5-2020

Retrospective Reports of Fathering and New Fathers' Parenting Identities

Shelby Taylor Clouthier
University of Tennessee, sclouthi@vols.utk.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Shelby Taylor Clouthier entitled "Retrospective Reports of Fathering and New Fathers' Parenting Identities." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Child and Family Studies.

Heidi Stolz, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Hillary Fouts, Spencer Olmstead

Accepted for the Council:
Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

Retrospective Reports of Fathering and New Fathers' Parenting Identities

A Thesis Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Shelby Taylor Clouthier

May 2020

DEDICATION

To my family. Scott, Michele, Connor, Peggy, and Oscar. Thank you for your constant love and encouragement, and for always supporting me.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Abstract

Previous research has demonstrated that parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control were associated with various aspects of child and adolescent wellbeing. Less is known about the extent to which these parenting dimensions carry into adulthood and how they may be related to parenting attitudes of the subsequent generation. The current study utilized identity theory and self-efficacy theory as frameworks to investigate whether retrospective reports of fathering received during childhood (support, behavioral control, and psychological control/disrespect) were related to three dimensions of new fathers' parenting identity – self-efficacy, role salience, and role satisfaction. This study also sought to examine whether the relationships between the family of origin fathering dimensions and subsequent generation fathering identity dimensions differed based on the structure of the family of origin. Fathers ($N = 157$) were part of a broader home visiting study and responded to two phone surveys. Bivariate and multiple regressions were performed to explore the association of the family of origin fathering measures with new fathers' identity measures, individually and jointly. Additionally, a second set of three hierarchical regressions with family of origin father type as a moderator were used to determine if the relationships between the three family of origin fathering constructs and the three fathering identity measures differed by participants' childhood family structures. Although both family of origin father support and father psychological control was associated with new fathers' parenting self-efficacy in the individual models, findings from multiple regressions with all family of origin independent variables indicated that only father support was significantly associated with new fathers' parenting self-efficacy in the context of the other fathering variables. New fathers' reports of their own fathers' behavioral and psychological control was not associated with any of the three fathering identity variables in the

multiple regressions. Family of origin father type did not moderate the relationships between any retrospective fathering variables and any present-day fathering attitudes.

 Keywords: behavioral control, father identity, parenting self-efficacy, psychological control, role salience, role satisfaction, support

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Retrospective Reports of Fathering and New Fathers' Parenting Identities

An identity in a particular role is a construct that is shared with others, socially

recognized, and defined through an individual's particular actions. A clear identity provides a

person with a sense of consistency and continuity across time and place thereby promoting

psychosocial wellbeing (Erikson, 1968). The formation of identity is dynamic and dependent on

various factors encountered throughout life (Pellerone, 2015). A man's identity as a father

influences his parenting behaviors and his child's well-being (Adamsons & Pasley, 2013).

Aspects of a man's fathering identity that have been linked to positive parenting and child well-

being include his parenting self-efficacy, parenting role salience, and parenting role satisfaction

(cf. Coleman & Karraker, 2000; Fox & Bruce, 2001; Fox, Nordquist, Billen, & Savoca, 2015;

Jones & Prinz, 2005). There is evidence that some fathering attitudes and behaviors are

transmitted across generations (Guzzo, 2011; Hofferth, Pleck, & Veseley, 2012), yet little is

known about whether or how young men's experiences with their own fathers shape their

subsequent fathering identity. Further, there are few studies that have examined whether these

intergenerational trajectories vary based on the structure of the family of origin. Also, the

majority of research focuses on upper-middle class White populations. Therefore, the purpose of

the current study was to understand the relationship between fathering received and new fathers'

identity using a low socioeconomic status sample. This study used data from participants who

were enrolled in home visiting services, a program designed to support low income families with

the goal of improving the health and wellbeing of children and parents (Home Visiting, 2019).

Further, the purpose of the present study was to consider whether men's reports of the fathering

they received during childhood and adolescence (support, behavioral control, and psychological control/disrespect) were related to three important aspects of their fathering identity (self-efficacy, role salience, and role satisfaction). Additionally, I examined whether the relationship between the fathering received during childhood and adolescence and new fathers' parenting identity measures differed based on childhood family structure.

Theoretical Framework

The present study is grounded in both identity theory and self-efficacy theory. Identity theory (Stryker, 1968) explains how individuals develop a sense of who they are based on their roles, environment, and social relationships, thus lending insight into the potential correlates of fathering identity. Identity theory also suggests that stronger identities lead to more positive performance in one's roles. Self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1969) explains the sources of feelings of competence, and also describes how those feelings translate into more positive behaviors. Taken together, these theories support (a) the importance of investigating fathering identity and efficacy, given the links to fathering behavior and subsequent child outcomes, and (b) the likely relationship of family of origin parenting with subsequent fathering attitudes. Each theory is reviewed in detail below.

Identity Theory

Identity theory, which serves as a foundation for the present study, is a subset of symbolic interaction (SI) theory. SI focuses on individual relationships within a society and states that meanings are developed through social interactions interpreted by individuals (Stryker, 1959). Specifically, it is the meaning one attaches to a social role that provides the motivation for behaviors within that role (Stryker, 1980). SI theory proposes that the self is

composed of multiple identities, structured by role relationships, and organized into a salience

hierarchy (Burke & Reitzes, 1981; LaRossa & Reitzes, 1993; Stryker, 1987).

Identity theory focuses on three specific social factors believed to contribute to one's

identification with a social role: (a) the salience of a role to a person's identity, (b) the level of

role satisfaction, and (c) the perception and appraisal of others in a social environment (Stryker

& Serpe, 1994). Internalized meanings associated with roles, as well as societal norms

surrounding those roles, define one's identity within a specific social role. These meanings serve

as a standard reference for who one is, and this standard becomes the basis for how an individual

decides to enact a role. As one ages, new identities are discovered, and individuals adapt to these

new roles throughout their life course (Burke, 1991). Individuals are motivated to create plans

and achieve performance or activities that reinforce, support, and confirm their personal

identities (Burke & Reitzes, 1981).

An important component of identity theory is socialization, which is the process by which

humans acquire symbols, beliefs, and attitudes of a particular culture (Mead, 1934). Identity

theory suggests that the socialization of appropriate role behaviors in childhood provided by

authority figures, such as parents, impacts the formation of a parenting identity later in

adulthood. Some researchers stated that families are the primary source of children's

socialization because they influence child development, values, and attitudes by transmitting

societal values and norms as well as family-specific attitudes such as parenting styles and beliefs

(Grusec, Goodnow, & Kuczynski, 2000).

Identity theory views the self as maintaining a hierarchy of identities, where the vertical

position of an identity is referred to as the "identity salience" sometimes known as role salience

(Stryker, 1980). Stryker and Serpe (1994) defined identity salience as "a readiness to act out an

identity as a consequence of the identity's properties as a cognitive structure or schema" (p. 17). The higher the level of salience an identity maintains, the more likely the behaviors associated with it will be enacted. Further, identities with higher salience are more likely to be important to the individual's sense of who they are (Stryker, 1968, 1980). Stryker (1968) suggested that role identities are more likely to be salient when they require high levels of commitment and have socially agreed upon meanings for role fulfillment. According to this theory, men who place a high level of importance on their role as a father or who view their fathering status as central to their identity would be more likely to be involved with their children, and this relationship has been examined empirically (cf. Pasley, Petren, & Fish, 2014). For example, using a sample of 208 White, middle- to upper-income fathers, Fox and Bruce (2001) found that role salience was associated with three measures of fathering behaviors: responsivity, harshness, and engagement. According to Fox and Bruce, identity theory suggests that men's commitment to children through fathering is a function of role salience, role satisfaction, and the perceived assessment of his performance in the fathering role by significant others.

In addition to the role salience, the satisfaction with a particular role is also related to the quality of performance in that role (Stryker, 1980). According to Steele and Barling (1996), "Role satisfaction reflects an appraisal of the extent to which individuals derive satisfaction from their roles" (p. 637). Role satisfaction is related to the capacities and skills that an individual brings to the specific role itself (Wethington & Kessler, 1989). Kulik, Shilo-Levin, and Liberman (2014) found that having a larger number of satisfying roles was associated with lower role conflict. Performing roles in various domains of life may lead to a sense of fulfillment and self-actualization which provides empowerment that, in turn, reduces levels of conflict caused by role

demands. Further, occupying many satisfying roles enhances resilience which allows individuals to cope better with adverse effects from conflict (Kulik et al., 2014).

Role satisfaction has been associated with many positive outcomes for parents. Satisfaction in the caregiving role was shown to be directly related to greater wellbeing (such as better physical health and positive affect) after controlling for stress experienced in the caregiving role (Martire, Stephens, & Atienza, 1997). Role satisfaction in the parenting role has been shown to be negatively related to harshness of discipline and positively related to supportive parenting and parental health and wellbeing (Simons, Beaman, Conger, & Chao, 1993; Umberson & Williams, 1993). Further, according to Simons et al. (1993), "parental satisfaction with the child's behavior was related to quality of parenting received as children. Parents who had experienced involved, supportive parenting when they were young reported high satisfaction" (p. 102). According to identity theory, men who maintain high levels of satisfaction in their role as a father would likely engage in more positive parenting behaviors, have higher quality of performance in the paternal role, and have higher levels of health and wellbeing.

Self-Efficacy Theory

A second theory relevant to the current study is self-efficacy theory. Self-efficacy theory is derived from cognitive social learning theory, which assumes that modeling produces learning and that observers acquire symbolic representations of modeled activities (Bandura, 1969a, 1971a). For example, children model behaviors they observe from their caregivers to develop an understanding of behaviors, actions, and objects; a boy may observe his father using tools to build something, and then model the behavior by hitting a table with a toy hammer. Bandura (1994) defined self-efficacy as "people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated

levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives" (p. 24). Further, self-efficacy involves an individual's assessment of the degree to which they can cope with stressful events (Bandura, 1978). Self-efficacy is a continuous life process that evolves as individuals acquire new skills, experiences, and levels of understanding (Bandura, 1992). These statements emphasize how self-efficacy is related to an individual's ability to perceive and manage external social factors. Self-efficacy in terms of parenting and how it influences the present study is discussed in subsequent sections.

In terms of parenting, parenting self-efficacy (PSE) is defined as "parents' perceived ability to positively influence the behavior and development of their children" (Coleman & Karraker, 2003, p. 128), which is associated with competent and positive parenting practices, strategies, and behaviors (Coleman & Karraker, 1998), and is related to healthy child development (Ardelt & Eccles, 2001; Coleman & Karraker, 2003). Moreover, some research has shown that the effects of self-efficacy carry over intergenerationally; parents with a high sense of self-efficacy are more likely to serve as positive role models for children, who will in turn adopt their parents' attitudes and beliefs (Eccles et al., 1993; Schneewind, 1995; Whitbeck, 1987). Studies have also found a positive relationship between PSE and parental satisfaction (Coleman & Karraker, 2000; Laws & Millward, 2001).

