Lastly, I included a dummy indicator, traditional father, that identified fathers who stated providing economic support, disciplining, or protecting the child was the single most important aspect of fathering "1" whereas respondents who stated showing love, teaching the child about life, or caregiving was the most important were coded as "0."

Time was coded as a continuous variable (in years) ranging from 0 to 5. Data were strongly balanced across time. However, there were gaps in time as the only valid values were 0, 1, 3, and 5.

³ Due to small cell sizes, I could not differentiate between married to another woman and cohabiting with another woman.

⁴ I confirmed relationship status and resident status with children could be modeled as separate indicators as 66 of fathers were married to the birth mother and did not live with the child most of the time. The comparable estimate for fathers who were cohabiting with the birth mother was 197.

Analytic Strategy

Longitudinal data provide considerable advantages for estimating causality. However, collecting data at multiple time points cannot guarantee causality. Both unobserved characteristics and temporal order continue to threaten claims of causality in any non-experimental research design. In response to these challenges, scholars have embraced alternative techniques (e.g. fixed and random effects models) to account for unobserved characteristics and their effects on outcome variables. Diagnostic analyses considered pooled OLS models to assess the biases of unobserved characteristics. Regressing the stochastic error on the lagged stochastic error confirmed there was considerable, positive correlation in the error term ($0.38, p < 0.001$)⁵, which suggested fixed or random-effects models were preferable to pooled OLS. The Sargan-Hansen statistic yielded a nonsignificant X^2 critical value of 10.9 and suggested random effects models were appropriate. Therefore, analyses included both time-variant and time-invariant characteristics in models. Descriptive statistics were presented first (both overall and by survey wave). Next, random effects models were estimated. First, indicators of economic capital were included models. Second, relational capital was entered. Third, economic and relational capital were modeled in addition to vision of masculinity. Finally, the interactions between vision of masculinity and indicators of both economic and relational capital were considered.

Results

[Table 1 about here]

⁵ Diagnostic models controlled for the fathers' age at birth and racial/ethnic status in addition to time-varying indicators of human capital and vision of masculinity.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of both dependent and independent variables. The first column is presented in person-period format and highlights the descriptive statistics for all waves of data collection. Additional columns noted the distributions of characteristics at each survey wave and were presented in person (rather than person-period format). Overall, fathers reported moderate levels of verbal interaction. The mean level of verbal interaction for all waves suggested that, on average, fathers spent slightly over three days per week reading or telling stories to their children. Moreover, verbal interaction remained fairly stable across survey waves and did not increase or decrease monotonically over time. Descriptive statistics for economic factors underscore the disadvantage of Fragile Families sample. Over the course of the entire study, 81.2% of fathers reported having stable employment. Few fathers, 1.60%, reported engaging in any illegal employment whereas 4.9% of fathers reported having “other” employment. Lastly, 12.3% of fathers reported no source of employment over the course of the study. Additional columns demonstrated that the distribution of employment status varied slightly across waves with higher percentages of fathers being unemployed in the last wave and fewer father engaging in illegal employment over time. Over three-quarters (78.1%) of fathers reported one increase in education between survey waves whereas 14.1% of fathers reported two or more gains in education and only 7.8% of fathers did not experience a gain in education over the course of the study.

Relationship status to the birth mother was spread fairly evenly over the course of the survey. Approximately 40% of fathers were married to the birth mother over the course of the study whereas almost one-third (29.9%) of fathers were cohabiting to the birth mother, 7.1% of fathers were living with another woman, and 20.4% of fathers were single. In contrast to

sporadic fluctuation in economic capital, a higher percentage of fathers were married to the birth mother, living with another woman, or single at subsequent waves whereas decreasing percentages of fathers were cohabiting with the birth mother at later waves. Overall, the majority (75.9%) of fathers reported living with their child either all or most of the time over the course of the survey. This percent dropped consistently at each subsequent wave and reached its lowest point of 71.3% at the 5-year follow-up. In terms of maternal gatekeeping, the majority (91.2%) of mothers were pleased with fathering at least some of the time with only 10.8% of mothers being rarely pleased with fathering. Over time, mothers were less likely to report being pleased with fathering most of the time (from 73.6% to 58.9%) and more likely to be rarely pleased with fathering (from 7.8% to 13.8%). Finally, 16.2% of the fathers in this sample reported having a traditional vision of fathering at the child's birth.

