Patterns in American Fathers' Fathering Attitudes[1]

Jamie M. Lewis[2]

[1] This paper is the first chapter of my dissertation, "Fathering Attitudes and Father Involvement." I would like to express thanks to my committee members—Dr. Lisa Pearce, Dr. Kathie Harris, Dr. Philip Cohen, Dr. Ron Rindfuss, and Dr. E. Michael Foster—for their thoughtful comments on previous drafts of this work. Special thanks are due to Dr. E. Michael Foster for his guidance in latent class analysis. Finally, I am particularly grateful to my chair, Dr. Lisa Pearce, for her continued support throughout the dissertation process.

[2] Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 155 Hamilton Hall, CB# 3210, Chapel Hill, NC 27599; e-mail: jamielewis@unc.edu.

Patterns in American Fathers' Fathering Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Although research on fathering has grown, how fathers experience themselves as fathers merits greater attention. Here, I conduct latent class analysis of resident fathers' fathering attitudes and test whether these views differ by race/ethnicity and class, using representative data from the 2001-2002 Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Birth Cohort (ECLS-B). Results demonstrate that fathers have largely embraced the expectations of the involved father role, though this transition is incomplete for a substantial minority of men. I also find that the commonly-used provider father-involved father typology inadequately describes observed fathering patterns. Group variations exist, with racial/ethnic minorities and non-professional fathers more likely than non-Hispanic Whites and professionals to endorse an adaptive form of fathering that combines aspects of the provider and involved father roles. Men's endorsement of involved fathering may facilitate positive outcomes in children and richer lives for men and women, but also exposes men to the potential for work-family conflict.

Patterns in American Fathers' Fathering Attitudes

INTRODUCTION

Research on fathers in recent years has increased in volume and depth. The considerable growth in this body of research has been fueled largely by social scientists' greater recognition of the importance of fathering for child development (Lamb 1981; Pleck 2007). Fatherhood scholars agree that fathers' expanded participation in childrearing is associated with positive consequences for fathers themselves, their marriages, and their children (Marsiglio et al. 2000; Marsiglio, Day, and Lamb 2000).

While the burgeoning literature on father involvement advances our knowledge in numerous ways, an element of fatherhood that merits increased attention is how fathers experience themselves as fathers (Bretherton, Lambert, and Golby 2005). In particular, we need to step back and develop a better understanding of views toward fathering, including those held by fathers themselves. Fathers' roles, like others, are socially constructed, variable, and changing (Coontz 1997; Griswold 1993; Kimmel 1996). Family researchers have generally assumed that the ideology of the male breadwinner-father has largely eroded (Warren 2007), and been replaced by expectations for fathers' more active involvement in daily supervision and care of children. However, little research has been done to document the extent of this transition, in particular among fathers themselves. Further investigation of racial/ethnic and class distinctions in fathering attitudes is also required.

In this first chapter of my dissertation, I use nationally representative data from the 2001-2002 Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Birth Cohort (ECLS-B) to assess latent classes of fathering attitudes among resident fathers. These data allow me to study a representative sample of children and their resident fathers, building on research that has primarily focused on fathering in middle-class White families. Information is also attained directly from fathers, offering a considerable advantage over surveys that obtain information on fathers from their wives/partners. I inspect how fathers sort into classes according to their fathering attitudes. In particular, I evaluate whether fathers simply sort into provider versus involved fathers, or whether there is evidence for additional types of fathers. The relative proportion of fathers who fall in the various classes are also estimated, allowing a look at how far and completely the transition from provider to involved father has progressed. Survey indicators useful for measuring latent classes of

fathering attitudes are identified, and the characteristics of the father classes described. I also assess whether patterns of fathering attitudes differ by race/ethnicity and class.

BACKGROUND

In this section, I discuss the extent research literature on the topic of fathering attitudes and group variation in these attitudes. First, I consider the provider father role, addressing the historic context of the role, its characteristics, and rewards and costs associated with the role. I next outline the involved father role, again with a focus on historic context, key features, and rewards and costs connected to the role. In the following section, I discuss possible limitations to the provider father-involved father typology, asserting a need to investigate whether men's views toward fathering are more complex than this dichotomy suggests. I then review theory and research relevant to the examination of how paternal attitudes may vary according to race/ethnicity and social class membership. Finally, I briefly sketch the research aims and contributions of the current study.

Provider Father Role

Historic Context Fathering attitudes and expectations vary across time and place. Key to understanding a father role is grasping the historic context in which it is embedded (LaRossa 1997; Pleck and Pleck 1997). The provider-father and housewife-mother household, often conceived of as the 'traditional' American family, was most prominent from the 1830s through the mid-twentieth century (Bernard 1981).

Patterns of economic production are often thought to relate to family structure and behavior. The male provider role appears to have developed during the shift from subsistence to market economies marked by the industrial revolution (Coltrane 1996). Prior to this period, economic production was predominantly agricultural. Production was closely tied to the family homestead, and family members, male and female, worked side by side to generate items for family use and consumption. As industrial production grew, however, family members worked away from home, selling their labor for cash wages. Because men were substantially more likely to engage in commercial enterprise and wage labor, their gender identity became closely connected to cash provision, economic work, and the work site. In this way, the concept of 'separate spheres' developed. The outside public world of business and industry came to be

considered the realm of men, while women were responsible for the inner realm comprised of family, childrearing, and care work (Bernard 1981; LaRossa 1997).

As industrialization and manufacturing increased in prominence, and families relied more and more on cash to furnish their needs, men's economic provision became more important. At the same time, the powers and privileges associated with the provider role expanded. However, men also encountered higher demands placed on them as providers (Bernard 1981). As affluence and standards of living augmented, the provider role intensified and transformed into the good-provider role.

Characteristics The primary characteristic of the father-provider as an ideal type is that he earns money to pay bills, financially supporting his wife/partner and children (Coltrane 1996; Hofferth 2003). Under the strictest definition, the male provider fulfills this function exclusively. His wife is not required to participate in the labor force, and can engage in stay-at-home motherhood (Bernard 1981).

In order to excel in his role, the provider father is expected to allocate the vast majority of his effort and time to his paid work. For this reason, his routine absence from the day-to-day activities of childrearing and family life is accepted, even expected (Coltrane 1996). Indeed, in the event of conflict between family and job responsibilities, work takes precedence. When this occurs, however, he is not thought to be shirking his family duties, since it is precisely through his paid work and financial provision that he frames himself as a 'family man.' Thus, provider fathers' identity as men is closely connected to their work and workplace (Bernard 1981).

To the extent that the provider father actively participates in quotidian family life, his involvement is expected to differ substantially from that of the mother (Coltrane 1996). Thus, the parenting of the provider father and homemaker mother is framed as complimentary rather than based on shared parenting goals and activities. Traditionally, a distinct responsibility of the provider father has been to serve as a role model for his male children. In this way, it was expected that boys, despite spending most of their time under the authority of their mothers and other female teachers, would develop a masculine identity and behaviors appropriate for males.

Finally, sentimental expression and outward signs of affection are not required nor expected from the provider father (Bernard 1981; Hofferth 2003). Often, this facet of the provider role can position men as emotional outsiders to the family (Coltrane 1996). Like his

commitment to paid work, lack of emotional involvement does not constitute neglect of fathering, since he fulfills his paternal duties through financial provision.

Rewards and Costs of Role The provider father role poses both rewards and costs to men and families. Notable benefits include the power and prestige associated with economic resources. Successful providers are accorded status in both their families and their wider communities (Bernard 1981; Schwartz 1994). Financial achievement also translates into greater power in social bargaining. Men with ample income are better able to attract and maintain marital partners (Coltrane 1996). Higher income often translates into a greater say in family decision making (Griswold 1993; Schwartz 1994), and more freedom from less pleasant household tasks and family obligations (Mannino and Deutsch 2007; Stevens et al. 2006). Also important, because the provider father role does not demand emotional involvement or regular participation in the day-to-day tasks of family life, fatherhood entails substantially fewer responsibilities and sacrifices than mothering (Coltrane 1996).

Despite these rewards, the provider role entails some costs for fathers and their families. Evidence suggests that American men highly value their family lives (Lamb and Sagi 1983; Pleck 1983). Many fathers may find an exclusive focus on economic support at odds with their commitment to family, or feel that they sacrifice other family needs in the name of provision (Bernard 1981). Notably, men who are not very financially successful are especially likely to experience problems. They may abide considerable frustration and dissatisfaction arising from their inability to sustain their families at the expected level, and forfeit prestige and power within the family and larger society. These issues can be quite persistent, since fathers who perform poorly as providers cannot compensate for this shortcoming through other acts of fathering (Bernard 1981).