Identity theory and self-efficacy theory support the present study in important ways. First, these theories suggest that the stronger the fathering identity, the more frequent and positive fathering behaviors will be. Due to socialization, the fathering received in childhood and adolescence may be associated with men's subsequent fathering identities. Similarly, self-efficacy theory focuses on individuals' beliefs within a particular role and their ability to carry out designated role behaviors. Therefore, men who have a strong belief in their ability to be good

fathers may be more likely to perform the designated role behaviors they associate with the fathering role.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The following sections review research on parenting dimensions, intergenerational

transmission, identity, and family structure. The literature surrounding parenting is complex in

the sense that it includes various approaches, dimensions, and frameworks to operationalize and

measure parenting behaviors and their influences. First, two broad approaches to parenting will

be defined and differentiated. Next, three dimensions of parenting will be defined and discussed

in terms of child and adolescent outcomes and wellbeing. Further, this review will discuss the

fathering role and how it is differentiated from other roles a man may hold. Measures of the

fathering identity will be discussed as well as how parenting and identity may differ based on the

family structure. This section concludes with an introduction to the current study, purpose,

research questions, and hypotheses.

Parenting Dimensions

There are two broad approaches to the study of parenting – the typological approach and

the dimensional approach. A typological approach focuses on identifying a small number of

parenting dimensions and intersecting them to create categories of parenting. A dimensional

approach, on the other hand, focuses on the specific relationships between individual parenting

dimensions and outcomes without combining dimensions into categories.

Baumrind's parenting framework has been often used as a typological approach to the

study of parenting and has greatly influenced parenting research (cf. Darling & Steinberg, 1993;

Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbush, 1991). This framework features the parenting types

of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive, differentiated by the dimensions of

responsiveness and demandingness, which aim to categorize a parent in one parenting type based

on underlying dimensions and characteristics (Baumrind, 1971). In Baumrind's parenting

typology, parents are typed as having a specific parenting style based on their combination of

parenting scores from observations and interviews (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

One potential issue with the typological approach is that when parenting dimensions are

aggregated, individual contributions of each parenting dimension cannot be isolated and

examined (Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005). As a result of this limitation, other researchers have

utilized a dimensional approach to the study of parenting. One commonly used dimensional

approach, which will be used in the current study, was proposed by Barber (1996) and Steinberg

(1990). This approach suggests that the parenting dimensions of support, behavioral control, and

psychological control have important linkages with child wellbeing. Further, these dimensions

have been defined as conceptually and empirically distinct although there is some extent of

relatedness (Barber et al., 2005). This approach is grounded in Schaefer's (1965) original

dimensions of acceptance vs. rejection, psychological autonomy vs. psychological control, and

firm control vs. lax control. An advantage of the dimensional approach is that each dimension

can be isolated and studied within a context of other socializing factors. Further, unique and joint

effects of parenting dimensions on important youth outcomes can be examined (Barber et al.,

2005). Below, the three key dimensions of parenting are further discussed.

Parental support. One key parenting dimension suggested by Barber (1996) and

Steinberg (1990) is parental support. Parental support has been defined as "behavior manifest by

a parent toward a child that makes the child feel comfortable in the presence of the parent and

confirms in the child's mind that he is basically accepted and approved as a person by the

parent" (Rollins & Thomas, 1979).

Rollins and Thomas (1979) have previously viewed support as a continuous, quantitative, and unidimensional variable. Though their research operationalizes support as parental behaviors toward a child such as praise, approval, encouragement, cooperation, endearment, and physical affection, they did not conceptualize support as multidimensional, but advised that the possibility of multiple dimensions be further investigated in future research (Barber & Thomas, 1986; Rollins & Thomas, 1979). Many researchers later described parental support as multifaceted and an important component in the development of children's positive attitudes and life circumstances (cf. Barber & Thomas, 1986; Felson & Zielinski, 1989; Rhoner, 1986). For example, in their study of 527 college students designed to distinguish multiple dimensions of support, Barber and Thomas provided factor analytic evidence for the multidimensionality of support and further demonstrated that the various dimensions of support are related to different consequences. Supportive parenting is characterized by positive engagement, warmth, responsiveness, affection, nurturance, and rewarding positive behavior (Brooks-Gunn & Markman, 2005). Further, Barnes and Farrell (1992) indicated that parental support involves a high level of praise, encouragement, and physical affection, which allows the child to feel accepted and loved. Much was written about the conceptualization of parental support in the 1980s and 1990s and has remained unchallenged today.

There is an association between parental supportive behaviors and child and adolescent functioning. Parental support and warmth are associated with lower levels of child depression, loneliness, and antisocial behavior (Barber et al., 2005; Mounts, 2004). In a study using a relatively equal sample of low SES, middle SES, and high SES participants, adolescents' perceptions of support were correlated with their career self-efficacy (Ginevra, Nota, & Ferrari, 2015). Research also confirmed that parental support is positively associated with self-esteem

and self-efficacy in the classroom for grades 6-12 (Ruholt, Gore, & Dukes, 2015). Parental support is positively correlated with adolescent involvement in extracurricular activities as well (Fawcett, Garton, & Dandy, 2009). Parental support has also been shown to serve as a buffer for stress responses in children (Hostinar, Johnson, Gunnar, 2015) and as a protective factor against negative or stressful life experiences (Thoits, 2011).

Previous research has found a relationship between the supportive parenting experienced in childhood and positive outcomes in adulthood. Yeung, Duncan, and Hill (2000) utilized data from a 27 year-long study to examine associations between children's home environment and their outcomes in early adulthood. Measures of outcomes included social and emotional wellbeing, for example, years of school completed, hourly earnings, and childbearing. Overall, Yeung, Duncan, and Hill found that men with more involved fathers also reported greater wellbeing in adulthood. Fathers' achievement-related characteristics are important predictors of their outcomes in early adulthood. Further, fathers' allocation of time to non-work activities, such as church, housework, vacation, or children's schooling, positively affected child outcomes and family characteristics. Lastly, children whose fathers took precautions to ensure familial safety and financial security were significantly more successful in the two domains studied.

Parental control. Parental control is a construct that has historically encompassed a wide variety of behaviors. Previous research on parental control has included behaviors such as restrictiveness (Baumrind & Black, 1967), firm control and psychological control (Schaefer, 1965), and demandingness (Siegelman, 1965). Due to the complexity of this construct, empirical evidence of its relationship with other variables has been historically inconsistent (Barber, 1992; Rollins & Thomas, 1979). Schaefer (1965) distinguished parental attempts to control children's psychological state from parental attempts to regulate children's behavior. However, little was

done with that framework until the early 1990s. Barber and colleagues (1994) revisited this approach and reported a distinction between psychological control and behavioral control. Thus, they demonstrated that the two types of parental control are empirically independent dimensions of family interactions that have contrasting associations with internalized and externalized youth outcomes. Behavioral control is distinctly different than psychological control in the sense that it includes "sufficient regulation of behavior to enable [children] to learn that social interaction is governed by rules and structures that must be recognized and adhered to in order to be a competent member of society" (Barber et al., 1994, p. 1121). Parental behavioral control and psychological control will be further differentiated in the subsequent sections.

Parental behavioral control. Parental behavioral control is one form of parental control distinguished by Barber (1996) and is a key component of his parenting framework. Behavioral control involves parental behaviors towards the child designed to direct the child's behavior in a way that is deemed acceptable to the parent and is justified by societal norms (Barber, 1996; Barnes & Farrell, 1992). Further, it includes communicating parental expectations for appropriate child behaviors and therefore involves consistent monitoring of the behavior based on parental expectations (Akcinar & Baydar, 2014). Behavioral control is an umbrella term that may encompass a variety of constructs, including monitoring (Brown, Mounts, Lamborn, & Steinberg, 1993; Crouter, MacDermid, McHale, & Perry-Jenkins, 1990; Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986; Steinberg, Lambord, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994), supervision (Coley & Hoffman, 1996; Kurdek, Fine, & Sinclair, 1995; McCord, 1979), demandingness, and knowledge of child's activities (Barber et al., 2005; Baumrind 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

One key element of behavioral control, parental monitoring, has undergone much debate and reconsideration in recent decades. Dishion and McMahon (1998) defined parental

monitoring as a set of correlated parenting behaviors including attention and tracking of children's whereabouts, activities, and adaptions. Others suggested monitoring includes parental awareness of children's peers, what their child is doing, and where their child spends their time (Patterson & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1984). Stattin and Kerr (2000) pointed out that although researchers use the term "parental monitoring," they most often used measures that actually evaluated parental knowledge of their children's activities, rather than parental active tracking and checking in. Thus, according to these researchers, common measures of monitoring did not identify how a parent's knowledge of their child was gained. It is possible that parents gain knowledge of their children's activities in at least three different ways: child disclosure, parental solicitation, and parental control including monitoring (Stattin & Kerr, 2000). Child disclosure is defined as a child spontaneously telling their parent information without the parent prompting them. Parental solicitation involves a parent directly asking their child and/or their child's friends for information. Lastly, parental control is exhibited when a parent imposes rules and restrictions on their children's activities and associations (Stattin & Kerr, 2000). Subsequent to the challenge by Stattin and Kerr, researchers have attempted to better label and define measures surrounding parental monitoring.

Much research supports the association of behavioral control in all its forms with positive child outcomes (Barber et al., 2005). Aspects of behavioral control have been consistently associated with fewer adolescent delinquency problems (Pettit, Laird, Dodge, Bates, & Criss, 2003) as well as greater child competence (Barber, Maughan, & Olsen, 2005). In a study of 694 adolescents of parents with very low education levels in China (i.e., 85% of fathers and 94% of mothers had less than a high school education), behavioral control was positively related to self-control and negatively related to peer victimization (Li, Zhang & Wang, 2015). Further, lower

levels of behavioral control have been associated with child and adolescent behavioral regulation problems such as impulsivity, aggression, and substance abuse (Barber, 1996). Research has also shown behavioral control to be positively associated with adolescent self-esteem and greater life satisfaction (Barber et al., 2005; Ozdemir, 2012). Poorly monitored children and adolescents tend to exhibit antisocial, delinquent, or criminal behavior (cf. Patterson & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1994; Crouter et al., 1990), use illegal substances (Flannery, Vazsonyi, Torquati, & Fridrich, 1994), and perform poorly academically (White & Kaufman, 1997). A long-term study of emerging adults ages 12-21 designed to investigate prominent dimensions of family socialization found that men who reported greater parental behavioral control in childhood and adolescence were engaged less in substance abuse and had fewer sexual partners in young adulthood (Roche, Ahmed, & Blum, 2008).