[Table 2 about here]

Multivariate Findings

Table 2 presents the results from random effects models that predicted verbal interaction. Model 1 included indicators of economic capital -- both time-variant and time invariant. Second, Model 2 examined three time-variant indicators of relational capital. Third, Model 3 included traditional father ideology. Model 4 presented the only interaction between traditional father human capital that approached significance -- traditional father and employment status. According to Model 1 both indicators of economic capital had a significant effect on father's verbal interaction net of stable characteristics. Moreover, increases in employment status corresponded to higher levels of engagement. Fathers who were involved in illegal employment rather than regular employment reported a 0.55 unit decrease in the number of days they read/told stories to their children. Experiencing two gains in educational attainment rather than

one gain increased father's engagement by 0.18 days per week, on average. However, this effect was only marginally significant. Model 1 demonstrated no significant differences in engagement for (1) employed versus non-employed fathers or fathers engaged in "other" employment; (2) fathers who only experienced one gain in educational attainment versus fathers who did not experience gains in education; or (3) over time. Lastly, the overall R^2 for this model suggested that indicators of human capital provided minimal predictive power for verbal interaction ($r^2 = 0.003$).

Model 2 considered the effects of three time-variant indicators of relational capital: relationship status, child coresidence, and maternal gatekeeping. Again, results indicated increases in each indicator of relational capital had a positive effect on verbal interaction. More specifically, fathers who were in a coresidential relationship with another woman (rather than married to the child's mother) reported a 0.40 unit decrease in the number of days they read/told stories to the child whereas fathers who were single (rather than married to the child's mother) reported a 0.37 unit decrease in verbal interaction. Interestingly, no differences between verbal interaction of fathers who were married to or cohabiting with the biological mother emerged. Not surprisingly, living with the child most of the time greatly increased father engagement. Fathers who lived with their children most of the time, approached a one-day increase (0.91) in the number of days they read/told stories to their children, on average. I also found some support for maternal gatekeeping as men whose child's mothers were either sometimes or rarely pleased with their fathering (rather than pleased most of the time) reported a 0.20 unit decrease in the number of days they read/told stories to their. However, as the baseline data did not include information on mothers' satisfaction with fathering, I could not establish a clear temporal order. Although this effect suggests maternal gatekeeping might occur, I cannot discount reverse

causality (i.e. mothers are likely more satisfied with more involved fathers). Once time-variant indicators of relational capital are controlled, the effect of time became positive and significant. Indeed, each increase in time corresponded to a 0.03 increase in the number of days fathers read/told stories to their children. Lastly, the R^2 for Model 2 demonstrated that indicators of relational capital had more predictive power than measures of economic capital ($r^2 = 0.060$).

The final model considered indicators of economic and human capital alongside baseline visions of masculinity. The effects of relational capital remained largely unchanged once I controlled for economic capital and traditional father. However, the effects of economic capital were less robust once changes in relational capital were modeled. In fact, the negative effect of illegal employment was reduced to nonsignificance whereas the effects of gains in education remained once relational capital was included in the model. The positive effect for time remained significant net of both economic and relational capital, but the effect of traditional father did not approach significance. Lastly, it is important to note that a man's vision of masculinity in fathering is not a significant predictor net of time-variant indicators of economic and relational capital.

I considered the interaction between traditional father and time-variant predictors of economic and relational capital to ascertain if changes in human capital varied according to a fathers' vision of masculinity in fathering, but the only marginally significant interaction was between employment status and masculinity. Indeed, the effect of illegal employment was conditional on baseline visions of masculinity in fathering. The main effect of illegal employment suggested that illegal employment (rather than regular employment) had a negative effect on verbal interaction for fathers who did not hold a traditional vision of fathering at the child's birth ($-0.44, p < 0.05$). In contrast, among traditional fathers, engaging in illegal

employment (rather than regular employment) resulted in a 0.62unit increase (-0.44 + 1.06) in the number of days he read/told stories to his children, on average. Alternatively, among traditional fathers, having some “other” form of employment reduced father involvement whereas it increased involvement among non-traditional fathers. Targeting centering suggested the positive effect of illegal employment on traditional fathers and negative effect of “other” employment on traditional fathers were nonsignificant. Since these interaction terms are only marginally significant and the effects of illegal and “other” employment for traditional fathers were nonsignificant, I conclude that the association between economic and relational capital do not vary by traditional father ideology.