The provider role can also create penalties for families. The provider-homemaker model entails prolonged physical separation of wives and husbands and divergent interests, which can lead to communication problems, lower levels of intimate relating, and ultimately to separation or divorce (Bernard 1981). These issues are further complicated by the toll that economic dependency of one spouse can take on marital health (Schwartz 1994). Some families, in order to rely solely on the father's income and enable stay-at-home motherhood, may experience financial hardship. Finally, some portion of men resent the pressures of sole provision. Men who find marriage and fatherhood to be especially onerous and restraining are more likely to have

strained relationships with loved ones. Some ultimately abandon their families (Bernard 1981), with deleterious consequences for children.

Involved Father Role

Historic Context Since the mid-twentieth century, male breadwinning has declined considerably in Western societies (Warren 2007), and the ideal of involved fatherhood has grown in prominence. Both cultural and economic factors are thought to relate to this shift in fathering. Important cultural elements include the growth in tolerance of diverse family forms accompanying the second demographic transition (van de Kaa 1987). This easing of normative requirements enabled greater flexibility and independence in family behaviors and roles, including fathering attitudes (Coltrane 1996). A second cultural phenomenon relevant to the advent of the involved father role is the long-term increase in the emotional value of children. Historically, declines in mortality and fertility have created a shift in focus from quantity of offspring to quality, as well as allowed greater emotional investment in children (Kirk 1996). Zelizer (1985) asserts that the recent emphasis on involved fathering is an extension of this process, and serves as a strategy to enhance child quality.

Economic changes in the latter part of the twentieth century, particularly shifts in the organization of women's and men's work, are also important for understanding the shift in focus from male provision to involved fatherhood. During this time, developed economies transitioned from industrial to postindustrial production. In this context of deindustrialization, men's wages and labor force participation decreased markedly (Oppenheimer 1994; Strangleman 2005). As a result, fewer and fewer families were able to rely on a sole male provider, and women's employment rates sharply rose (Creighton 1999; Crompton 1999). As more and more women assumed a share of the responsibility for financial procurement, the authority and privileges associated with the provider father role became diluted. Demands placed on men accordingly expanded, as co-providing wives summoned fathers to participate more in the daily activities of family life and elevate their emotional investment in children (Bernard 1981; Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006).

Characteristics The ideal type of the involved father differs dramatically from that of the provider father. Compared to those for the provider father, the expectations for the involved father align much more closely with the characteristics and behaviors desired of mothers

(Coltrane 1996; Golden 2007; Lister 2003). In particular, the involved father is expected to engage in more equal sharing of household responsibilities and childcare (Doherty, Kouneski, and Erickson 1998; Thompson and Walker 1989). This high level of involvement is desired even at early stages of fatherhood, with new fathers expected to be present at their child's birth and to be active in infant care (Pleck 1987).

One way that the involved father engages in childrearing is through simply spending time with his children, or 'being there' (Barclay and Lupton 1999; Golden 2007). At the most basic level, this encompasses participation in joint activities such as playing games or leisure outings (Hays 1996; Lupton and Barclay 1997). For many involved fathers, 'being there' additionally entails caring for children's physical needs and more practical activities such as bathing, meal preparation and feeding, clothing and laundering, and educational exercises (Coltrane 1996). Finally, 'being there' also requires emotional care. A key way in which the involved father cares for his child in this way is serving as an attachment figure for the child, providing comfort and security (Bretherton, Lambert, and Golby 2005).

In addition to committing time to the care of children, the involved father cultivates and maintains a strong feeling of closeness between himself and his child (Golden 2007; Palkovitz 2002). Compared to past expectations of fathers, not only is closeness more tightly bound with the model of the 'good father,' but also closeness is defined in different terms. Until recently, the father-child tie developed primarily on the basis of economic cooperation or the father's position as an authority figure. While emotional intimacy as a form of closeness is not a new concept, it is distinctly and robustly connected to the involved father role. Contemporary parent-child relationships, much like romantic relationships, have come to resemble Giddens' (1992) 'pure relationship' based primarily on emotional intimacy. Another important way that father-child relationships take shape under expectations of high father involvement is that fathers are expected to form strong ties with both their daughters and sons, and to show an equivalent degree of interest in their children regardless of a child's gender (Pleck 1987). This is a stark contrast to the provider father, who is thought to be a role model primarily for his son.

A distinct attribute of the highly involved father is his child-centeredness (Coltrane 1996). His first priority is his children, and his sense of self is derived primarily from his role as a father. Other important elements of child-centeredness include high valuation of child well-being and a strong belief that one's actions as a father foster positive growth in children. Due to

these views, the involved father treats parenting as a particularly consequential and serious activity. He prioritizes family well-being over financial success, and as a result permits family responsibilities to encroach upon paid work (Schwartz 1994). Other evidence of child-centeredness is men's organization of time and social contacts around their children. Highly involved fathers arrange their non-employed hours in order to maximize time with children, and build social networks with those who are similarly concerned with the responsibilities of parenting (Coltrane 1996).

A final and important way in which the expectations of the involved father differ substantially from those of the provider father is the greater degree of intimacy, emotional expression, and nurturance associated with highly involved fatherhood (Bernard 1981; Pleck 1987). This standard for positive fathering demands foremost sensitivity to children's needs (Bretherton, Lambert, and Golby 2005; Hays 1996). Though these characteristics have been conventionally associated with women, under expectations of involved and nurturing fathering, experiencing and conveying intense emotion in relation to childrearing are validated as legitimate masculine attributes (Levine 2000).

Rewards and Costs of Role Though different from the provider father role in many ways, views emphasizing involved fathering are similar in that they offer both rewards and costs to men and families. First, involved fathering potentially leads to richer lives for men (Coltrane 1996). By fully participating in childrearing, fathers develop closer relationships with their children. Involvement in daily activities of childcare also enables men to experience a greater range of emotions and to foster a well-rounded mental state. Involved fathers are not required to deny their more tender or feminine tendencies, and may instead develop a more complete sense of masculinity.

Benefits also accrue to others. Children thrive under circumstances of intimate father-child relationships and regular interaction with fathers (Marsiglio et al. 2000; Marsiglio, Day, and Lamb 2000). Men's intensive participation in childrearing also enables more choices for women, freeing them from some of the demands of parenting (Coltrane 1996). Women consequently have greater flexibility in pursuing personal and professional goals, which in turn contribute to the family's financial well-being. Also important, because coparenting promotes strong attachment between fathers and children, it serves as a potential protection against divorce (Schwartz 1994). Finally, high levels of father involvement challenge traditional divisions of

labor between women and men and pave the way for increased gender equality among future generations (Coltrane 1996).

However, expectations of involved fatherhood also impose costs. Unlike provider fathers, highly involved fathers face the difficulty of sometimes feeling that they have committed 'treason against tradition,' as well as the never-ending struggle to maintain equity in parenting (Schwartz 1994). Also, when men participate more in family responsibilities, tensions between work and family are more likely to arise. Thus, work-family conflict is likely to become a problem for men as well as women. Such conflict may also lead fathers to make sacrifices at their places of employment, which in turn can result in lost income or forfeited career opportunities which affect both men personally and the family as a whole (Coltrane 1996; Schwartz 1994).

Possible Limitations to Provider Father-Involved Father Typology

In many current discussions of fatherhood, both in popular culture and academic research, caring is conceptualized as opposite to breadwinning (Crompton 2006; Pfau-Effinger 1998; Pfau-Effinger 2004). Though the typology of the provider father and highly involved father is useful for understanding men's motivations for and perceptions of fathering, there is reason to believe that it may not accurately reflect men's fathering attitudes. Whereas researchers often assume that men generally fit into one of these ideal types and have values corresponding closely with either the provider father or involved father role, real life is complicated and may lead some men to possess other fathering attitudes. Social scientists have previously called for the development and investigation of a more complex typology of views regarding fathering. Golden (2007) suggests that this can be achieved by studying men's experiences with and interpretations of childrearing from the outlook of fathers themselves. Thus, it is necessary to investigate fathering attitudes as a person-based characteristic with the potential to vary among individual fathers, rather than to treat fathering as a sweeping and static social role.