Parental psychological control. The last key parenting dimension proposed by Barber (1996) is parental psychological control. Psychological control was originally conceptualized by Schaefer (1965) and refers to the level of control discernable when a parent intrudes on the psychological and emotional development of a child. Psychological control is characterized by invalidating feelings, constraining verbal expressions, withdrawal, and guilt induction (Schaefer, 1965). Later, Barber and colleagues focused on independent contributions of psychological control to youth outcomes (cf. 1992, 1994).

According to Barber, Olsen, and Shagle (1994), psychological control and behavioral control are empirically independent dimensions that predict contrasting youth effects. Psychological control, conceptualized as intrusive family experiences, tends to lead to internalized adolescent difficulties. It is important to note that children require a degree of psychological autonomy and they learn through social interactions that they are effective,

competent individuals with a clear sense of identity (Barber et. al., 1994). Psychological control

can also be defined as patterns of family interactions that intrude upon an adolescent's

individuation process which occurs during identity formation (Erickson, 1968; Sabatelli &

Mazor, 1985).

Parental disrespect. Recently, psychological control was further refined, by the

conceptualization and measurement of psychological control, as disrespect (Barber, Xia, Olsen,

McNeely, & Bose 2012). In this study, 120 urban adolescents from five different national groups

(located in Costa Rica, Thailand, and South Africa) identified parental behaviors they perceived

as disrespectful towards their individuality. From their responses, a new set of items was

developed to measure this form of parental control and was labeled the Psychological Control–

Disrespect Scale, which is empirically distinct from the original psychological control measure.

The behaviors noted by the participants included ridiculing, violation of privacy, comparing to

others, ignoring, and embarrassing in public.

Research suggests that psychological control, including disrespect, is associated with

negative outcomes among children and adolescents. Greater levels of psychological control were

consistently associated with higher levels of child anxiety, depression, and delinquent behavior

(Barber, 2002; Pettit et. al., 2001). Wijsbroek, Hale, Raaijmakers, and Meeus (2011) examined

age and sex differences between Dutch adolescents' perceptions of parental behavioral and

psychological control and their self-reported anxiety disorders. They found that adolescents'

perception of parental levels of psychological control were systematically related to generalized

anxiety disorder and separation anxiety disorders. Psychological control has also been found to

be negatively associated with adolescent self-esteem and life satisfaction, and positively

associated with antisocial behavior as seen in a study of 330 Turkish adolescents ages 13 to 15

from three different public schools (Ozdemir, 2012). Adolescents are influenced by psychological control due to their developmental need of achieving greater autonomy as a component of identity development (Barber, 1996; Erickson, 1968; Marcia, 1980). A study of undergraduate students yielded results showing that young adults who perceived their parents as psychologically controlling during childhood experienced difficulties in establishing committed choices, felt uncertain in their decision making, and had difficulty establishing a committed identity as adults (Luyckx, Soenens, Vansteenkiste, Goossens, & Berzonsky, 2007). In another study of primarily White (88%) college students from a public university where 65% qualified for financial aid, those who reported their parents as psychologically controlling during childhood and adolescence were more likely to have developed maladaptive stress responses compared to adults who did not report having psychologically controlling parents (Abaied & Emond, 2013).

Intergenerational Transmission of Parenting

Intergenerational transmission of parenting refers to the influence of the parenting a person received as a child on their subsequent interactions with their own children. These include all aspects of childrearing such as traditions, values, and interests (Feldman & Goldsmith, 1986). Intergenerational transmission of parenting implies influence upon three generations: grandparents, parents, and their children. Some similarity across generations is genetically informed (where the transmission of genes may shape predispositions) whereas other similarities are a function of socialization (Van Ijzendoorn, 1992). The present study focuses on the transmission of socialization across generations.

Research has shown that parents' own experiences of being reared in childhood affects their parenting behaviors towards their own adolescents (Pettit & Laird, 2002). Thornberry and

colleagues (cf. Thornberry, 2005; Thornberry, Freeman-Gallant, Lizotte, Krohn, & Smith, 2003) analyzed 15-year longitudinal data of high-risk youth (individuals ages 14-18 who were subject to serious delinquency and drug use) and found that positive parenting behaviors in childhood and adolescence (Generation 1) had a direct effect on subsequent fathers' (Generation 2) positive parenting. Further, Hofferth, Pleck, and Veseley (2012) conducted a study designed to address the extent to which residential paternal parenting practices were associated with their sons' ($N =$ 409) parenting behaviors as adults. The majority of participants were African American and Latin American (63% combined). They found a direct effect of positive fathering across generations. Positive fathering was conceptualized as the number of decisions a father made for his child and the proportion of years the father provided child care. Young men who reported having fathers who were positively involved with them in childhood reported engaging in more positive parenting behaviors towards their own children, such as showing affection and giving praise. A study by Guzzo (2011), which consisted of 3,525 fathers, was designed to consider if father type, presence, and involvement was associated with new fathers' attitudes towards fathering. Fathers (majority Black, employed, and with less than a high school degree) were part of a larger longitudinal study and were interviewed at their child's birth, and again when their children were ages one, three, and five. Results were that men tended to hold attitudes towards fathering that reflected their own father's involvement. Further, although men raised by biological fathers modeled their behaviors on their fathers, men who perceived their coresidential biological father as somewhat or not at all involved were less likely to believe in the importance of fathers as an authority figure. A large body of research reveals that intergenerational transmission of parenting is consistent among positive and negative parenting and both behaviors

and beliefs (cf. Belsky, Jaffee, Sligo, Woodward, & Silva, 2005; Chen & Kaplan, 2001; Van Ijzendoorn, 1992)

Family of origin structure and intergenerational transmission. One question of interest for the current study is whether fathers in different family structures (e.g., biological father, step-father, nonresidential father) transmit fathering attitudes and behaviors to their sons in similar ways and to similar extents. To conceptually understand the step-fathering identity, it is necessary to consider a step-father's perception of his role (White, 1994), the relationships surrounding him (Palkovitz, 2002), the level of involvement in fathering behaviors (Ganong, Coleman, Fine, & Martin, 1999), and the process of communication that leads to salience of the step-fathering role (Ganong et. al., 1999; Marsiglio, 2004). Some research suggests that step-fathers can be as positive and effective as biological fathers, and thus may be equally able to transmit fathering attitudes and behaviors to their sons (Fox & Bruce, 2001). Further, the degree to which a step-father views his role as salient is a better indicator of fathering behaviors than biological relationship or demographic characteristics (Fox & Bruce, 2001). Research suggests step-fathers tend to be less engaged and emotionally close than biological fathers (Hofferth & Anderson, 2003). A study that compared step-fathers to biological fathers found that step-fathers reported more difficulty, conduct problems, and hyperactivity in children after adjusting for controls, such as involvement (Flouri, 2007). Using a sample of 839 girls and 741 boys ages 8-17, Foley and colleagues (2004) found that children living in step-father families were more exposed to parental psychiatric risk factors, such as alcoholism, depression, and conduct disorders, than if they were raised in intact families. However, in studying adolescents with a living biological father and a resident step-father, researchers found a positive relationship between step-father relationship quality and child outcomes such as lower risk of internalizing

and externalizing disorders (White & Gilbreth, 2001). Nonresidential biological fathers have also been shown to have an influence on their children. For example, Fox and Bruce (1999) conducted a study of nonresidential and residential fathers to examine paternal involvement. Participants were majority White with an average annual income of $30,000-$40,000, and children ages 1-18. Nonresidential fathers comprised about 16% of the overall sample. Fox and Bruce found that, although father involvement was higher for residential fathers than nonresidential fathers, fathers' identity was more strongly associated with nonresidential fathers' involvement compared to residential fathers.

Fathering Identity

According to identity theory (Stryker, 1968), the father role itself is composed of a man's internalized conception of important paternal behaviors, including culturally defined behaviors and individual variations of the behavior (Pederson, 1985). Although there may be societal pressure for a father to enact a normative role, there are many ways a father can interact with his children, which suggests the way that fathers define their personal role influences their behaviors (Ihinger-Tallman, Pasley, & Buehler, 1993).

It is important to study the fathering role separately from other roles a man may enact because, according to identity theory, individuals enact a variety of roles, and maintain different levels of salience and satisfaction within each role. In a study of parents, wherein 87% of fathers worked outside the home an average of 42 hours per week, showed that men tended to restructure their personal identity to adapt to their new role as a father, and reported roles specific to the fathering identity that were different than the roles of the mother. These additional fathering roles included supporter, disciplinarian, and companion (Rane & McBride, 2000). Findings from a middle-income sample (70% of fathers reported annual income over $30,000) of

married and divorced non-resident fathers indicated that men perceived their status as a father as multidimensional and included a range of co-existing meanings and responsibilities such as provider, protector, caretaker, supporter, and teacher (Olmstead, Futris, & Pasley, 2009). Research has identified the importance of studying a man's father role identity. Three components of fathering identity are relevant to the current study and are discussed below, including fathering role salience, fathering role satisfaction, and fathering self-efficacy.

   Fathering role salience. Role salience, or identity salience, can be conceptualized as the probability an identity will be evoked across a variety of situations (Stryker & Burke, 2000). Role identities are part of a hierarchical structure, where salient and prominent identities hold positions at the top of the hierarchy (Callero, 1985). A higher commitment to a specific social role results in a higher level of salience and is therefore more influential in behavioral choices (Callero, 1985; Stryker & Serpe, 1982). Individuals are motivated to form plans and achieve levels of performance that reinforce, support, and confirm their personal identity (Burke & Reitzes, 1981). Although findings on father role salience have been mixed, studies have generally indicated that men who view their fathering role as central to their identity and place more importance on their fathering role are more actively involved with their children compared to men who place less importance on the fathering role (Pasley, Petren, & Fish, 2014).

   Role salience is positively associated with fathering outcomes. For example, in their study of residential and nonresidential fathers, Fox and Bruce (1999), found that men who place their fathering role higher within their identity hierarchy made greater efforts to seek out opportunities to enact their fathering role. In a follow up study, Fox and Bruce (2001) found that identity salience was related to fathers' behavioral engagement, active involvement, and responsivity. Many scholars have asserted that role salience contributes positively to parents'

psychological wellbeing (cf. Martire, Stephens, & Townsend, 2000; Pleck, 1985). Fox, Nordquist, Billen, and Savoca (2015) designed a study with measures of empowerment, role salience, reflected appraisals, and role satisfaction. Results from a study using a sample of 135 fathers (93% White, 45% college educated), showed that fathers' personal interpretation of their fathering role, as measured through role salience and role satisfaction, was associated with their fathering behaviors. Father role salience was also related to attachment, responsibility, and engagement, and was further linked with other measures of the fathering identity such as satisfaction and reflected appraisals (Fox et. al., 2015). This finding shows the importance of considering men's self-reported interpretations of their fathering role and how it is associated with other measures of identity and the enactment of positive paternal behaviors.