Discussion

Recent scholarship has paid increasing attention to fatherhood and father involvement. Thus, this study provided a timely, rigorous discussion of the correlates of father involvement that added to the literature by considering attitudes of masculinities in fathering in addition to human capital. Overall, I found partial support for hypotheses. First and foremost, increases in both economic and relational capital were associated with an increase in fathers’ involvement. Net of stable characteristics, increases in economic capital (specifically education) and relational capital (current relationship status, child coresidence, and mothers’ satisfaction with fathering) were associated with higher levels of father involvement. Second, I found support for the third hypothesis in that time-varying measures of relational capital had more predictive power than measures of economic capital (comparison of Model 1 and Model 2 r^2 ’s, see Table 2).

In contrast to hypotheses concerning the effects of human capital, I found considerably less support for hypotheses concerning fathers’ baseline vision of masculinity in fathering. In fact, being a traditional father was not a significant predictor of verbal interaction in either

pooled OLS or random effects models. Although being a traditional father reduces verbal interaction, the magnitude of this effect is minimal and very nonsignificant. Lastly, I found partial support for the final hypotheses. Illegal and “other” employment had different effects on a father’s level of involvement depending on his vision of masculinity in fathering at the child’s birth. Specifically, for traditional fathers, illegal employment was associated with a significant increase in verbal interaction whereas illegal employment reduced non-traditional fathers’ level of involvement. Further, “other” employment was associated with less involvement among traditional fathers and more involvement among nontraditional fathers. The former finding suggests that fathers who place greater importance on the provider role might be willing to engage in illegal forms of employment to meet that role. Given the ambiguous nature of “other” employment, it is difficult to theorize why “other” employment fostered higher involvement among nontraditional fathers but hampered involvement among traditional fathers. The effects of relational capital were not a function of baseline masculinities in fathering.

The current analyses provided three noteworthy contributions to research on father involvement. First, I considered a fluid measure of child coresidence that was not nested within fathers’ relationships to birth mothers. Researchers have demonstrated that a father’s resident status is often fluid and dynamic (e.g. Jarrett et al., 2002; Mott, 1990). However, prior research has largely considered father involvement among either resident or nonresident fathers. This operationalization becomes problematic as custody arrangements have become more fluid in light of increasing nonmarital and multipartnered fertility (see Cancian & Meyer, 2011). By considering children’s coresidence as a time-varying characteristic that was in fact independent of a father’s relationship to the birth mother, I provided a more nuanced measure of children’s coresidence. In fact, results indicated that both relationship status to birth mothers and child

coresidence had independent, significant effects on verbal interaction. Second, my inclusion of traditional father provided key insights that were related to conceptualizations of masculinity. Arguably, the notable effects of human capital coupled with the virtually nonexistent effects of fathers' visions of masculinity at the child's birth suggested masculinities might be shaped by human capital rather than a stable identity. For instance, critical gender scholars have suggested that masculinities are fluid identities that are influenced by sociodemographic characteristics (e.g. Connell, 1987; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Hearn, 2002; Morgan, 2002). Initially, Connell (1987) suggested that men strived for a culturally sanctioned form of hegemonic masculinity, but due to either structural constraints or attitudinal protests some men forged marginal, reactionary, or protest masculinities. My results were consistent with this perspective as time-varying measures of human capital were consequential for fathers' involvement whereas the time-invariant vision of masculinity in fathering had virtually no effect on verbal interaction. Third, by considering differences in the effects of human capital for traditional versus nontraditional fathers, I demonstrated that the detrimental effects of illegal employment were conditional on a father's vision of masculinity. Although this effect was marginally significant ($p < 0.061$), small instances of illegal employment among fathers could have resulted in large standard errors.