One possibility that arises is that of additional classes of fathering attitudes. This prospect is suggested by findings on another set of family attitudes, gender ideology. As for fathering expectations, it has often been assumed that two categories of gender attitudes are sufficient to characterize people's views regarding appropriate roles for women and men. Typically, individuals are described as either supporting traditional gender roles or endorsing gender

equality. However, in his investigation of gender attitudes among a sample of Japanese women, Yamaguchi (2000) found evidence of a third class of these attitudes. Specifically, he found that those supporting gender equality were composed of two groups—those that are prowork and those that are antiwork. Whereas both of these groups endorsed gender equality, the prowork gender-equality supporters were substantially more likely to value women's work lives than the antiwork gender-equality supporters.

In addition to there being additional classes of fathering attitudes, it is possible that one or more of these as-yet unrecognized classes combine elements of the provider father and involved father roles. That is, these roles may not be as distinct in practice as is generally assumed. There is likely a degree to which provision fits into the involved father role, or caring into the duties of the provider father. Golden (2007) is critical of the polarized provider-father-involved father typology, and calls for movement beyond this either/or orientation to promote a both/and perspective.

Some evidence suggests the presence of a class of fathering attitudes that lies between or somehow combines aspects of the provider father and involved father ideals. Observed trends in gender ideology and the gendered division of labor point to only a partial transition from provision to full involvement among fathers. Whereas men in dual-career families have considerably increased their engagement with children (Coltrane 1996; Darling-Fisher and Tiedje 1990), paternal involvement has not kept pace with the expectations of the involved father role (Backett-Milburn 1982; Bretherton, Lambert, and Golby 2005; LaRossa 1988; Parke 1996). Coltrane (1996) has found the provider father-involved father typology to be inadequate in describing observed fathering patterns, instead classifying men as main providers, ambivalent co-providers, and full co-providers. Also important, Wilcox (2004), in his study of conservative Protestant fathers, found evidence of fathers who combined roles related to provision and involvement. These 'soft patriarchs,' who served as breadwinners and heads of their families, nonetheless were affectionate to, supportive of, and actively involved with their children.

Group Differences in Fathering Attitudes

Though male sole breadwinning has declined in general, the extent of this decline differs by race/ethnicity and class (Warren 2000). Regarding race/ethnicity, some evidence indicates that African American men are slightly less likely than Whites to value highly involved

fatherhood (Hofferth 2003). However, there is also reason to believe that African American fathers emphasize aspects of the paternal role other than economic provision. Hofferth (2003) suggests that fathers who encounter difficulties fulfilling expectations of financial provision may offset this by becoming involved with children in other ways. It may follow that the historical barriers to educational and occupational success encountered by African American men (Foster 1995; Ogbu 2007; Wilson 1987) lead them to esteem the highly involved father role.

Cultural differences among various racial/ethnic groups are also likely related to discrepancies in fathering attitudes across these groups. Two elements of Mexican-American culture, machismo and familism, may distinguish fathering in these families compared to other groups. Early research on Mexican-American families suggested that machismo is related to more rigid patriarchy, as well as more emotional detachment in Hispanic fathers compared to Whites (Baca Zinn 1980). Consistent with this, Hofferth (2003) determined that Hispanic fathers, in comparison to White fathers, are somewhat less likely to believe the father role to be important for child development. Others, however, have pointed out that machismo is also associated with a number of positive and family-centric traits such as respect, courtesy, devotion, and responsibility (Madsen 1973). Some research also suggests that Mexican-American fathers are more actively involved with children than macho stereotypes imply (Mirande 1988). Familism, in which family needs are prioritized over personal needs, may lead Hispanic men to value high father involvement (Baca Zinn 1994; Fuller, Holloway, and Liang 1996).

With regards to class, Messner (1993) asserts that highly involved fatherhood is more common among the more affluent. This is the case, he argues, because fathers feel the need to first ensure that their children are financially provided for and that basic needs such as regular meals, adequate clothing, and comfortable housing are met; only after these needs are met can fathers focus on meeting children's emotional and developmental demands. Because fathers with lower educational attainment or income encounter greater difficulty in meeting children's basic needs, they are more likely to focus on their role as economic providers and to take considerable pride in this role. Fathers with greater economic and human capital, however, have the privilege to concentrate on their emotional involvement and intimate relationships with children. More affluent fathers also have greater freedom to test the newer role of highly engaged fatherhood (Moen and Yu 1999). This is consistent with findings that highly educated men are particularly likely to engage in involved fatherhood (Darling-Fisher and Tiedje 1990).

Current Study

In this initial piece of my dissertation, I describe the distribution of fathering attitudes among resident fathers and factors related to these views, using data from the 2001-2002 Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Birth Cohort (ECLS-B). After generating and describing classes of fathering attitudes for resident fathers as a whole, I investigate variations in attitudes by race/ethnicity and class. Data come from the first wave, when children were about 9 months old, as this is the sole wave during which information on fathering attitudes was collected from the full sample of resident fathers.

As ideas about parenting are always changing (Coltrane 1996), a current characterization of fatherhood ideals is needed. In addition, whereas economic and caring behavior has received considerable attention, values regarding provision and care work have been understudied (Hood 1986; Warren 2007). I evaluate and, where needed, suggest improvements to the provider father-involved father typology. A key contribution is the use of latent class analysis, which enables inductive investigation into the measurement of fathering attitudes. In essence, the method allows fathers themselves to share their views regarding appropriate ways of fathering. Further, it permits investigation into whether fathering attitude classes in addition to the provider father and highly involved father are present. Estimates of the proportion of fathers in various classes are attained, enabling a look at how far and/or completely the transition from provider to involved father has progressed.

The current examination offers other contributions as well. The ECLS-B data are particularly suited to the study's purpose. First, specific measures of fathering attitudes are available, which present a substantial improvement over more widely available measures of general gender attitudes. Second, information on views regarding fathering is obtained directly from resident fathers. Past studies generally rely on reports of fathering from the child's mother. Third, because data are from fathers of a particular birth cohort, the age of a child, which can impact fathering attitudes, is controlled for. Finally, these data allow study of a nationally representative sample of children and their resident fathers. As previous research on fathering has generally concentrated on middle-class White fathers, a more representative study of fathering attitudes is needed.

METHODS

Data

Analyses were conducted using data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Birth Cohort (ECLS-B), a nationally representative probability sample of children born in 2001. The study was conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for the purpose of describing and better understanding children's early development and experiences. Children were selected using a clustered list-frame design; the sampling frame consisted of registered births from the National Center for Health Statistics vital statistics system. Participating children in the ECLS-B came from various racial/ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. Oversamples of the following groups were drawn: Asian and Pacific Islander children, American Indian and Alaska native children, Chinese children, twins, and low birth weight children. Data came from the 2001-02 collection period, when the children were approximately 9 months old.

Completed 9-month parent interviews, completed mainly by children's mothers, were obtained for 10,700[1] children, yielding a weighted unit response rate of 74.1% (National Center for Education Statistics 2008). Following the parent interview, a resident father questionnaire was distributed to all cases where a resident father was living in the household with the sampled child. Completed 9-month resident father questionnaires were acquired for 6,300 children, generating a weighted unit response rate of 76.1% (National Center for Education Statistics 2008). In addition to fathers who finished the resident father questionnaire, there were a handful of resident fathers who completed the parent interview rather than the resident father questionnaire, and who were also included in analysis. In preparation for analysis, cases missing on all indicator variables used to create the dependent latent class variable were dropped, resulting in an overall analytic sample of 6,150 resident fathers. In analyses conducted by class, a small number of fathers missing information on class were excluded, yielding an analytic sample of 6,100 fathers.

[1] In order to comply with NCES confidentiality legislation, all unweighted sample sizes are rounded to the nearest 50.

Measures

Dependent Variable Latent classes of fathering attitudes were constructed and used as the dependent variable in analysis. Seven indicator variables that measure attitudes about fathering were used to construct the latent classes. Fathers indicate whether they strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each of the following statements about men's role as fathers:

1. It is essential for the child's well being that fathers spend time playing with their children.
2. It is difficult for men to express affectionate feelings towards babies.
3. A father should be as heavily involved as the mother in the care of the child.
4. The way a father treats his baby has long-term effects on the child.
5. The activities a father does with his children don't matter. What matters more is whether he provides for them.
6. One of the most important things a father can do for his children is to give their mother encouragement and emotional support.
7. All things considered, fatherhood is a highly rewarding experience.

Prior to analysis, dichotomous measures of each indicator were created denoting whether a father agrees or disagrees with the statement.