Fathering role satisfaction. A second factor central to an individual's personal identity is how happy or satisfied one is when enacting a role. Theoretically, role satisfaction is important for role enactment (Fox & Bruce, 2001; Minton & Pasley, 1996) and results in better role performance (Stryker & Serpe, 1982). Some studies have found a positive relationship between parental self-efficacy and parent role satisfaction; individuals who have higher parenting self-efficacy are more satisfied in their parenting role (Coleman & Karraker, 2000; Laws & Millward, 2001). In a methodological review, Nelson, Kushlev, and Lyubomirsky (2014) examined paternal wellbeing and found that various psychosocial aspects are interrelated with the development of the fathering role and are therefore likely to influence paternal role satisfaction. These aspects may include age, socioeconomic status, relationship status, family structure, social environment, child characteristics (age, gender, or co-residential status), parenting style, social support, and personality traits.

Role satisfaction has been consistently found to be associated with various fathering behaviors. For example, Fox, Nordquist, Billen, and Savoca (2015) found that role satisfaction was related to three measures of father involvement: attachment, engagement, and responsibility in a sample of fathers with children ages birth to four. Another study found that role satisfaction was negatively associated with harshness and positively associated with responsivity and behavioral engagement (Fox & Bruce, 2001). These results are important in conveying how measures of fathering identity, such as role satisfaction, impacts paternal childrearing behaviors. Fathers who are more satisfied in their role are more likely to engage in more positive fathering behaviors. Results from a study of dual earning couples found that fathers who reported greater parental role satisfaction also reported more liberal beliefs related to fathering, less work-family conflict, and greater confidence in the parenting role (Jacobs & Kelley, 2006). Moreover, Ohan, Leung, and Johnston (2000) studied parents with children ages five to 12 using the Parenting Sense of Competence Scale (Johnston & Mash, 1989; which was used in this study). They found that parental role satisfaction was negatively related to children's internalizing and externalizing behavioral problems. Therefore, it is important to understand the sources of fathers' role satisfaction given the literature on linkages with child outcomes.

Fathering self-efficacy. Parental self-efficacy (PSE) is broadly defined as individuals' expectations they hold about their ability to parent successfully (Jones & Prinz, 2005). PSE incorporates specific knowledge of parenting behaviors and parents' confidence in their ability to carry out designated behaviors (Coleman & Karraker, 1998; Pennell, Whittingham, Boyd, Sanders, & Colditz, 2012). Bandura (1977) stated that "An efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes" (p. 193). PSE further involves parents' beliefs in their ability to influence their children and the environment in

a way that would promote the development and success of their children (Ardelt & Eccles, 2001). Parental self-efficacy is a determining competent of parenting behaviors (Jones & Prinz, 2005) and is consequently linked to healthy child development (Coleman & Karraker, 2003). Given this link to key child outcomes, it is important to better understand the sources and development of a parent's self-efficacy.

Research has found several correlates of parental self-efficacy. For example, Grusec, Hastings, and Mammone (1994) found that parental self-efficacy beliefs initially form from childhood experiences with caregivers. This finding is relevant to the current study because it involves the influence of parenting behaviors on new parents' identities. For fathers, parenting stress and relational functioning, including marital satisfaction and family functioning, have been shown to be related to their PSE (Sevigny & Loutzenhiser, 2010). Previous research has suggested that an individual's generalized sense of self-efficacy is associated with their parenting self-efficacy (Coleman & Karraker, 2003). Parents with lower self-efficacy tend to focus on more coercive and harsh parenting whereas parents with higher self-efficacy use more positive parenting strategies such as warmth, sensitivity, positive affect, or rule setting (Johnston & Mash, 1989; Teti & Gelfand, 1991). There is a strong association between parental competence and parental self-efficacy (Jones & Prinz, 2005). In their study of couples (85% legally married), Sevigny and Loutzenhiser (2010) found that higher ratings of PSE were associated with lower levels of parenting stress and depressive symptoms for fathers. Moreover, higher levels of PSE were associated with more positive family functioning overall. These findings are important for the current study because they confirm that parenting self-efficacy can be shaped from childhood experiences, familial functioning, and an individual's general sense of self-efficacy.

Parental self-efficacy is associated with positive fathering behaviors. A study by Murdock (2013) with parents of children age three to five found that, consistent with prior research, PSE was associated with paternal involvement. Moreover, fathers with higher PSE had higher levels of supportive parenting behaviors and exertion of control. Another study, which included fathers with various parenting statuses (biological fathers, step-fathers, adoptive fathers, intimate partners, or nonbiologically related co-parents), found that paternal PSE was associated with father involvement from birth to 18 years (Trahan, 2017). Father involvement has been consistently related to a variety of child outcomes including: better psychosocial adjustment in children, higher levels of cognitive and social competence, increased social responsibility, self-control, self-esteem, social maturity, better academic progress, and enhanced occupational achievement (Lamb, 2004). Therefore, it is important to study the link between measures of fathering behaviors and new fathers' perceived identity with the understanding that the positive outcomes of paternal identity are associated with a host of positive child outcomes.

The Current Study

Men who place a high level of importance on their role as a father and feel capable in and satisfied with that role may be more likely to enact positive fathering behaviors with subsequent benefits for children. Thus, it is important to examine how fathering identity originates and develops with particular attention to the possibility of an intergenerational transmission mechanism. The current study investigates aspects of fathering identity in a low SES sample. Further, it investigates whether three aspects of fathering identity are associated with retrospective reports of fathering received during childhood and adolescence. In addition, this study examines whether the relationship between one or more of the family of origin fathering variables with the fathering identity variables varies as a function of family of origin father types.

This study was guided by the following research questions:

RQ1: Are retrospective reports of family of origin paternal support, behavioral control, and psychological control associated with new fathers' parenting self-efficacy, role salience, and role satisfaction?

RQ2: Do the relationships between the three family of origin fathering constructs (support, behavioral control, and psychological control) and the three fathering identity measures (self-efficacy, role salience, and role satisfaction) vary as a function of family of origin father type?

It is anticipated that participants who reported receiving more positive fathering during childhood and adolescence (i.e., higher levels of support and behavioral control, and lower levels of psychological control) will report stronger fathering identities (i.e., higher parenting self-efficacy, role salience, and role satisfaction). Given that my analytical approach places all three independent variables together in the analyses, it is possible that they will not all emerge as significant correlates. Rather, family of origin father support may emerge as the significant correlate because the known outcomes of parental support are most closely related with the parenting identity outcomes of this study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The sample for the present investigation was drawn from the Tennessee Dad (TD) study. For the broader TD study, eight home visiting agencies operating at 11 agency sites across 50 counties in Tennessee were invited and agreed to participate. These agencies delivered federally-funded home visiting services using the Healthy Families America model. Home visiting is a voluntary, eligibility-based program that supports low-income pregnant women, families, and children and is designed to improve the health and wellbeing of children and parents (Home Visiting, 2019). Home visited families were eligible for participation in TD if both the female early home visiting (EHV) client and the baby's father met certain eligibility requirements. Eligibility requirements for the home visited client were that she was the mother of the baby and spoke English. Enrollment criteria to be a "participating father" were that the individual speaks English and was either (a) the biological father of the baby and living with the EHV client, (b) not the biological father of the baby, but the partner, boyfriend, or husband of the EHV client and living with her, or (c) the biological father of the baby who lived within 30 minutes of the EHV client, and had been in contact with the EHV client at least twice in the past 30 days. Only one father per family was invited to participate in (a) through (c) order. Lastly, for inclusion in the study, the "participating mother" had to agree to be contacted by the research team, and both the mother and the father had to provide informed consent.

Using cluster randomization, agency supervisors were assigned to treatment or control conditions. Each home visitor was then assigned to a condition based on their supervisor's assignment. Of the 694 EHV clients who initiated services between July 2016 and July 2017,

424 were eligible for the TD program and study. Of the eligible families, 282 provided informed consent, representing 67% of eligible families. These participating families were assigned to the treatment or control condition based on the condition of their agency-appointed home visitor. This resulted in 140 families participating in the treatment condition, and 134 families in the control condition. Eight families withdrew immediately after providing informed consent and were not assigned to a condition.

The sample was further restricted to only include fathers who responded to the Time 2 (T2) survey and identified a man who was "like a father to them" growing up. Given the nature of rolling admissions throughout the 13-month project, many participating fathers were not enrolled long enough to provide T2 data, thus the sample for the present study consisted of 157 fathers. The present study utilizes data from only participating fathers, combining both those in the treatment (n = 73) and control (n = 84) conditions. The racial makeup of the sample was as follows: 61.6% White, 27.2% Black, and 9.9% other (American Indian/Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, Other, and Prefer not to answer). Approximately 72% of participants were working at a job for pay and 24.2% of participants were either not working (23.6%), or on paternity leave (0.6%). The average age of participants was 27.07 (range = 17-52; SD = 7.00). On average, participants worked 41.67 hours per week (range = 10-112; SD = 13.09). Participants earned on average $28,466 per year (range = $10,200-$150,0000; SD = $16,662).

Intervention

Although the present study combines participants from both the treatment and control conditions, and the fathering identity outcomes of interest were all collected prior to the TD intervention, I offer a brief overview of the TD project in this section. The TD project was

designed to better engage fathers in home visiting services. Goals of the TD project were as follows: to improve fathers' engagement in home visiting services; increase fathers' knowledge of child safety and development; increase co-parenting alliance; increase fathers' sense of importance, role salience, role satisfaction, and parenting efficacy; increase fathers' accessibility and mindful parenting; and reduce fathers' general stress, financial stress, and increase social support.

Eight modules were created to promote the aforementioned goals and address areas critical to increasing a father's involvement in the life of his child. Three Topic Guides were developed within each module, for a total of 24 Topic Guides. Sample topic guides included "Providing Financially for Your Family," "Understanding and Protecting Your Baby," and "Building Healthy Relationships." The "Tennessee Dad Toolbox" was developed, which included 24 Topic Guides, and a corresponding gift to be left with the dad if he engaged with the home visitor in a five-minute (or more) meaningful conversation utilizing a Topic Guide. Fathers in the treatment condition were exposed to standard home visiting curriculum plus the TD curriculum at each home visit, whereas fathers in the control condition were provided only the standard home visiting curriculum.

Procedures

Participating fathers had the opportunity to complete two surveys. Surveys took place between July 18, 2016 and July 22, 2017. The Time 1 survey (T1) was completed as a baseline measure, and the Time 2 survey (T2) was administered as a four-month follow up. Verbal consent was obtained by a qualified member of the research team prior to completion of the baseline survey. If the participant was a minor, verbal informed consent was first obtained by their legal guardian, then the minor was contacted and given the opportunity to assent to

participation. Surveys were administered by phone by a member of the research team to participating fathers. Team members recorded responses using Qualtrics survey software. Surveys typically lasted 35-45 minutes. After completion of each survey, participants were emailed a $40 gift card. If an emailed gift card was not feasible, a participant had the option to have it mailed to their residential address.