This study provided notable contributions to the field, but there are limitations worth noting. First, these analyses only considered one indicator of father involvement. Both theory and research have argued that father involvement was a multidimensional construct (e.g. Dyer et al., 2013; Lamb et al., 1985; Schoppe-Sullivan et al., 2004). Although researchers have demonstrated that verbal interaction has key implications for children's cognitive development (see Tamis-Lemonda et al., 2004) and I found that verbal interaction was highly correlated to

other aspects of fathering, a more holistic conceptualization of father involvement could provide subtle nuances. Second, I did not consider the interaction between racial/ethnic status and changes in human capital. Prior research has demonstrated that racial/ethnic status had major implications for father involvement (e.g. Cabrera et al., 2011; Hofferth, 2003; Woldoff & Cina, 2007), but considering racial/ethnic interactions were beyond the scope of the present study. Third, I did not consider changes in mother's human capital. Research has demonstrated that fathers increase their level of involvement in response to increases in maternal employment (see Sayer et al., 2004), but this analyses did not account for any time-varying characteristics of mothers. Last, I interpreted the effects of mothers' satisfaction with fathering on verbal interaction as evidence of maternal gatekeeping based on prior work (e.g. Fagan & Barnett, 2003; Schoppe-Sullivan et al., 2008; Waller & Swisher, 2006); however, it is also possible that mothers were pleased with fathering because fathers were more involved with their children. In reality, both processes likely contributed to the observed effects.

I provided robust estimates for human capital and its influence on a father's involvement with his children. Taken together these findings suggest that although both increases in economic and relational capital increased father involvement, relational capital was more consequential for father involvement. As such I provided additional evidence that policy initiatives and fathering programs should target factors such as effective coparenting and dual-custody arrangements in efforts to increase father involvement.

References

- Allen, S.M. & Hawkins, A.J. (1999). "Maternal Gatekeeping: Mothers' Beliefs and Behaviors that Inhibit Greater Father Involvement in Family Work." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61(1), 199-212.
- Berger, L.M., Carlson, M.J., Bzostek, S.H., & Osborne, C. (2008). "Parenting Practices of Resident Fathers: The Role of Marital and Biological Ties." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(3), 625-639.
- Bulanda, R.E. (2004). "Paternal Involvement with Children: The Influence of Gender Ideologies." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(1), 40-45.
- Cabrera, N.J., Fagan, J., & Farrie, D. (2008). "Explaining the long reach of Fathers' Prenatal Involvement on Later Paternal Engagement." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(5), 1094-1107.
- Cabrera, N.J., Hofferth, S.L., & Chae S. (2011). "Patterns and Predictors of Father-Infant Engagement across Race/Ethnic Groups." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 26(3), 365-375.
- Cabrera, N.J., Tamis-LeMonda, C.S., Bradley, R.H., Hofferth, S., & Lamb, M.E. (2000). "Fatherhood in the Twenty-First Century." *Child Development*, 71(1), 127-136.
- Carlson, M.J. (2006). "Family Structure, Father Involvement, and Adolescent Behavioral Outcomes." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(1), 137-154.
- Cancian, M. & Meyer, D.R. (2011). "Child Support Policy Given Multiple-Partner Fertility." *Social Science Review*, 85(4), 587-617.
- Coles, T. (2009). "Negotiating the Field of Masculinity: The production and reproduction of multiple dominant masculinities." *Men & Masculinities*, 12(1), 30-44.