Grouping Variables Two grouping variables were used in analysis: race/ethnicity and class. An assortment of dummy variables signify the father's race/ethnicity, measured as Hispanic, White non-Hispanic, Black non-Hispanic, Asian non-Hispanic, and other (includes non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native, and non-Hispanic multiple race). Non-Hispanic Whites were used at the reference group. Class was captured using a dichotomous variable for occupation type. Fathers were coded as working in a professional/managerial occupation versus a non-professional occupation.

Method of Analysis

I used latent class analysis (LCA) to examine resident fathers' fathering attitudes. LCA uses a set of observed categorical variables to identify an assortment of discrete, mutually exclusive latent classes of individuals (Lanza et al. 2007). The latent classes were determined using the seven dichotomous measures on fathering attitudes as indicators.[2] First, I specified a series of latent class models with two, three, four, and five classes. These models were then

[2] In preliminary analysis, I conducted latent class analysis using a more limited number of indicators. However, these alternate compositions did not improve model fit, and in most cases reduced the fit. For this reason, I present here the latent classes constructed from all seven indicators.

assessed and an optimal base model selected using the following instruments: the likelihood-ratio G^2 statistic, Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC; Akaike 1974), and the sample size-adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion (ABIC; Sclove 1987).[3] When selecting the optimal base model, I also considered the model's interpretability. This criterion requires that no class be of trivial size, that a meaningful label can be given to each class, and that the classes be distinct from one another in terms of their characteristics (Lanza et al. 2007).

Next, for the optimal base model I estimated two sets of parameters: class membership probabilities (γ (gamma) parameters) and item-response probabilities contingent on class membership (ρ (rho) parameters). The γ parameters express the distribution of individuals across the latent classes, and the ρ parameters indicate the correspondence between the observed indicators and the latent classes. Values on the ρ parameters range from 0 to 1; values closer to 1 signify greater correspondence between a particular indicator response and membership in a given latent class.

Following selection of an optimal base model for the full sample, I conducted multiple-group LCA to explore possible variations in latent classes of fathering attitudes by race/ethnicity and class. Using multiple-group LCA, I tested whether item-response (ρ) probabilities differ significantly by race/ethnicity or by class. To test for these differences, I first estimated grouped models in two ways: with item-response probabilities constrained to be equal across group categories, and with item-response probabilities freely estimated (allowed to vary across group categories). The constrained model assumes that the meaning of the latent classes is the same across various groups, whereas the freely estimated model allows for the possibility that the classes differ by group. The second step involved a chi-square test comparing the constrained and freely estimated models, with the chi-square statistic calculated as the difference in the likelihood-ratio G^2 statistics for the constrained and freely estimated models. For the analysis of race/ethnicity, as well as that of class, the chi-square statistic was significant, indicating that the

[3] There is some debate over whether the BIC or ABIC is the superior information criterion in LCA. Some studies support the BIC (e.g., Hagenaars and McCutcheon 2002; Magidson and Vermunt 2004) whereas others support the ABIC (e.g., Tofighi and Enders 2007; Yang 2006). Nyland and her associates (2007) determined that the BIC should be used in continuous LCA and the ABIC used in categorical LCA. Because I conducted categorical LCA, I used the ABIC in model selection. In addition, selection should coincide well with a study's objectives and the conceptual perspective used (Nagin 2005). Models chosen on the ABIC reveal the presence of classes unique to specific racial/ethnic groups, a key research aim.

meaning of the fathering attitude classes differs by race/ethnicity and by class.[4] For this reason, I conducted LCA modeling separately for each racial/ethnic and class group, following the steps outlined above to select the optimal base model for each group.

RESULTS

Full Sample

Table 1 displays the likelihood-ratio G^2 statistic, AIC, and ABIC for baseline latent class models of the full sample with two, three, four, and five latent classes. By comparing these statistics across the models with various numbers of latent classes, I can determine the optimal base model depicting latent classes of fathering attitudes. Improved model fit is indicated by a noteworthy decrease in the likelihood-ratio G^2 statistic, AIC, and ABIC between a model with c classes and a model with c + 1 classes. In Table 1, a substantial decrease in each of the three criteria is observed when comparing the two-class and three-class model, indicating that the three-class model is an improvement over the two-class model. This is not the case, however, when comparing the three-class and four-class model. Compared to the three-class model, for the four-class model there is only a minute decrease in the AIC, and a noteworthy increase in the BIC. These results indicate that the three-class model is the optimal base model and that there are three latent classes of fathering attitudes among the general population of resident fathers.

< Table 1 about here>

To gain a sense of what these three classes are, as well as their commonality and characteristics, additional material from the latent class analysis is useful. This information for the three-class base model of the full sample is displayed in Table 2. Here, for reasons to be explained shortly, I have labeled the three latent classes of fathering attitudes to reflect fathers who value involved fathering, those who endorse adaptive involved fathering, and fathers who favor resistant involved fathering. Most common are those who favor involved fathering, representing about 78% of new fathers. A substantial minority of fathers (18%) value adaptive involved fathering. Least common, denoting under 4% of new fathers—a small but nontrivial proportion, are those who endorse resistant involved fathering.

< Table 2 about here>

[4] To conserve space, and because preliminary analyses revealed that group-separate modeling is more appropriate than multiple-group LCA, I do not present results from multiple-group LCA. They are available upon request.

Examination of the ρ parameters allows a detailed look into the characteristics of the various latent classes, and also makes clear why the given class labels are appropriate. The ρ parameters displayed in Table 2 indicate the probability, ranging from 0 to 1, of agreeing with a particular item given class membership. For example, we see that for fathers who favor involved fathering, the probability of agreeing that fathers must play with their children is about 1.00. Let us first look at the involved fathering class. The responses of men in this class match closely with the expectations of the highly involved father role prominent in social discourse since the latter part of the twentieth century. These fathers have a very high probability of agreement ($\rho > 0.9$) on the following items: father must play with child, father should be as involved as mother, father's treatment has long-term effects, important for father to encourage mother, and fatherhood highly rewarding. In contrast, those who value involved fathering are very unlikely ($\rho < 0.2$) to agree that men have difficulty expressing affection toward babies or that provision is more important than activities with children.

Turning to fathers who endorse adaptive involved fathering, we see that although their response patterns are in some ways similar to those who value involved fathering, distinct differences also exist. Like men who endorse involved fathering, fathers in this class are very likely ($\rho > 0.9$) to agree that a father must play with his child, that a father should be as involved with his child as a mother, that fathering is important for long-term child outcomes, that it is important for a father to encourage his child's mother, and that fatherhood is highly rewarding. However, adaptive involved fathers are substantially more likely than involved fathers to believe that men have difficulty with affection toward babies ($\rho = 0.42$) and that provision takes precedence over activities with children ($\rho = 0.53$). Thus, although there are many aspects of the highly involved father role that adaptive fathers endorse, these fathers appear to be reluctant to eschew some aspects of the provider father ideal. Their adaptation of involved fathering incorporates, to a degree, a hesitance regarding affection and an emphasis on paternal provision.

Finally, we turn to those who value what I have labeled resistant involved fathering. Compared to those who endorse involved fathering, their probability of agreeing that a father must play with his child is similarly high ($\rho > 0.9$), and they are only slightly less likely ($0.7 < \rho < 0.9$) to assert that fathering has long-term effects on children, that fathers should encourage mothers, and that fatherhood is rewarding. Resistant involved fathers' likelihoods of finding affection difficult and prioritizing provision lie between those of the involved and adaptive

fathers. The distinguishing trait of this class of fathers is their resistance to the idea that fathers should be as involved with their children as mothers, a key expectation of the highly involved father role. Those who endorse resistant involved fathering are only about half as likely (ρ = 0.46) as those in the other fathering classes to embrace this belief.

By Race/Ethnicity

Fit statistics for baseline latent class models derived separately by race/ethnicity are found in Table 3. For White non-Hispanics, when proceeding from the two-class to the three-class model, whereas the likelihood-ratio G^2 statistic declines by a substantial amount, the decrease in the AIC is small and the value of the ABIC increases. For fathers of some other race, both the AIC and ABIC grow larger when comparing the two- and three-class models. Thus, for these two groups, the two-class model is optimal. When advancing from the two- to the three-class model for Black non-Hispanics, the likelihood-ratio G^2 statistic and AIC decrease notably, and a small reduction in the ABIC is observed. However, the third class in the three-class model represents only about 1.5% of Black fathers, or about 8 fathers in the sample. Because the trivial size of this class suggests that the three-class model is of problematic interpretability, the two-class model is ideal.[5]

< Table 3 about here>

Comparison of fit statistics across models of varying numbers of latent classes for Hispanics and Asian non-Hispanics reveals that a three-class model is optimal for these groups. In Table 3, for both groups a noteworthy decrease in each of the fit criteria occurs when proceeding from the two- to the three-class model, providing evidence that the three-class model is preferable over the two-class model. However, for both groups the four-class model is not an improvement upon the three-class model. When comparing the three- and four-class models for Hispanics, both the AIC and ABIC increase. For Asian non-Hispanics, a slight decrease in the AIC and an increase in the ABIC are observed.