T1 and T2 surveys contained items related to father and child characteristics, fathering identity, attitudes, and behaviors, child knowledge, and the couple relationship. The T2 survey also asked participants to reflect back on the fathering they received during childhood and adolescence. All outcome measures were taken from the baseline (T1) survey, and retrospective reports of participants' childhood experiences with their own fathers were taken from the T2 survey. It is not anticipated that the intervention activities that took place prior to the T2 survey would alter participants reports of fathering received during childhood and adolescence; however, in the interest of thoroughness, we formally compared treatment and control conditions on retrospective reports of parenting (see analysis and results sections).

Measures

Participant demographic characteristics. Demographic data were collected via the T1 baseline survey and are included in the present study to provide a description of the overall sample and to investigate potential control variables. Measures of demographic characteristics included age, race, employment status, and income.

Age. Participant age was measured with a single item, "How old are you?"

Race. Race was measured with the single item, "With which racial or ethnic group do you most closely identify?" Response options were as follows: 1 (*American Indian/Native American*), 2 (*Asian/Pacific Islander*), 3 (*Black/African American*), 4 (*Hispanic/Latino*), 5

(*White/Caucasian*), 6 (*Other, please specify*), or 7 (*Prefers not to answer*). Due to the limited

responses for American Indian/Native American ($n = 2$), Asian/Pacific Islander ($n = 1$),

Black/African American ($n = 41$), Hispanic/Latino ($n = 7$), and Other ($n = 5$), a dichotomous

variable was created where items were recoded into two categories: 0 (*White*) and 1 (*Minority*).

    Employment status. Employment status and hours were measured with two items.

Participants were first asked, "Are you currently working at a job for pay, on parental leave from

a job, or not working?" Response options included: 1 (*Job for Pay*), 2 (*Paternity Leave*), or 3

(*Not Working*). If participants indicated that they were currently working at a job for pay,

participants were then asked, "How many hours do you work in a typical week?" Because only

one participant indicated that they were on paternity leave, and it is assumed that paternity leave

is a temporary break from a job, a dichotomous variable was created where items were recoded

into two categories, 0 (*Working or on paternity leave from a job*) and 1 (*Not working*).

    Income. The questions related to income were contingent upon employment status. If

participants indicated that they were working at a job for pay or on paternity leave, they were

then asked to respond to the following question, "How much do you earn?" Participants verbally

indicated their income. If participants did not specify a unit, they were then asked, "Is that (1)

per hour, (2) *per day*, (3) *per week*, (4) *per month*, or (5) *per year*?" Because income was

measured in different increments, we converted all responses to a yearly salary as follows with

personally generated assumptions. Because the average person works 40 hours per week, 52

weeks per year, we multiplied the hourly salary by 2,080. To convert daily salaries, we

multiplied the daily amount by 260 to account for about 260 weekdays per year. To convert

weekly salaries, we multiplied that number by 52. To transform monthly salaries, we multiplied

them by 12. Lastly, yearly salaries were kept as is.

Family of origin measures. To introduce this section, the surveyor stated, "First I have some questions about your relationship with your parents when you were growing up."

Family of origin father type. To identify father type, participants were asked, "Please think of the man most involved in raising you or most like a father to you. Was this person your biological father, step-father, or someone else?" Response options were: 1 (*Biological father*), 2 (*Step-father*), 3 (*Grandfather*), 4 (*Adoptive father*), 5 (*Someone else*), or 6 (*No one*). Due to the limited number of cases in the "Step-father" ($n = 21$), "Grandfather" ($n = 8$), "Adoptive father" ($n = 5$) and "Someone else" ($n = 21$) categories, I decided to create a dichotomous father type variable with the categories 0 (*biological father*; $n = 93$) and 1 (*all other types; $n = 55$*). Approximately 60% of participants reported having a biological dad and 34% of participants indicated an "other" type of father. Ten participants indicated that they did not have someone who was like a father to them growing up and were therefore excluded from the study.

Family of origin father support. Father support was measured with 10 items from the Acceptance Subscale of the Child Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (Schaefer, 1965; Schluderman & Schluderman, 1988). The original scale consisted of 30 items to which a child responded, indicating how their father acted towards them on a scale from 1 (*Not like him*), 2 (*Somewhat like him*), and 3 (*A lot like him*). Ten of these items have been commonly used in research with adolescents (see Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005) and were used in the present study. Items were stated in past tense given that participants were asked to think back on their childhood and adolescence. Sample items included, "My father was a person who gave me a lot of care and attention," "My father smiled at me very often," and "My father was a person who often praised me." Items were averaged to construct a family of origin father support scale where

greater scores indicated higher levels of support received during childhood and adolescents. The

measure of father support yielded acceptable inter-item reliability (α = .95).

Family of origin father behavioral control. Family of origin father knowledge of youth

behavior, one component of parental behavioral control, was measured using a five-item scale

used previously in family research with adolescents (e.g. Brown, Mounts, Lamborn, Steinberg,

1993). These items were considered measures of monitoring but were reconceptualized as

parental knowledge (Crouter & Head, 2002; Kerr & Stattin, 2000; Stattin & Kerr, 2000), given

that the source of the parents' knowledge is not known. This measure consisted of five items

stated in past tense because participants were asked to think back on their childhood and

adolescence. Again, participants were asked to think about "The man most involved in raising

you or most like a father to you" when responding to the items. Sample items included, "How

much did your father REALLY know about where you went at night," "How much did your

father REALLY know about how you spent your money," and "How much did your father

REALLY know about who your friends were." Response options were 1 (*didn't know*), 2 (*knew

a little*), or 3 (*knew a lot*). Items were averaged to construct a family of origin father behavioral

control scale, and greater scores indicate higher levels of behavioral control received. The

measure of behavioral control yielded acceptable inter-item reliability (α = .87).

Family of origin father psychological control/disrespect. Retrospective reports of family

of origin father psychological control/disrespect was measured with the eight-item Psychological

Control-Disrespect scale (Barber et al., 2012). Items were stated in past tense given that

participants were asked to think back on their childhood and adolescence. Again, participants

were asked to think about the man most involved in raising them when answering the questions.

Sample items included, "My father ridiculed me or put me down, for example, saying I was

stupid or useless," "My father violated my privacy, for example, entering my room or going through my things," and "My father tried to make me feel guilty for something I had done or something he thought I should do." Items were measured on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Not like him*) to 3 (*A lot like him*). Items were averaged to construct a family of origin father psychological control/disrespect scale, and greater scores indicate higher levels of psychological control. The psychological control measure yielded acceptable inter-item reliability ($\alpha = .82$).

Fathering identity measures.

Role salience. Father role salience was measured using eight items adapted from the Parental Role Salience Scale (Fox & Bruce, 2001), which was designed to measure the salience of the fathering role in a man's hierarchy of identities. Participants indicated how much they agreed with each statement. Sample items included, "I like being known as a parent," "When I think about who I am and what my goals are, being a dad is one of the main things I think about," and "My role as a father is important to me." Items were measured using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 4 (*Strongly agree*). The items were averaged to construct a role salience scale where higher scores indicate greater role salience. This measure demonstrated acceptable inter-item reliability ($\alpha = .70$).

Role satisfaction. Role satisfaction was measured using eight items from the Satisfaction subscale of the Parenting Sense of Competence Scale. These items were designed to assess fathers' satisfaction in their role as a parent (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978; Johnston & Mash, 1989). Participants indicated how much they agreed with each statement. Sample items included: "Even though being a parent could be rewarding, I am frustrated now," "If being a father of a child were more interesting, I would be motivated to do a better job," and "Being a parent makes me tense and anxious." In the original scale items were measured on a 6-point

scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly agree*) to 6 (*Strongly disagree*). In the present study, items were measured using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 4 (*Strongly agree*). All eight items were reverse-scored such that greater scores reflected higher role satisfaction. Items were averaged to construct a role satisfaction scale. The role satisfaction measure yielded acceptable inter-item reliability (α = .74).

> **Parenting self-efficacy.** Parenting self-efficacy was measured using the Efficacy subscale of the Parenting Sense of Competence Scale designed to assess fathers' confidence in their role as a parent (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978; Johnston & Mash, 1989). The original measure consisted of 17 items on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly agree*) to 6 (*Strongly disagree*). For this study, seven of the items were selected for inclusion in the T1 survey. Participants indicated how much they agreed with each statement. Sample items were: "I meet my own personal expectations for the quality of care I give my child," "The problems of taking care of a child are easy to solve once you know how your actions affect your child," and "I believe I have all the skills necessary to be a good father to my child." Items were measured using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 4 (*Strongly agree*). Items were averaged to construct a parenting self-efficacy scale, and greater scores indicate higher levels of reported parenting self-efficacy. The parenting self-efficacy measure yielded acceptable inter-item reliability (α= .70).

Analysis

> First, descriptive statistics were analyzed to test for outliers and determine whether variables were normally distributed. Second, I investigated whether any demographic variables were associated with an independent or dependent variable to identify potential control variables. To do this, I first ran bivariate correlations to examine if age or income were associated with

family of origin support, behavioral control, psychological control, parenting self-efficacy, role salience, or role satisfaction. Second, I ran independent samples t-tests to determine whether race and work status were associated with family of origin support, behavioral control, psychological control, parental self-efficacy, role salience, or role satisfaction. The results of these initial analyses indicated that income was associated with role satisfaction ($r = .30, p < .01$). Age, race, and employment status yielded non-significant associations with the independent or dependent variables; therefore, only income was included as a controlvariable, and only in the models that included role satisfaction.

Although it is not expected that the intervention would alter participants' retrospective reports of fathering received during childhood, I tested to see if the independent or dependent variables differed by study condition. An independent samples t-test to compare the means between treatment and control conditions was conducted to determine if these subsamples were different. There were no differences between participant's reports of paternal support, psychological control, and behavioral control or their parental self-efficacy, role salience, and role satisfaction based on treatment and control conditions, which suggested that the intervention that took place between Time 1 and Time 2 did not influence fathers' reports of the fathering received during childhood. Therefore, participants' condition was not controlled during analysis.

To address RQ1, I first conducted a series of nine regression models to investigate whether each of the three family of origin fathering variables was associated with each of the three new father identity variables. For the three models with role satisfaction as the dependent variable, I controlled for income. Next, to further investigate the relationship between family of origin fathering with fathering identity, a set of three multiple regressions was conducted with all three independent variables together examining each dependent variable separately. These

combined models allowed for the investigation of fathering in a more ecologically valid manner, given that youth do not experience one parenting variable at a time. Specifically, two multiple regressions were performed, regressing parenting self-efficacy and role salience (separately) on the set of three independent variables (family of origin father support, behavioral control, and psychological control/disrespect). Next, a hierarchical regression was performed regressing role satisfaction on income (entered in the first block as a control variable) and the set of three family of origin fathering variables (entered in the second block).