- Coley, R.L. & Hernandez, D.C. (2006). "Predictors of Paternal Involvement for Resident and Nonresident Low-Income Fathers." *Developmental Psychology*, 42(6), 1041-1056.
- Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and Power*. Allen and Unwin.: Australia.
- Connell, R.W. & Messerschmidt, J.W. (2005). "Hegemonic Masculinities: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829-850.
- DeMaris, A., Mahoney, A., & Pargament, K. (2011). "Doing the Scut Work of Infant Care: Does Religiousness Encourage Father Involvement?" *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(2), 354-368.
- Doucet, A. (2004). "It's Almost Like I have a Job, but I Don't Get Paid: Fathers at Home Reconfiguring Work, Care, and Masculinity." *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 2(3), 277-303.
- Doucet, A. (2013). "Gender Roles and Fathering." In Cabrera, N.J. and Tamis-Lemonda, C.S. (eds.) *Handbook of Father Involvement 2nd Edition*, New York: Routledge, 297-329.
- Dyer, W.J., Day, R.D., & Harper, J.M. (2013). "Wrestling Proteus: Assessing the Varying Nature of Father Involvement Across Contexts." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(4), 837-857.
- Edin, K. & Kefalas, E. (2005). *Promises I Can Keep: Why Poor Women Put Motherhood before Marriage*. University of California Press: California.
- Edin, K., Tach, L., & Mincy, R. (2009). "Claiming Fatherhood: Race and the Dynamics of Paternal Involvement among Unmarried Men." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 621(1), 149-177.

- Fagan, J. & Barnett, M. (2003). "The Relationship between Maternal Gatekeeping, Paternal Competence, Mothers' Attitudes about the Father Role, and Father Involvement." *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(8), 1020-1043.
- Gaertner, B.M., Spinrad, T.L., Eisenberg, N., & Greving, K.A. (2007). "Parental Childrearing Attitudes as Correlates of Father Involvement during Infancy." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(4), 962-976.
- Garasky, S., Stewart, S.D., Gundersen, C., & Lohman, B.J. (2010). "Toward a Fuller Understanding of Nonresident Father Involvement: An Examination of Child Support, In-Kind Support, and Visitation." *Population Research and Policy Review* 29, 363-393.
- Gavanas, A. (2002). "The Fatherhood Responsibility Movement: the centrality of marriage, work and male sexuality in reconstructions of masculinity and fatherhood." In Hobson, B. (ed) *Making Men into Fathers: Men, Masculinities and the Social Politics of Fatherhood*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 213-244.
- Guzzo, K.B. (2009). "Maternal Relationships and Nonresidential Father Visitation of Children born outside of Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(3), 632-649.
- Hearn, J. (2002). "Men, fathers and the state: national and global relations." In Hobson, B. (ed.) *Making Men into Fathers: Men, Masculinities and the Social Politics of Fatherhood*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 245-274.
- Hofferth, S.L. (2003). "Race/Ethnic Differences in Father Involvement in Two-Parent Families: Culture, Context, or Economy?" *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(2), 185-216.
- Hofferth, S.L. (2006). "Residential Father Family Type and Child Well-Being: Investment versus Selection." *Demography*, 43(1), 53-77.

- Hofferth, S.L. & Anderson, K.G. (2003). "Are all Dads Equal? Biology versus Marriage as a Basis for Paternal Investment." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65(1), 213-232.
- Hofferth, S.L. & Goldscheider, F. (2010). "Does Change in Young Men's Employment Influence Fathering?" *Family Relations*, 59(4), 479-493.
- Hohmann-Marriott, B. (2011). "Coparenting and Father Involvement in Married and Unmarried Coresident Couples." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(1), 296-309.
- Jarrett, R.L., Roy, K.M., & Burton, L.M. "Fathers in the 'Hood': Insights from Qualitative Research on Low-Income African-American Men." Taken from *Handbook of Father Involvement Multidisciplinary Perspectives* eds. Tamis-Lemonda and Cabrera. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: New Jersey.
- Lamb, M.E., Pleck, J.H., Charnov, E.L., & Levine, J.A. (1985). "Paternal Behavior in Humans." *American Zoologist*, 25(3), 883-894.
- King, V. (2006). "The Antecedents and Consequences of Adolescents' Relationships with Stepfathers and Nonresident Fathers." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(4), 910-928.
- King, V., Harris, K.M., & Heard, H.E. (2004). "Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Nonresident Father Involvement." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(1), 1-21.
- King, V. & Sobolewski, J.M. (2006). "Nonresident Fathers' Contributions to Adolescent Well-Being." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(3), 537-557.
- Landale, N.S. & Oropesa, R.S. (2001). "Father Involvement in the Lives of Mainland Puerto Rican Children: Contributions of Nonresident, Cohabiting and Married Fathers." *Social Forces*, 79(3), 945-968.
- Manning, W.D. & Smock, P.J. (1999). "New Families and Nonresident Father-Child Visitation." *Social Forces*, 78(1), 87-116.