The selected models for the various racial/ethnic groups are displayed in Table 4. To interpret these models, I focus on one class of fathering attitudes at a time, considering similarities and differences in the focal class by race/ethnicity. Looking first at the involved

[5] To conserve space, I do not show the item-response probabilities associated with the three-class model for Black non-Hispanics. They are available upon request.

fathering class, I observe that this class is represented in all racial/ethnic groups, and is the largest class for each racial/ethnic group. In addition, the ρ parameters associated with this class take on similar values for each racial/ethnic group, indicating that an involved father's views regarding play with children, the expression of affection, etc. are alike regardless of whether he identifies as White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, or of some other race. In other words, the characteristics of those endorsing involved fathering are similar across the various racial/ethnic groups. Despite these similarities, however, the proportion of fathers favoring involved fathering varies by race/ethnicity. This group is largest among Whites (93%), somewhat smaller among Blacks (86%), smaller still among Hispanics (68%) and those of another race (65%), and smallest among Asians (53%).

When focusing on the resistant involved fathering group, one observes that this class is found only among White non-Hispanic fathers. In contrast, the adaptive involved fathering class is represented among each racial/ethnic minority group. Although this class is the second-largest for each minority group, the proportion of adaptive involved fathers differs somewhat by racial/ethnic minority group. This class of fathering attitudes is most common among Asians (39%) and fathers of another race (35%), less common among Hispanics (28%), and least common among Blacks (14%). In addition, the characteristics of adaptive fathering vary in some ways by race/ethnicity. Compared to other minority fathers, those of some other race are about 9-17% less likely to agree that fathers should be as involved as mothers. Black non-Hispanics are about 8-10% less likely than other minority fathers to endorse the statement that fathering has long-term effects on children. Thus, there are some slight fluctuations among adaptive fathers in terms of their adherence to central tenets of the involved fathering role. Variation is greater, however, regarding adaptive fathers' incorporation of aspects of the provider father ideal. Adaptive fathers of another race do so the least, as they are least likely to agree that men have difficulty expressing affection ($\rho = 0.39$) or that provision takes priority over activities with children ($\rho = 0.32$). Black adaptive fathers express the greatest hesitance regarding affection ($\rho = 0.63$), followed by their Asian ($\rho = 0.53$) and Hispanic ($\rho = 0.51$) counterparts. Emphasis on paternal provision is greater for Black ($\rho = 0.65$) and particularly Hispanics ($\rho = 0.72$) adaptive fathers compared to their Asian counterparts ($\rho = 0.38$).

An important result apparent when investigating fathering attitudes by race/ethnicity is the presence of two small but nontrivial classes that are missed when describing the full sample

of fathers. Similar to resistant involved fathering, these classes are unique to a single racial/ethnic group. The first, affectionate providing, is found only among Hispanic fathers. In many ways, the views of members of this class coincide well with the expectations of the provider father role. Their high probability of agreeing that fathers must play with children (ρ = 0.95) is consistent with a focus on fathers as playmates rather than caretakers. Similarly, affectionate providers' emphasis on encouraging mothers (ρ = 0.84) can be interpreted as an underscoring of indirect rather than direct forms of fathering. In addition, these fathers are more than 25% less likely than involved fathers to find fatherhood highly rewarding, suggesting for these men a looser connection between one's sense of self and role as a father. Affectionate providers, compared to involved fathers, are also about 30% less likely to believe that fathers should be as involved with children as mothers or that fathering has long-term consequences for children. Members of this group also have a substantial likelihood (ρ = 0.64) of prioritizing economic provision over activities with children. Yet there is one way in which the affectionate providers do not resemble the classic provider role; this characteristic makes clear the label assigned to this class of fathering attitudes. These fathers are unlikely to agree (ρ = 0.11) that fathers have difficulty expressing affection toward young children.

The final unique class, uninvolved fathering, is found only among Asian fathers. Fathers in this class resemble involved fathers in terms of their valuation of play and fatherhood in general. Compared to involved fathers, uninvolved fathers are only somewhat less likely to avow that fathering has long-term effects on children or that fathers should encourage mothers. Although Asian uninvolved fathers are more likely than involved fathers to express hesitance regarding affection or prioritize provision, their probabilities of agreeing with these items fall short of those of the Asian adapters. The distinguishing characteristic of those favoring uninvolved fathering is their view towards the relative involvement of fathers versus mothers in childrearing. These fathers are very unlikely (ρ = 0.08) to endorse equal involvement of fathers and mothers with children, setting them apart from involved fathers, adaptive fathers, resistant fathers, and even the affectionate providers.

By Class

Table 5 contains the likelihood-ratio G^2 statistic, AIC, and ABIC for baseline latent class models by class. For non-professionals, the three-class model is a better fit than the two-class

model, as indicated by a substantial decline in each of the fit criteria. When proceeding to the four-class model, however, the decrease in the AIC is small and the value of the ABIC increases. These results suggest that the three-class model is optimal among non-professionals. Professionals, however, are best described using a two-class model. Comparison of the two- and three-class models for this group reveals an upturn in the ABIC.

< Table 5 about here>

Item-response probabilities for selected models for non-professionals and those engaged in professional/managerial work are presented in Table 6. Among non-professionals, the three classes of fathering attitudes match those found in the full sample of resident fathers: involved fathering, adaptive involved fathering, and resistant involved fathering. However, only two of these classes—involved and resistant involved fathering—are represented among professional fathers. That adaptive involved fathering is found only among non-professionals suggests that residual beliefs associated with the provider father role—including a de-emphasis of fathers' emotional closeness with children and placing priority on economic provision—are more prominent among men who work in less prestigious occupations.

< Table 6 about here>

Further comparison of fathering attitudes by occupational category reveals a mixture of similarities and differences. The involved fathering class, which is found among both professionals and non-professionals, is for both groups the largest class, and has similar characteristics across both groups. However, a smaller proportion (74%) of non-professionals, compared to professionals (95%), endorses involved fathering. Instead, a substantial portion (23%) of non-professionals belongs in the adaptive new fathering class, a group that, as noted before, is not observed among professionals.

Turning to resistant involved fathering, we see that this class is the smallest class for both occupational groups, and that the size of this group is only slightly larger for professionals/managers compared to non-professionals. Yet the characteristics of resistant involved fathers differ somewhat according to professional status, such that non-professional members of this class distance themselves a little more from norms of involved fathering. Compared to professional resistant involved fathers ($\rho = 0.17$), non-professionals in this class are slightly more likely ($\rho = 0.28$) to emphasize provision over active involvement with children. Non-professional resistant involved fathers are about 13% less likely than their

professional/managerial counterparts to find fatherhood highly rewarding. The most substantial difference involves the belief that fathers ought to encourage mothers, such that non-professional resistant involved fathers are only about two-thirds as likely as professionals to agree with this item.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Social scientists have begun to build a body of literature suggesting that paternal involvement is related to desirable consequences for children, parental relationships, and fathers themselves (Marsiglio et al. 2000; Marsiglio, Day, and Lamb 2000). Although research on fathering has grown in recent years, little attention has been paid to men's expectations of themselves as fathers. Because fathering practices are shaped by men's fathering attitudes (Nangle et al. 2003; Parke 2004), more information on this topic is needed. Here, I assess these attitudes using nationally representative data from resident fathers, documenting whether men's beliefs regarding fathering reflect the shift in the larger culture from an emphasis on the provider role to greater valuation of the highly involved father role. In addition, I reveal important variations in fathering ideology by race/ethnicity and class.

My results demonstrate that American resident fathers do highly value their roles as fathers, consistent with previous research (Lamb and Sagi 1983; Pleck 1983). Although their fathering attitudes differ in various ways, men of various ideological classes tend to agree that fatherhood is highly rewarding. This finding suggests that researchers should explore men's fathering not only in terms of its consequences for children and romantic relationships, but also in terms of its relevance for men's identities.