To address RQ2, I conducted a set of three hierarchical regressions. In the regression with role satisfaction as the dependent variable, I entered income and the three independent variables in the first block, and I entered income, father type, and the three interaction terms of father type with the independent variables in block two. To test whether father type moderated associations with parenting self-efficacy and role salience, I followed the same approach but omitted income as a control variable.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Results

Data were analyzed in SPSS (26). The basic distribution of the sample on key variables is reviewed below. Role salience was negatively skewed (-3.00), which indicated that the current sample had high levels of role salience. Parental self-efficacy and role salience were also skewed (Self-efficacy at -1.20 and role satisfaction at -.74) which indicated moderate to high levels of parental self-efficacy and role satisfaction in the current sample. Support was negatively skewed (-1.29) indicating moderate to high levels of father support during childhood or adolescence in this sample. Psychological control was positively skewed (2.13) indicating low levels of psychological control in the present sample. Lastly, behavioral control was negatively skewed (-1.17) which indicated moderate to high levels of behavioral control from participants' father figures. Because the constructs of interest were measured on Likert-type scales with only three or four response options, it is possible that the limited number of response options may skew the data causing non-normal distribution if the majority of participants agreed or disagreed with the statement provided. Descriptive statistics for independent and dependent variables are provided in Appendix A and correlations for study variables are provided in Appendix B.

The results of the nine regression models that treated each independent variable separately indicated that fathers' parenting self-efficacy was associated with both family of origin father support ($B = .18$, $R^2 = .07$, $p < .01$) and psychological control ($B = -.22$, $R^2 = .05$, $p < .05$), but not behavioral control. Neither fathers' role salience nor role satisfaction were associated with family of origin support, psychological control, or behavioral control in these individual models.

The results of the multiple regressions with all three family of origin fathering measures in the same model are reviewed below. In the regression with parenting self-efficacy as the dependent variable, family of origin father support was significant ($B = .17$, $R^2 = .09$, $p < .05$,) but behavioral control and psychological control were not. Neither family of origin father behavioral control nor psychological control were associated with any of the three fathering identity variables. The results of the analyses for RQ2 indicated that father type did not moderate the relationships between any of the family of origin fathering variables and any father identity variable (parenting self-efficacy, role salience, and role satisfaction).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to investigate whether retrospective reports of fathering received during childhood (support, behavioral control, and psychological control/disrespect) were related to three dimensions of new fathers' parenting identity – self-efficacy, role salience, and role satisfaction. This study also sought to examine whether the relationships between the family of origin fathering dimensions and subsequent generation fathering identity dimensions varied based on the structure of the family of origin.

Income was the only demographic variable that was associated with a study variable, specifically it was positively associated with role satisfaction. This relationship is not surprising given that income has been reported to be related to measures of satisfaction in other domains such as life satisfaction (cf. Cheung & Lucas, 2015), stable marital satisfaction (cf. Jackson, Krull, Bradbury, & Karney, 2017), and job satisfaction (cf. Bakan & Buyukbese, 2013). Further, as previous research has indicated, men tend to restructure their role to adapt to fatherhood. One meaning and responsibility men have attributed to fatherhood is the role of a provider (Olmstead, Futris, & Pasley, 2009). Therefore, the finding that income was a significant demographic variable may be because men view financial responsibility as a component of their provider role.

With regard to new fathers' parenting self-efficacy, two findings emerged in the bivariate regressions. First, new fathers' parenting self-efficacy was negatively associated with family of origin father psychological control. This finding is consistent with previous research. Intrusive or psychologically controlling parenting has been shown to be negatively related to adolescent and emerging adults' ability to develop a stable and integrated identity and their commitment to an established identity in adulthood (Barber, 2002; Luyckx et. al., 2007). Further, this finding is also

consistent with previous research that has found parental psychological control to be negatively associated with youth self-esteem, defined as an individual's overall feelings of self-worth or acceptance (Ozdemir, 2012; Rosenberg, 1965). Thus, the intrusive nature of psychological control may reduce feelings of worth and competence, and this relationship may hold inter-generationally.

A second finding that emerged from the bivariate regressions is that new fathers' parenting self-efficacy was positively associated with their reports of their fathers' support. Given that support also emerged as the only significant correlate of parenting self-efficacy in the context of the other parenting measures, this finding is discussed in detail below.

In the multiple regression examining the relationship between new fathers' parenting self-efficacy and family of origin fathering variables, only family of origin father support was positively associated with new fathers' parenting self-efficacy. This indicates that support explained unique variance in parenting self-efficacy beyond what was explained by psychological control, but family of origin father psychological control did not contribute explanatory power beyond that of father support. It is likely that the regression analyses yielded only one significant finding because the independent variables have some extent of relatedness and thus their shared predictive ability is ignored by the regression approach. The finding that family of origin father support is associated with new fathers' parenting self-efficacy is consistent with theory and previous research, for example, in studies with similar samples with regard to participants' income, adolescents' perceptions of parental support is significantly associated with self-efficacy in other domains, such as the classroom and in careers (Ginevra, Nota, & Ferrari, 2015; Ruholt, Gore, & Dukes, 2015).

When considering the mechanisms through which family of origin fathers' support may translate into improved parenting efficacy for adult men, it is important to note that participants who reported higher support from their fathers likely had more involved fathers (cf. Amato & Rivera, 1999). Considering the support items in the present study, men who responded that "he made me feel better after talking over my worries with him" was "a lot" like their father, likely had fathers who were simply present and positively involved. Research conducted using a sample of men with varying family of origin father types found that men held attitudes towards fathering that reflected their own father's involvement (Guzzo, 2011). Positive father involvement, a similar construct to support but with a quantity (rather than quality) of time aspect, provides an opportunity for modeling of positive father support behaviors. Mead (1934) indicated that individuals acquire beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors through observing and modeling. Further, some researchers argue that parents are the primary source of children's socialization because they transmit family-specific attitudes, parenting styles, and beliefs (Grusec et. al., 2000). Self-efficacy theory supports these findings as well; modeling produces an opportunity for learning, and observers acquire symbolic representations from modeled activities (Bandura, 1969a, 1971a). It is possible that family of origin parental support contributes to new fathers' feelings of competence and efficacy through the modeling and positive representation of parenting that occurs when fathers are supportive during childhood and adolescence.

None of the family of origin fathering measures were associated with new fathers' role satisfaction in the individual models or the multiple regression. Of course, this finding that no parenting variable was significant in the multiple regression is expected because if an association did not emerge in individual bivariate models, it is unlikely to emerge in a joint model with other variables competing for predictive ability.

No known studies have previously investigated parenting received and its association with subsequent fathering role satisfaction or role salience; however, the current study's finding that neither fathering identity variable was associated with any family of origin measure is not consistent with our expectations from theory. Identity theory states that role salience refers to the commitment and meaning one ascribes to a particular role (Stryker, 1968) and that roles are fluid over time, hierarchically organized, and based on socially agreed upon meanings for fulfillment (Stryker, 1968). Thus, the norms and values of a society at the time that the new father is parenting may have more influence on the formation of his identity as a father than the fathering he received in a prior socio-historical period. Perhaps fathers are developing their meaning of what a father is from present-day cues they receive from their peers and society more broadly about what fathering should look like and how important the role should be relative to other roles. The satisfaction a new father derives from his role may similarly be a function of social comparisons with other contemporary fathers in his social circle or the expectations of other important individuals in the father's life. This idea is in keeping with the premises of identity theory in that it includes the perception and appraisal of others in a social environment (Stryker & Serpe, 1994). Thus, current commitments may outweigh the role model of fathers when the men were children or adolescents. This present-day socialization process may be more relevant for new fathers than the intergenerational socialization mechanism.

Additionally, the level of satisfaction a person has with a role has been reported to be related to the skills an individual brings to a specific role (Steele & Barling, 1996; Wethington & Kessler, 1989). Therefore, it is possible that an individual's satisfaction with his fathering role may increase through the development of personal skills more so than through the model of fathering they received during childhood and adolescence. Taking this idea one step further, it

could be the case that these new fathers have not yet developed the skills that could later contribute to their role satisfaction. To summarize, identity theory and limited existing literature suggest that personal skills, social norms, and individual variations contribute to role satisfaction. The internalized nature of an individual's fathering role satisfaction and salience may not be impacted by the fathering he received.

Turning now to the results of RQ2, father type did not moderate the relationships between any of the family of origin fathering variables and any father identity variable. Although reviewed literature suggests that, on average, non-biological fathers are less involved than biological fathers (cf. Fox & Bruce, 1999), little is known about whether specific fathering variables have a different impact on offspring based on the structure of the father-child relationship. Additionally, it should be noted that even these studies indicating different levels of fathering (e.g., more or less father involvement) based on father type stem from upper-middle class, educated, primarily White samples (cf. Foley et al., 2004; Fox & Bruce, 1999, Hofferth & Anderson, 2003), whereas the present study used a low SES sample. Further, although several studies have investigated whether family structure moderated the relationship between a parental characteristic (e.g., education level) with a youth outcome (cf. Martin, 2012), there has been less investigation of moderation of parenting dimensions, and fewer articles still focused on moderation of fathering dimensions by family structure. One somewhat related study investigated whether family structure (nuclear vs. non-nuclear) moderated the relationships between Baumrind's parenting types and adolescents' identity development (Basson, 2018). They reported no moderation by family structure. Thus, it could be that the relationship between parenting and identity development, whether for adolescents or new fathers, is unrelated to family structure. Given that our participants are all biological fathers themselves, there was an

expectation that perhaps the support of biological fathers would have had a stronger impact on new fathers' parenting identities than the support of non-biological fathers. This was not the case in the present study.

Limitations

There several limitations to the current study. First, it is quite likely there was a selection effect with regard to the original sample, given that mothers were put in a gatekeeping situation with regard to family enrolment in the study. This being the case, it is likely that mothers who were in positive relationships with the home visited babies' fathers were more likely to agree to allow the family to participate. Thus, our sample likely does not reflect the home visited population more broadly.

Another limitation is that participants were asked to retrospectively report on their experiences with their father figure during childhood and adolescence. Some may question the validity and reliability of retrospective reports and suggest they misrepresent actual experiences or a produce a problematic shift in frames of reference (cf. Pratt, McGuigan, & Katzev, 2000; Rocca, Wilson, Jeon, & Foster, 2019). However, Bell and Bell (2018) reported that retrospective reports validly captured family environmental influences during childhood and adolescence. Further, some researchers suggest that traditional and retrospective studies are both subject to bias but recommend retrospective reports to assess participants' subjective experiences (Hill & Betz, 2005). Doll, Bartenfield, and Binder (2003) suggested that retrospective designs can provide accurate information.