- Marsiglio, W., Day, R.D., & Lamb, M.E. (2000). "Exploring Fatherhood Diversity: Implications for Conceptualizing Father Involvement." *Marriage & Family Review*, 29(4), 269-293.
- Marsiglio, W. & Pleck, J.H. (2005). "Fatherhood and Masculinities" taken from *Handbook of Studies on Men & Masculinities eds. Kimmel, Hearn, and Connell*. Sage Publications, Inc.: California.
- Morgan, D. (2002). "Epilogue." In Hobson, B. (ed.) *Making Men into Fathers: Men, Masculinities and the Social Politics of Fatherhood*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 273-287.
- Mott, F.L. (1990). "When is Father Really Gone? Paternal-Child Contact in Father-Absent Homes." *Demography*, 27(4), 499-517.
- Nelson, T.J. (2004). "Low-Income Fathers." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 427-451.
- Reichman, N., Tietler, J., Garfinkel, I., & McLanahan, S. (2001). "Fragile Families: Sample and Design." *Children and Youth Services Review*, 23, 303-326.
- Roggman, L.A., Boyce, L.K., Cook, G.A., Cook, J. (2002). "Getting dads involved: Predictors of father involvement in Early Head Start and with their children." *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 23, 62-78.
- Roy, K.M. (2004). "You Can't Eat Love: Constructing Provider Role Expectations for Low-Income and Working-Class Fathers." *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers*, 2(3), 253-276.
- Roy, K.M. & Dyson, O.L. (2005). "Gatekeeping in Context: Babymama Drama and the Involvement of Incarcerated Fathers." *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers*, 3(3), 289-310.

- Roy, K.M. & Dyson, O.L. (2010). "Making Daddies into Fathers: Community-based Fatherhood Programs and the Construction of Masculinities for Low-Income African American Men." *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 45, 139-154.
- Russell, G. & Hwang, C. (2004). "The Impact of Workplace Practices on Father Involvement." *Taken from The Role of the Father in Child Development eds. Lamb. Wiley & Sons, Inc. New Jersey.*
- Sayer, L.C., Bianchi, S.M, & Robinson, J.P. (2004). "Are Parents Investing Less in Children? Trends in Mothers' and Fathers' time with Children." *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(1), 1-43.
- Schoppe-Sullivan, S.J., Brown, G.L., Cannon, E.A., Mangelsdorf, S.C., & Sokolowski, M.S. (2008). "Maternal Gatekeeping, Coparenting Quality, and Fathering Behavior in Families with Infants." *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(3), 389-398.
- Schoppe-Sullivan, S.J., McBride, B.A., & Ho, M.H.R. (2004). "Unidimensional Versus Multidimensional Perspectives on Father Involvement." *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers*, 2(2), 147-163.
- Shows, C. & Gerstel, N. (2009). "Fathering, Class, and Gender: A comparison of Physicians and Emergency Medical Technicians." *Gender & Society*, 23(2), 161-187.
- Tach, L., Mincy, R., & Edin, K. (2010). "Parenting as a 'Package Deal': Relationships, Fertility, and Nonresident Father Involvement among Unmarried Parents." *Demography*, 47(1), 181-204.
- Tamis-LeMonda, C.S., Shannon, J.D., Cabrera, N.J., & Lamb, M.E. (2004). "Fathers and Mothers at Play with Their 2- and 3-Year-Olds: Contributions to Language and Cognitive Development." *Child Development*, 75(6), 1806-1820.