I also find evidence that fathers have largely embraced and internalized the expectations of the highly involved father role. Whether looking at resident fathers as a whole or considering variation in fathering attitudes by race/ethnicity or social class, the larger proportion of men endorse this form of fathering. These fathers value 'being there' for children, including engaging in playful pastimes with children, expressing affection for children, and participating in activities with children as well as providing for them. Members of the involved father class also demonstrate child-centeredness, believing fathering to be highly salient for child outcomes and finding fatherhood to be highly rewarding. Of central importance, involved fathers stress not

only indirect support of children via encouragement of a child's mother, but also emphasize more equal sharing of parenting responsibilities between fathers and mothers.

Although my results demonstrate that a majority of resident fathers approves of highly involved fathering, others possess values that fall short of the involved father ideal. This is true of the adaptive involved fathers, resistant involved fathers, affectionate providers, and uninvolved fathers. This finding suggests that for a substantial minority of men, the transition from provision to full paternal involvement is incomplete.

I also find, as have others (Coltrane 1996; Wilcox 2004), that the commonly-used provider father-involved father typology inadequately describes observed fathering patterns. First, no class of fathering attitudes aligns closely with the characteristics of the father-provider ideal type. The class that most resembles this ideal, the affectionate providers, do prioritize provision over engaging with children in activities, but reject the emotional distance associated with the good-provider role. Further, this class is small and found only among Hispanic fathers. Second, I find evidence of additional classes of fathering attitudes that combine elements of the provider father and involved father roles. Despite their support for various aspects of involved fathering, adaptive involved fathers remain unenthusiastic regarding the emotional demands of engaged fathering, and continue to place some emphasis on financial provision. Resistant involved fathers and, to a greater degree, uninvolved fathers are reluctant to accept an equal share of parenting responsibilities.

Whereas the involved fathering class is the largest class for each racial/ethnic and occupational group, discrepancies by race/ethnicity and class are also apparent. Of note is that the adaptive involved fathering class is represented among minority fathers but not among Whites. This finding may reflect disadvantages experienced by minority groups relative to Whites, including economic disadvantages. This is consistent with Messner's (1993) argument that fathers who face greater hindrances to meeting children's basic needs place greater value on their role as a financial provider.

The importance of cultural factors particular to certain racial/ethnic groups is highlighted by the unique class of fathering attitudes, the affectionate provider class, found only among Hispanic fathers. It appears that Latino men's values are influenced both by machismo and familism. As suggested by earlier work on Mexican-Americans (Baca Zinn 1980), the custom of machismo is likely related to endorsement of a more rigid gendered division of labor, with men

prioritizing financial provision over activities with children. Yet affectionate providers express considerable comfort with emotional closeness to children, suggesting the influence of familism. With regards to class, I find that a greater proportion of professional/managerial fathers, compared to non-professionals, endorse involved fathering. This result is consistent with prior research indicating that social class is positively related to involved fatherhood (Darling-Fisher and Tiedje 1990).

Although this paper offers new information on the fathering attitudes of resident fathers, it is not without some limitations. My descriptive analyses of racial/ethnic and class differences do not include controls for other factors that may be related to fathering attitudes. For this reason, I cannot definitively conclude that group variation in fathering ideology is due to race/ethnicity or to social class. In addition, my use of occupational status—working in a professional/managerial versus non-professional vocation—as an indicator of social class involves the choice of one out of multiple potential measures. It may be that findings differ somewhat when operationalizing social class in another way, say as educational attainment or income.

Whereas I provide a much-needed description of resident fathers' fathering attitudes, other tasks remain for future research. One topic of importance is how factors other than race/ethnicity and social class relate to fathering attitudes. Potential factors to consider include other personal characteristics, traits of fathers' wives and partners, and levels of social support for involved fathering received from others. A description of fathering attitudes among non-resident fathers is required as well. Also of interest would be an empirical test of the relationship between men's fathering attitudes and their paternal involvement. Finally, the relevance of men's fathering attitudes for outcomes for children, fathers, and relationships between parents merits investigation.

In summary, I find that American resident fathers largely embrace the highly involved father role. Thus, there is potential for the reaping of rewards associated with this form of fathering, such as richer lives for men and benefits for children (Marsiglio et al. 2000; Marsiglio, Day, and Lamb 2000). Involved fathering may also facilitate expansion in choices available to women, with a potential to increase gender equality in the future (Coltrane 1996). However, men and families may also be exposed to costs associated with this type of fathering. There is a potential for these fathers to experience work-family conflict and to make sacrifices in the

workplace, which can be problematic for men as well as their families (Schwartz 1994). This research is also relevant to policy makers and promoters of shared parenting. It suggests that findings that fathering behavior lags behind the expectations of the involved father role (see, for example, Bretherton, Lambert, and Golby 2005; Parke 1996) cannot be accounted for by a great hesitance on the part of men to adopt these expectations. Other potential explanations for fathers' lower parental engagement relative to mothers must be developed and tested.

REFERENCES

Akaike, H. 1974. "A New Look at the Statistical Model Identification." *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 19:716-723.

Baca Zinn, Maxine. 1994. "Adaptation and Continuity in Mexican-Origin Families." Pp. 64-81 in *Minority Families in the United States: A Multicultural Perspective*, edited by R.L. Taylor. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

------. 1980. "Employment and Education of Mexican-American Women: The Interplay of Modernity and Ethnicity in Eight Families." *Harvard Educational Review* 50(1):47-62.

Backett-Milburn, Kathryn. 1982. *Mothers and Fathers: A Study of the Development and Negotiation of Parental Behaviour.* London: Macmillan.

Barclay, Lesley and Deborah Lupton. 1999. "The Experiences of New Fatherhood: A Socio-Cultural Analysis." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 29(4):1013-1020.

Bernard, Jessie. 1981. "The Good-Provider Role: Its Rise and Fall." *American Psychologist* 36(1):1-12.

Bianchi, Suzanne M., John P. Robinson and Melissa A. Milkie. 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bretherton, Inge, J. D. Lambert and Barbara Golby. 2005. "Involved Fathers of Preschool Children as seen by themselves and their Wives: Accounts of Attachment, Socialization, and Companionship." *Attachment & Human Development* 7(3):229-251.

Coltrane, Scott. 1996. *Family Man: Fatherhood, Housework, and Gender Equity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Coontz, Stephanie. 1997. *The Way we really are: Coming to Terms with America's Changing Families.* New York: BasicBooks.

Creighton, Colin. 1999. "The Rise and Decline of the 'Male Breadwinner Family' in Britain." *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 23(5):519-541.

Crompton, Rosemary. 2006. *Employment and the Family: The Reconfiguration of Work and Family Life in Contemporary Societies.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

------. 1999. "The Decline of the Male Breadwinner: Explanations and Interpretations." Pp. 1-25 in *Restructuring Gender Relations and Employment: The Decline of the Male Breadwinner,* edited by R. Crompton. New York: Oxford University Press.

Darling-Fisher, Cynthia and Linda B. Tiedje. 1990. "The Impact of Maternal Employment Characteristics on Fathers' Participation in Child Care." *Family Relations* 39(1):20-27.

Doherty, William J., Edward F. Kouneski and Martha F. Erickson. 1998. "Responsible Fathering: An Overview and Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60(2):277-292.

Foster, Herbert L. 1995. "Educators' and Non-Educators' Perceptions of Black Males: A Survey." *Journal of African American Men* 1(2):37-70.

Fuller, Bruce, Susan D. Holloway and Xiaoyan Liang. 1996. "Family Selection of Child-Care Centers: The Influence of Household Support, Ethnicity, and Parental Practices." *Child Development* 67(6):3320-3337.

Giddens, Anthony. 1992. *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love, and Eroticism in Modern Societies.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Golden, Annis G. 2007. "Fathers' Frames for Childrearing: Evidence toward a "Masculine Concept of Caregiving."" *Journal of Family Communication* 7(4):265-285.

Griswold, Robert L. 1993. *Fatherhood in America: A History.* New York: BasicBooks.

Hagenaars, Jacques A. and Allan L. McCutcheon. 2002. *Applied Latent Class Analysis.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hays, Sharon. 1996. *The Cultural Contradictions of Motherhood.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hofferth, Sandra L. 2003. "Race/Ethnic Differences in Father Involvement in Two-Parent Families: Culture, Context, or Economy?" *Journal of Family Issues* 24(2):185-216.