There are limitations related to aspects of the procedures as well. First, the telephone surveys were quite long, lasting between 35-45 minutes. This may have impacted participants' ability or willingness to provide accurate responses due to boredom or tiredness. Moreover,

because all of the measures were on three- or four-point Likert scales, they had less variability than they may have had if more response options had been provided. The decision to truncate the number of response options was made due to the nature of a telephone survey; it requires considerable time to provide participants with additional response options, and it sometimes leads to participant confusion when they do not have a visual matrix of response options. Also, restricting the sample to only include participants who indicated that they had someone who was like a father to them growing up resulted in a relatively small sample of 157 participants. Given that some questions in the present study required this sample to be further split by father type, a larger sample may have yielded different findings. Further, the fact that parenting dimensions are always correlated, and were in our study as well, may have impacted results of the multiple regression analyses. Lastly, the majority of participants indicated that they had a biological father growing up. Due to the lack of responses for step-father, adoptive father, grandfather, and some other type of father, these participants were combined into the "other" category. It could be that the relationship between fathering received and new fathers' parenting identities does actually differ between one or more category of father type, but the fact that we combined categories makes it impossible to detect this.

Implications for Research and Practice

First, future research should focus on low-income populations of fathers to identify the precursors or predictors of new fathers' perceived identity beliefs. Fathers' identities are known to contribute to the quality of their fathering and thus to subsequent child outcomes (Adamsons & Pasley, 2013; Fox & Bruce, 2001; Fox et al., 2015), thus additional exploration is warranted. Ideally, future research should measure reports of fathering during adolescence and follow up with participants when they become fathers themselves, thereby avoiding reliance on

retrospective reports. The highly skewed distribution of parenting self-efficacy, role salience, and role satisfaction showed that the current sample had very strong and positive beliefs about their identities as fathers which may have limited our ability to identify predictors of these identity variables. Further, there is a chance that participants provided socially desirable answers given that they were interviewed over the phone and their responses were not anonymous. Future research should utilize measures with more variability and more response options. Fathering identity is important (Marsiglio, Amato, Day, & Lamb, 2000; Pasley et. al., 2014), thus, we need to better understand the mechanisms that lead to a strong fathering identity, especially for low-income fathers.

Given the importance of father support in potentially shaping new fathers' parenting self-efficacy, it is important for home visitors and other family life educators to identify men who received little support from their own fathers and recognize they may not feel capable and efficacious as a father given the lack of appropriate role modeling they received. When working with a father, it is important to help him reflect on the fathering he received and how that impacts his view of himself and his fathering role. It is important for researchers and practitioners to recognize that fathers who were raised by men who did not provide high levels of warmth and support may not feel confident in themselves as fathers. By encouraging fathers to engage in warm and supportive ways, and providing opportunities for fathers to express their warmth and support, family professionals may be impacting fathering for generations to come.

Strengths and Contributions

The present study demonstrated a variety of strengths and contributes to the literature in several, key ways. First, we were able to explore fathering identity within a low-income, somewhat racially diverse sample of fathers who were receiving federally funded home visiting

services. The majority of prior research on fathering has been conducted with majority White participants with relatively high income and education levels (cf. Fox & Bruce, 1999, 2001; Fox et. al., 2015), thus our sample yields unique insights into an understudied population of fathers. Second, this study investigated the intergenerational transmission of parenting. Although the design was not longitudinal, the measures allowed participants to reflect on their childhood experiences with their own parents, and we used those reports to assess possible associations with their identity as a new father. Some studies have focused on the intergenerational transmission of "parenting" behaviors (cf. Hofferth et al., 2012; Thornberry, 2005; Thornberry et. al., 2003), but the vast majority have focused on mothering. Thus, few have focused on intergenerational transmission of fathering, and none has addressed whether family of origin fathering impacts new fathers fathering attitudes. This study contributes to the current literature by identifying sources of fathering attitudes and finding that participants who report having supportive fathers during childhood and adolescence report higher levels of parenting self-efficacy in their own roles as fathers.

REFERENCES

Abaied, J. L., & Emond, C. (2013). Parent psychological control and responses to interpersonal stress in emerging adulthood: Moderating effects of behavioral inhibition and behavioral activation. *Emerging Adulthood*, *1*(4), 258-270. doi:10.1177/2167696813485737

Adamsons, K., & Pasley, K. (2013). Refining identity theory to better account for relationships and context: Applications to fathering. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, *5*(3), 159-175. doi:10.1111/jftr.12014

Akcinar, B., & Baydar, N. (2014). Parental control is not unconditionally detrimental for externalizing behaviors in early childhood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *38*(2), 118-127. doi:10.1177/0165025413513701

Amato, P. R., & Rivera, F. (1999). Paternal involvement and children's behavior problems. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 375-384. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/353755.pdf?casa_token=pucHugfH7p8AAAAA:fCfEC G-ftQ_hB-k7sViomKR7g5jAtAUpo9CsPfiz5RLySH-ij2Lo2Dc-SJlV4jshDrA57-sLfhNiuR_mi1zf5lW9myjf4aQdeSoxi-PPfT8QyTX1BRs

Ardelt, M., & Eccles, J. S. (2001). Effects of mothers' parental efficacy beliefs and promotive parenting strategies on inner-city youth. *Journal of Family Issues*, *22*(8), 944-972. doi:10.1177/019251301022008001

Bakan, I., & Buyukbese, A. T. (2013). The relationship between employees' income level and employee job satisfaction: An empirical study. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *4*(7). Retrieved from http://www.ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_7_July_2013/3.pdf

Bandura, A. (1969*). Principles of behavior modification*. Oxford, England. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Bandura, A. (1971). Psychotherapy based upon modeling principles. In A. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (Eds.) *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change* (pp 653-708). New York: Wiley.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*(2), 191. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (1978). Reflections on self-efficacy. *Advances in Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *1*(4), 237-269. doi:10.1016/0146-6402(78)90012-7

Bandura, A. 1992. Exercise of personal agency through the self-efficacy mechanisms. In R. Schwarzer (Ed.), *Self-efficacy: Thought control of action* (pp. 3-38). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], Encyclopedia of mental health. San Diego: Academic Press, 1998). Retrieved from https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/Bandura1994EHB.pdf

Barber, B. K. (1992). Family, personality, and adolescent problem behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 69-79. doi:10.2307/353276

Barber, B. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development, 67*(6), 3296-3319. doi:10.2307/1131780

Barber, B. K. (2002). Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents. *American Psychological Association.* doi:10.1037/10422-000

Barber, B. K., Maughan, S. L., & Olsen, J. A. (2005). Patterns of parenting across adolescence. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *2005*(108), 5-16. doi:10.1002/cd.124

Barber, B. K., Olsen, J. E., & Shagle, S. C. (1994). Associations between parental psychological and behavioral control and youth internalized and externalized behaviors. *Child Development*, *65*(4), 1120-1136. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1994.tb00807.x

Barber, B. K., Stolz, H. E., & Olsen, J. A. (2005). Parental support, psychological control, and behavioral control: Assessing relevance across time, culture, and method. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 70*(4). doi:10.1111/j.1540-5834.2005.00365.x

Barber, B. K., & Thomas, D. L. (1986). Dimensions of fathers' and mothers' supportive behavior: The case for physical affection. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 783-794. doi:10.2307/352571

Barber, B. K., Xia, M., Olsen, J. A., McNeely, C. A., & Bose, K. (2012). Feeling disrespected by parents: Refining the measurement and understanding of psychological control. *Journal of Adolescence*, *35*(2), 273-287. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.10.010

Barnes, G. M., & Farrell, M. P. (1992). Parental support and control as predictors of adolescent drinking, delinquency, and related problem behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 763-776. doi:10.2307/353159

Basson, M. (2018). *Gender and family structure as moderators in the relationship between parenting styles and identity development among adolescents* (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Free State). Retrieved from https://scholar.ufs.ac.za/handle/11660/8605

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monograph: Part 2*, 4(1), 1. doi:10.1037/h0030372

Baumrind, D., & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of

    competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development*, 291-327.

    doi:10.2307/1127295

Bell, D. C., & Bell, L. G. (2018). Accuracy of retrospective reports of family

    environment. *Journal of child and family studies*, *27*(4), 1029. doi:10.1007/s10826-017-

    0948-5

Belsky, J., Jaffee, S. R., Sligo, J., Woodward, L., & Silva, P. A. (2005). Intergenerational

    transmission of warm-sensitive-stimulating parenting: A prospective study of mothers

    and fathers of 3-year-olds. *Child Development*, *76*(2), 384-396. doi:10.1111/j.1467-

    8624.2005.00852.x

Brooks-Gunn, J., & Markman, L. B. (2005). The contribution of parenting to ethnic and racial

    gaps in school readiness. *The Future of Children*, (15)1, 139-168.

    doi:10.1353/foc.2005.0001

Brown, B. B., Mounts, N., Lamborn, S. D., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting practices and peer

    group affiliation in adolescence. *Child Development*, *64*(2), 467-482.

    doi:10.2307/1131263

Bruce, C., & Fox, G. L. (1999). Accounting for patterns of father involvement: Age of child,

    father-child coresidence, and father role salience. *Sociological Inquiry*, *69*(3), 458-476.

    doi:10.1111/j.1475-682X.1999.tb00881.x

Burke, P. (1991). Identity processes and social stress. *American Sociological Review, 56*(6), 836-

    849. doi:10.2307/2096259

Burke, P., & Reitzes, D. (1981). The link between identity and role performance. *Social

    Psychology Quarterly, 44*(2), 83-92. doi:10.2307/3033704

Callero, P. (1985). Role-identity salience. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 48*(3), 203-215. doi:10.2307/3033681

Chen, Z. Y., & Kaplan, H. B. (2001). Intergenerational transmission of constructive parenting. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*(1), 17-31. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00017.x

Cheung, F., & Lucas, R. E. (2015). When does money matter most? Examining the association between income and life satisfaction over the life course. *Psychology and Aging*, *30*(1), 120-135. doi:10.1037/a0038682

Coleman, P. K., & Karraker, K. H. (1998). Self-efficacy and parenting quality: Findings and future applications. *Developmental Review*, *18*(1), 47-85. doi:10.1006/drev.1997.0448

Coleman, P. K., & Karraker, K. H. (2000). Parenting self-efficacy among mothers of school-age children: Conceptualization, measurement, and correlates. *Family Relations*, 49, 13–24. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2000.00013.x

Coleman, P. K., & Karraker, K. H. (2003). Maternal self-efficacy beliefs, competence in parenting, and toddlers' behavior and developmental status. *Infant Mental Health Journal: Official Publication of The World Association for Infant Mental Health*, *24*(2), 126-148. doi:10.1002/imhj.10048

Coley, R. L., & Hoffman, L. W. (1996). Relations of parental supervision and monitoring to children's functioning in various contexts: Moderating effects of families and neighborhoods. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *17*(1), 51-68. doi:10.1016/S0193-3973(96)90005-2

Crouter, A. C., & Head, M. R. (2002). Parental monitoring and knowledge of children. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Being and becoming a parent* (p. 461–483). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Crouter, A. C., MacDermid, S. M., McHale, S. M., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (1990). Parental monitoring and perceptions of children's school performance and conduct in dual-and single-earner families. *Developmental Psychology*, *26*(4), 649. doi:10.1037/001212-1649.26.4.649

Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*(3), 487. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487

Dishion, T. J., & McMahon, R. J. (1998). Parental monitoring and the prevention of child and adolescent problem behavior: A conceptual and empirical formulation. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 1*(1), 61-75. doi:10.1023/A:1021800432380

Doll, L., Bartenfeld, T., & Binder, S. (2003). Evaluation of interventions designed to prevent and control injuries. *Epidemiologic reviews*, *25*(1), 51-59. doi:10.1093/epirev/mxg003

Eccles, J. S., Midgley, C., Wigfield, A., Buchanan, C. M., Reuman, D., & Mac Iver, D. (1993). Development during adolescence: The impact of stage-environment fit on young adolescents' experiences in schools and in families. *American Psychologist*, *48*, 90-101. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.