- Townsend, N.W. (2002). *The Package Deal: Marriage, Work and Fatherhood in Men's Lives*. Temple University Press: Philadelphia.
- Waller, M.R. & Swisher, R. (2006). "The Implications for 'Healthy' Relationships and Father Involvement." *Social Problems*, 53(3), 392-420.
- Wildeman, C. (2009). "Parental Imprisonment, the Prison Boom, and the Concentration of Childhood Disadvantage." *Demography*, 46(2), 265-280.
- Woldolf, R.A. & Cina, M.G. (2007). "Regular work, underground jobs, and hustling: An examination of paternal work and father involvement." *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers*, 5(3), 153-172.
- Yeung, W.J., Sandberg, J.F., Davis-Kean, P.E., & Hofferth, S.L. (2001). "Children's Time with Fathers in Intact Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(1), 136-154.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics, by Survey Wave

	All Waves ¹		Baseline Interview		1-Year Follow-Up		3-Year Follow-Up		5-Year Follow-Up	
	μ/p	SD	μ/p	SD	μ/p	SD	μ/p	SD	μ/p	SD
Dependent Variable										
Verbal Interaction	3.3	2.2	--	--	3.1	2.4	3.6	2.2	3.1	1.9
Economic Capital										
Employment Status										
Regular employment	.812	--	.818	--	.798	--	0.816	--	0.823	--
Illegal employment	.016	--	.022	--	.021	--	0.014	--	0.011	--
“Other” employment	.049	--	.043	--	.061	--	0.050	--	0.037	--
Not employed	.123	--	.117	--	.120	--	0.120	--	0.129	--
Gains in Educational ²										
2 or more	0.141	--								
1	0.781	--								
0	0.078	--								
Relational Capital										
Father’s Relationship Status										
Married to BM	0.426	--	0.300	--	0.394	--	0.435	--	0.446	
Cohabiting to BM	0.299	--	0.401	--	0.396	--	0.295	--	0.208	
Living with a different partner ³	0.071	--	0.014	--	0.030	--	0.074	--	0.110	
Single	0.204	--	0.285	--	0.180	--	0.196	--	0.236	
Lives with child <i>most</i> of time	0.759	--	--	--	0.786	--	0.778	--	0.713	--
Mother’s Satisfaction with Father										
Pleased most of time	0.653	--	--	--	0.736	--	0.636	--	0.589	--
Pleased sometimes	0.239	--	--	--	0.186	--	0.255	--	0.273	--
Rarely pleased	0.108	--	--	--	0.078	--	0.109	--	0.138	--
Gender Ideology										
Traditional Father ⁴	0.163	--	0.163	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
N	7803				2475		2789		2539	

Source. Fragile Families and Child Well-being Data (Fragile Families), Baseline, 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year follow up surveys.

Notes.

1. Presented in person-year format.
2. Time invariant measure that documents the total number of educational gains fathers experienced over five years.
3. Married and cohabiting with a different partner had to be collapsed into one category due to small cell sizes.
4. Time invariant measure taken from the baseline data.

	M1: Economic Capital	M2: Relational Capital	M3: Final Model	M4: Interaction Model
Intercept	3.31 ***	2.70 ***	2.68 ***	2.68 ***
Time	-0.00	0.03 *	0.03 *	0.02 *
(Regular employment)				
Illegal employment	-0.55 **		-0.30	-0.44 *
“Other” employment	-0.02		0.10	0.18
Not employed	-0.05		0.07	0.07
(1 gain in education)				
2 or more gains in education	0.18 †		0.18 *	0.18 *
No gains in education	-0.15		-0.07	-0.07
(Married to BM)				
Cohabiting to BM		-0.08	-0.07	-0.07
Living with a different partner		-0.40 ***	-0.40 ***	-0.40 ***
Single		-0.37 ***	-0.36 ***	-0.36 ***
Lives with child <i>most</i> of time		0.91 ***	0.92 ***	0.91 ***
(Pleased with fathering most of time)				
Pleased with fathering sometimes		-0.20 ***	-0.20 ***	-0.21 ***
Rarely pleased with fathering		-0.20 *	-0.20 *	-0.20 *
Traditional father			-0.09	-0.08
(Traditional father, regular employment)				
Traditional, illegal employment				1.06 †
Traditional, “other” employment				-0.46 †
Traditional, no employment				0.01
Global F Statistic	14.9 *	467.1 ***	477.9 ***	485.2 ***
R ²	0.003	0.060	0.062	0.063

Source. Fragile Families and Child Well-being Data (Fragile Families), Baseline, 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year follow up surveys.