Hood, Jane C. 1986. "The Provider Role: Its Meaning and Measurement." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 48(2):349-359.

Kimmel, Michael S. 1996. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History.* New York: Free Press.

Kirk, Dudley. 1996. "Demographic Transition Theory." *Population Studies* 50(3):361-387.

Lamb, Michael E. 1981. *The Role of the Father in Child Development.* 2nd ed. New York: Wiley.

Lamb, Michael E. and Abraham Sagi. 1983. *Fatherhood and Family Policy.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lanza, Stephanie T., Linda M. Collins, David R. Lemmon and Joseph L. Schafer. 2007. "PROC LCA: A SAS Procedure for Latent Class Analysis." *Structural Equation Modeling* 14(4):671-694.

LaRossa, Ralph. 1997. *The Modernization of Fatherhood: A Social and Political History.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

------. 1988. "Fatherhood and Social Change." *Family Relations* 37(4):451-457.

Levine, Suzanne. 2000. *Father Courage: What Happens when Men Put Family First.* New York: Harcourt.

Lister, Ruth. 2003. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives.* 2nd ed. Washington Square, NY: New York University Press.

Lupton, Deborah and Lesley Barclay. 1997. *Constructing Fatherhood: Discourses and Experiences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Madsen, William. 1973. *Mexican-Americans of South Texas.* 2d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Magidson, J. and J. Vermunt. 2004. "Latent Class Models." Pp. 175-198 in *The Sage Handbook of Quantitative Methodology for the Social Sciences*, edited by D. Kaplan. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mannino, Clelia A. and Francine M. Deutsch. 2007. "Changing the Division of Household Labor: A Negotiated Process between Partners." *Sex Roles* 56(5-6):309-324.

Marsiglio, William, Paul Amato, Randal D. Day and Michael E. Lamb. 2000. "Scholarship on Fatherhood in the 1990s and Beyond." *Journal of Marriage & Family* 62(4):1173-1191.

Marsiglio, William, Randal D. Day and Michael E. Lamb. 2000. "Exploring Fatherhood Diversity: Implications for Conceptualizing Father Involvement." *Marriage and Family Review* 29(4):269-293.

Messner, Michael A. 1993. ""Changing Men" and Feminist Politics in the United States." *Theory and Society* 22(5):723-727.

Mirande, Alfredo. 1988. "Chicano Fathers: Traditional Perceptions and Current Realities." Pp. 93-106 in *Fatherhood Today: Men's Changing Role in the Family*, edited by P. Bronstein and C.P. Cowan. New York: Wiley.

Moen, P. and Y. Yu. 1999. *Having it all: Overall Work/Life Success in Two-Earner Families.* Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Nagin, Daniel. 2005. *Group-Based Modeling of Development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nangle, Suzanne M., Michelle L. Kelley, William Fals-Stewart and Ronald F. Levant. 2003. "Work and Family Variables as Related to Paternal Engagement, Responsibility, and Accessibility in Dual-Earner Couples with Young Children." *Fathering* 1(1):71-90.

National Center for Education Statistics. 2008. *ECLS-B 9-Month Sample Sizes, Population Sizes, and Response Rates*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Nylund, Karen L., Tihomir Asparouhov and Bengt O. Muthén. 2007. "Deciding on the Number of Classes in Latent Class Analysis and Growth Mixture Modeling: A Monte Carlo Simulation Study." *Structural Equation Modeling* 14(4):535-569.

Ogbu, John U. 2007. "African American Education: A Cultural-Ecological Perspective." Pp. 79-94 in *Black Families.* 4th ed, edited by H.P. McAdoo. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Oppenheimer, Valerie K. 1994. "Women's Rising Employment and the Future of the Family in Industrial Societies." *Population and Development Review* 20(2):293-342.

Palkovitz, Rob. 2002. "Involved Fathering and Child Development: Advancing our Understanding of Good Fathering." Pp. 119-140 in *Handbook of Father Involvement: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by C.S. Tamis-LeMonda and N.J. Cabrera. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Parke, Ross D. 2004. "Fathers, Families, and the Future: A Plethora of Plausible Predictions." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 50(4):456-470.

------. 1996. *Fatherhood.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pfau-Effinger, Birgit. 2004. "Socio-Historical Paths of the Male Breadwinner Model -- An Explanation of Cross-National Differences." *British Journal of Sociology* 55(3):377-399.

------. 1998. "Gender Cultures and the Gender Arrangement -- A Theoretical Framework for Cross-National Gender Research." *Innovation* 11(2):147-166.

Pleck, Elizabeth H. and Joseph H. Pleck. 1997. "Fatherhood Ideals in the United States: Historical Dimensions." Pp. 33-48 in *The Role of the Father in Child Development.* 3rd ed, edited by M.E. Lamb. New York: Wiley.

Pleck, Joseph H. 2007. "Why could Father Involvement Benefit Children? Theoretical Perspectives." *Applied Developmental Science* 11(4):196-202.

------. 1987. "American Fathering in Historical Perspective." Pp. 83-97 in *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity*, edited by M.S. Kimmel. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

------. 1983. "Husbands' Paid Work and Family Roles." In *Research in the Interweave of Social Roles, Vol. 3,* edited by H.Z. Lopata and J.H. Pleck. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Schwartz, Pepper. 1994. *Peer Marriage: How Love between Equals really Works.* New York: Free Press.

Sclove, Stanley L. 1987. "Application of Model-Selection Criteria to some Problems in Multivariate Analysis." *Psychometrika* 52(3):333-343.

Stevens, Daphne P., Krista L. Minnotte, Susan E. Mannon and Gary Kiger. 2006. "Family Work Performance and Satisfaction: Gender Ideology, Relative Resources, and Emotion Work." *Marriage & Family Review* 40(4):47-74.

Strangleman, Tim. 2005. "Sociological Futures and the Sociology of Work." *Sociological Research Online* 10(4). Retrieved September 11, 2010 (http://www.socresonline.org.uk/10/4/strangleman.html).

Thompson, Linda and Alexis J. Walker. 1989. "Gender in Families: Women and Men in Marriage, Work, and Parenthood." *Journal of Marriage & Family* 51(4):845-871.

Tofighi, D. and C. K. Enders. 2007. "Identifying the Correct Number of Classes in a Growth Mixture Model." Pp. 317-341 in *Mixture Models in Latent Variable Research*, edited by G.R. Hancock. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

van de Kaa, Dirk J. 1987. "Europe's Second Demographic Transition." *Population Bulletin* 42(1).

Warren, Tracey. 2007. "Conceptualizing Breadwinning Work." *Work, Employment and Society* 21(2):317-336.

------. 2000. "Diverse Breadwinner Models: A Couple-Based Analysis of Gendered Working Time in Britain and Denmark." *Journal of European Social Policy* 10(4):349-371.

Wilcox, William B. 2004. *Soft Patriarchs, New Men: How Christianity Shapes Fathers and Husbands.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, William J. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Yamaguchi, Kazuo. 2000. "Multinomial Logit Latent-Class Regression Models: An Analysis of the Predictors of Gender-Role Attitudes among Japanese Women." *American Journal of Sociology* 105(6):1702-1740.

Yang, Chih-Chien. 2006. "Evaluating Latent Class Analysis Models in Qualitative Phenotype Identification." *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 50(4):1090-1104.

Zelizer, Viviana A.R. 1985. *Pricing the Priceless Child: The Changing Social Value of Children.* New York: Basic Books.

Table 1: Comparison of Baseline Models, Full Sample (N=6,150)

Number of Classes	Likelihood Ratio G^2	Degrees of Freedom	AIC	ABIC
2	194.15	112	224.15	277.32
3	**93.26**	**104**	**139.26**	**220.79**
4	74.63	96	136.63	246.52
5	53.95	88	131.95	270.20

Note: Boldface type indicates selected model. AIC = Akaike's Information Criterion; ABIC = sample size-adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion.

Table 2: Item-Response Probabilities for Three-Class Model: Probability of Agreeing with Item Given Latent Class, Full Sample (N=6,150)

	Latent Class		
Item	*Involved Fathering 78.48% (3.65%)*	*Adaptive Involved Fathering 17.83% (3.89%)*	*Resistant Involved Fathering 3.68% (1.59%)*
Father Must Play with Child	0.9999	0.9978	0.9427
	(0.0005)	(0.0027)	(0.0259)
Men Difficult Express Affection toward Babies	0.1036	0.4216	0.3161
	(0.0102)	(0.0491)	(0.0661)
Father Should be as Involved as Mother	0.9263	0.9453	0.4618
	(0.0056)	(0.0210)	(0.1157)
Father's Treatment has Long-Term Effects	1.0000	0.9424	0.8012
	(0.0004)	(0.0145)	(0.0592)
Provision More Important than Activities	0.0100	0.5327	0.2475
	(0.0176)	(0.0711)	(0.0606)
Important for Father to Encourage Mother	0.9312	0.9831	0.7543
	(0.0044)	(0.0114)	(0.0688)
Fatherhood Highly Rewarding	0.9986	0.9912	0.8618
	(0.0012)	(0.0057)	(0.0517)

Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 3: Comparison of Baseline Models, By Race/Ethnicity

Number of Classes	Likelihood Ratio G^2	Degrees of Freedom	AIC	ABIC
	White Non-Hispanics (N=3,500)			
2	**99.60**	**112**	**129.60**	**174.25**
3	76.76	104	122.76	191.22
4	61.82	96	123.82	216.09
5	44.45	88	122.45	238.53
	Black Non-Hispanics (N=500)			
2	**45.65**	**112**	**75.65**	**91.29**
3	20.57	104	66.57	90.55
4	11.81	96	73.81	106.13
5	7.31	88	85.31	125.97
	Hispanics (N=950)			
2	85.57	112	115.57	140.93
3	**49.03**	**104**	**95.03**	**133.92**
4	34.94	96	96.94	149.36
5	25.28	88	103.28	169.23
	Asian Non-Hispanics (N=850)			
2	85.43	112	115.43	139.10
3	**48.90**	**104**	**94.90**	**131.19**
4	30.71	96	92.71	141.62
5	24.00	88	102.00	163.53
	Other Race (N=350)			
2	**20.48**	**112**	**50.48**	**59.75**
3	12.43	104	58.43	72.64
4	6.65	96	68.65	87.80
5	4.10	88	82.10	106.20

Note: Boldface type indicates selected models. AIC = Akaike's Information Criterion; ABIC = sample size-adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion.

Table 4: Item-Response Probabilities for Selected Models: Probability of Agreeing with Item Given Latent Class, By Race/Ethnicity

	Latent Class										
	White Non-Hispanics (N=3,500)		*Black Non-Hispanics (N=500)*		*Hispanics (N=950)*			*Asian Non-Hispanics (N=850)*			*Other Race (N=350)*	
	Involved Fathering 93.19%	*Resistant Involved Fathering* 6.81%	*Involved Fathering* 86.29%	*Adaptive Involved Fathering* 13.71%	*Involved Fathering* 67.85%	*Adaptive Involved Fathering* 28.03%	*Affectionate Providing* 4.12%	*Involved Fathering* 52.95%	*Adaptive Involved Fathering* 39.02%	*Uninvolved Fathering* 8.02%	*Involved Fathering* 64.69%	*Adaptive Involved Fathering* 35.31%
Item	*(2.66%)*	*(2.66%)*	*(6.84%)*	*(6.84%)*	*(6.50%)*	*(6.14%)*	*(1.87%)*	*(8.81%)*	*(9.61%)*	*(5.13%)*	*(14.49%)*	*(14.49%)*
Father Must Play with Child	1.0000	0.9705	0.9977	1.0000	1.0000	0.9967	0.9460	1.0000	0.9942	0.9848	0.9906	1.0000
	(0.0000)	(0.0158)	(0.0023)	(0.0005)	(0.0001)	(0.0039)	(0.0428)	(0.0001)	(0.0045)	(0.0178)	(0.0070)	(0.0008)
Men Difficult Express Affection	0.1008	0.4696	0.0978	0.6343	0.1587	0.5071	0.1100	0.0141	0.5330	0.3849	0.0262	0.3888
toward Babies	(0.0094)	(0.0821)	(0.0278)	(0.1760)	(0.0325)	(0.0455)	(0.0988)	(0.0458)	(0.0932)	(0.1102)	(0.0547)	(0.1154)
Father Should be as Involved as	0.9142	0.6431	0.9775	0.9069	0.9671	0.9924	0.6791	0.9664	0.9651	0.0781	0.9628	0.8245
Mother	(0.0068)	(0.0793)	(0.0091)	(0.0495)	(0.0084)	(0.0118)	(0.1189)	(0.0396)	(0.0747)	(0.1329)	(0.0307)	(0.0551)
Father's Treatment has Long-	0.9994	0.8813	0.9974	0.8669	0.9886	0.9378	0.6836	0.9997	0.9531	0.8365	1.0000	0.9651
Term Effects	(0.0018)	(0.0411)	(0.0051)	(0.0643)	(0.0087)	(0.0214)	(0.1181)	(0.0026)	(0.0158)	(0.0962)	(0.0005)	(0.0222)
Provision More Important than	0.0345	0.2710	0.0565	0.6458	0.0062	0.7188	0.6403	0.0860	0.3781	0.1683	0.0115	0.3198
Activities	(0.0055)	(0.0667)	(0.0297)	(0.1838)	(0.0203)	(0.1481)	(0.1703)	(0.0395)	(0.0529)	(0.0673)	(0.0427)	(0.1082)
Important for Father to	0.9307	0.8727	0.9407	0.9295	0.9366	0.9998	0.8432	0.9205	0.9839	0.8549	0.9194	0.9817
Encourage Mother	(0.0052)	(0.0393)	(0.0123)	(0.0433)	(0.0112)	(0.0015)	(0.0818)	(0.0159)	(0.0111)	(0.0861)	(0.0235)	(0.0232)
Fatherhood Highly Rewarding	0.9985	0.9661	0.9925	0.9588	0.9964	0.9998	0.7243	0.9889	0.9891	0.9206	1.0000	0.9914
	(0.0012)	(0.0179)	(0.0055)	(0.0318)	(0.0042)	(0.0022)	(0.1208)	(0.0062)	(0.0079)	(0.0554)	(0.0003)	(0.0093)

Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 5: Comparison of Baseline Models, By Class

Number of Classes	Likelihood Ratio G^2	Degrees of Freedom	AIC	ABIC
	Non-Professionals (N=3,950)			
2	145.00	112	175.00	221.56
3	**65.55**	**104**	**111.55**	**182.93**
4	43.85	96	105.85	202.06
5	32.86	88	110.86	231.90
	Professionals (N=2,150)			
2	**77.32**	**112**	**107.32**	**144.88**
3	51.82	104	97.82	155.42
4	44.23	96	106.23	183.85
5	26.52	88	104.52	202.18

Note: Boldface type indicates selected models. AIC = Akaike's Information Criterion; ABIC = sample size-adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion.

Table 6: Item-Response Probabilities for Selected Models: Probability of Agreeing with Item Given Latent Class, By Class

	Latent Class				
	Non-Professionals (N=3,950)			*Professionals (N=2,150)*	
Item	*Involved Fathering 74.01% (2.98%)*	*Adaptive Involved Fathering 22.97% (3.31%)*	*Resistant Involved Fathering 3.02% (1.61%)*	*Involved Fathering 94.54% (2.16%)*	*Resistant Involved Fathering 5.46% (2.16%)*
Father Must Play w/ Child	0.9999	0.9950	0.9743	1.0000	0.9327
	(0.0006)	(0.0031)	(0.0197)	(0.0001)	(0.0346)
Men Difficult Express Affection toward Babies	0.1074	0.4368	0.3108	0.1141	0.3889
	(0.0136)	(0.0241)	(0.0919)	(0.0098)	(0.0820)
Father Should be as Involved as Mother	0.9501	0.9518	0.4542	0.8949	0.4636
	(0.0058)	(0.0180)	(0.1417)	(0.0103)	(0.1050)
Father's Treatment has Long-Term Effects	0.9998	0.9308	0.8162	1.0000	0.8153
	(0.0020)	(0.0121)	(0.0676)	(0.0006)	(0.0784)
Provision More Important than Activities	0.0009	0.5486	0.2789	0.0625	0.1740
	(0.0041)	(0.0707)	(0.0772)	(0.0069)	(0.0642)
Important for Father to Encourage Mother	0.9294	0.9879	0.6031	0.9354	0.9334
	(0.0058)	(0.0094)	(0.1369)	(0.0057)	(0.0378)
Fatherhood Highly Rewarding	0.9987	0.9873	0.8213	0.9980	0.9410
	(0.0016)	(0.0065)	(0.0775)	(0.0014)	(0.0314)

Note: Standard errors in parentheses.