Erikson E. H., (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis*. New York, NY: Norton.

Fawcett, L. M., Garton, A. F., & Dandy, J. (2009). Role of motivation, self-efficacy and parent support in adolescent structured leisure activity participation. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *61*(3), 175-182. doi:10.1080/00049530802326792

Feldman, D. H., & Goldsmith, L. T. (1986). Transgenerational influences on the development of early prodigious behavior: A case study approach. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *1986(32),* 67-85. doi:10.1002/cd.23219863206

Felson, R. B., & Zielinski, M. A. (1989). Children's self-esteem and parental support. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51(3),* 727-735. doi:10.2307/352171

Flannery, D. J., Vazsonyi, A. T., Torquati, J., & Fridrich, A. (1994). Ethnic and gender differences in risk for early adolescent substance use. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *23*(2), 195-213. Doi:10.1007/BF01537445

Flouri, E. (2007). Fathering and adolescents' psychological adjustment: The role of fathers' involvement, residence and biology status. *Child: Care, Health and Development, 34(2),* 152–161. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2214.2007.00752.x

Foley, D. L., Pickles, A., Rutter, M., Gardner, C. O., Maes, H. H., Silberg, J. L., & Eaves, L. J. (2004). Risks for conduct disorder symptoms associated with parental alcoholism in stepfather families versus intact families from a community sample. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *45*(4), 687-696. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00263.x

Fox, G. L., & Bruce, C. (2001). Conditional fatherhood: Identity theory and parental investment theory as alternative sources of explanation of fathering. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*(2), 394-403. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00394.x

Fox, G. L., Nordquist, V. M., Billen, R. M., & Savoca, E. F. (2015). Father involvement and early intervention: Effects of empowerment and father role identity. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 64*(4), 461-475. doi:10.1111/fare.12156

Ganong, L., Coleman, M., Fine, M., & Martin, P. (1999). Stepparents' affinity-seeking and affinity-maintaining strategies with stepchildren. *Journal of Family Issues*, *20*(3), 299-327. doi:10.1177/019251399020003001

Gibaud-Wallston, J., & Wandersman, L. P. (1978). *Parenting sense of competence scale*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved from https://www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/sps/documents/c-change/parenting-sense-of-competence-scale.pdf

Ginevra, M. C., Nota, L., & Ferrari, L. (2015). Parental support in adolescents' career development: Parents' and children's perceptions. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *63*(1), 2-15. doi:10.1002/j.2161-0045.2015.00091.x

Grusec, J. E., Goodnow, J. J., & Kuczynski, L. (2000). New directions in analyses of parenting contributions to children's acquisition of values. *Child development*, *71*(1), 205-211. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00135

Grusec, J. E., Hastings, P., & Mammone, N. (1994). Parenting cognitions and relationship schemas. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *1994* (66), 5-19. doi:10.1002/cd.23219946603

Guzzo, K. B. (2011). New father's experiences with their own fathers and attitudes toward fathering. *Fathering*, *9*(3), 268. doi:10.3149/fth.0903.268

Hill, L. G., & Betz, D. L. (2005). Revisiting the retrospective pretest. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *26*(4), 501-517. doi:10.1177/1098214005281356

Hofferth, S., & Anderson, K. (2003). Are all dads equal? Biology versus marriage as a basis for parental investment. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65,* 213-232. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00213.x

Hofferth, S. L., Pleck, J. H., & Vesely, C. K. (2012). The transmission of parenting from fathers to sons. *Parenting*, *12*(4), 282-305. doi:10.1080/15295192.2012.709153

Hostinar, C. E., Johnson, A. E., & Gunnar, M. R. (2015). Parent support is less effective in buffering cortisol stress reactivity for adolescents compared to children. *Developmental Science*, *18*(2), 281-297. doi:10.1111/desc.12195

Ihinger-Tallman, M., Pasley, K., & Buehler, C. (1993). Developing a middle-range theory of father involvement postdivorce. *Journal of Family Issues*, *14*(4), 550-571. doi:10.1177/019251393014004005

Jacobs, J. N., & Kelley, M. L. (2006). Predictors of paternal involvement in childcare in dual-earner families with young children. *Fathering: A Journal of theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers*, 4(1), 23-47. doi:10.3149/ h.0401.23

Jackson, G. L., Krull, J. L., Bradbury, T. N., & Karney, B. R. (2017). Household income and trajectories of marital satisfaction in early marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *79*(3), 690-10.1111/jomf.12394

Johnston, C. & Mash, E.J. (1989). A measure of parenting satisfaction and efficacy. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*. 1989, 18, 167–175. doi:10.1207/s15374424jccp1802_8

Jones, T. L., & Prinz, R. J. (2005). Potential roles of parental self-efficacy in parent and child adjustment: A review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *25*(3), 341-363. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2004.12.004

Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2000). What parents know, how they know it, and several forms of adolescent adjustment: Further support for a reinterpretation of monitoring. *Developmental Psychology*, *36*(3), 366. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.36.3.366

Kulik, L., Shilo-Levin, S., & Liberman, G. (2014). Multiple roles, role satisfaction, and sense of meaning in life: An extended examination of role enrichment theory. *Journal of Career Assessment.* Advance Online Publication. doi:10.1177/ 1069072714523243

Kurdek, L. A., Fine, M. A., & Sinclair, R. J. (1995). School adjustment in sixth graders: Parenting transitions, family climate, and peer norm effects. *Child Development*, *66*(2), 430-445. doi:10.2307/1131588

Lamb, M. E. (Ed.). (2004). *The role of the father in child development*. John Wiley & Sons. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=iwdjF4r_OF0C&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq= +Lamb+ME,+ed.+The+Role+of+the+Father+in+Child+Development.+Hoboken,+NJ:+ Wiley,+2004.&ots=hSL72Kzk4o&sig=qtTET99v8i6HEdcO9lL3R5iISvs#v=onepage&q &f=false

Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, *62*(5), 1049-1065. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1991.tb01588.x

LaRossa, R., & Reitzes, D. C. (1993). Continuity and change in middle class fatherhood, 1925-1939: The culture-conduct connection. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *55*(2), 455. doi:10.2307/352815

Laws, G., & Millward, L. (2001). Predicting parents' satisfaction with the education of their child with down's syndrome. *Educational Research*, 43, 209–226. doi:10.1080/00131880110051173

Li, D., Zhang, W., & Wang, Y. (2015). Parental behavioral control, psychological control and Chinese adolescents' peer victimization: The mediating role of self-control. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *24*(3), 628-637. doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9873-4

Luyckx, K., Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Goossens, L., & Berzonsky, M. D. (2007). Parental psychological control and dimensions of identity formation in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *21*(3), 546. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.21.3.546

Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology*: *Vol. 4: Socialization, Personality, and Social Development* (4th ed., pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.

Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*, *9*(11), 159-187.

Marsiglio, W. (2004). When stepfathers claim stepchildren: A conceptual analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*(1), 22-39. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2004.00002.x

Marsiglio, W., Amato, P., Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Scholarship on fatherhood in the 1990s and beyond. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *62*(4), 1173-1191. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01173.x

Martin, M. A. (2012). Family structure and the intergenerational transmission of educational advantage. *Social Science Research*, *41*(1), 33-47. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2011.07.005

Martire, L. M., Stephens, M. A. P., & Atienza, A. A. (1997). The interplay of work and caregiving: Relationships between role satisfaction, role involvement, and caregivers' well-being. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *52*(5), S279-S289. doi:10.1093/geronb/52B.5.S279

Martire, L. M., Stephens, M. A. P., & Townsend, A. L. (2000). Centrality of women's multiple roles: Beneficial and detrimental consequences for psychological well-being. *Psychology and Aging*, *15*(1), 148. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.15.1.148

Maternal and Child Health Bureau. (2019). Home Visiting. Retrieved from https://mchb.hrsa.gov/maternal-child-health-initiatives/home-visiting-overview

McCord, J. (1979). Some child-rearing antecedents of criminal behavior in adult men. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*(9), 1477. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.37.9.1477

Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, self, and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist (Works of George Herbert Mead, Vol. 1).

Minton, C., & Pasley, K. (1996). Fathers' parenting role identity and father involvement: A comparison of nondivorced and divorced, nonresident fathers. *Journal of Family Issues*, *17*(1), 26-45. doi:10.1177/019251396017001003

Mounts, N. S. (2004). Contributions of parenting and campus climate to freshmen adjustment in a multiethnic sample. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *19*(4), 468-491. doi:10.1177/0743558403258862

Murdock, K. W. (2013). An examination of parental self-efficacy among mothers and fathers. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *14*(3), 314. doi:10.1037/a0027009

Nelson S. K., Kushlev K., & Lyubomirsky S. (2014). The pains and pleasures of parenting: when, why, and how is parenthood associated with more or less well-being?. *Psychological Bulletin*. 140(3):846–95. doi:10.1037/a0035444

Ohan, J. L., Leung, D. W., & Johnston, C. (2000). The parenting sense of competence scale: Evidence of a stable factor structure and validity. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *32*(4), 251. doi:10.1037/h0087122

Olmstead, S. B., Futris, T. G., & Pasley, K. (2009). An exploration of married and divorced, nonresident men's perceptions and organization of their father role identity. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers*, *7*(3). doi:10.3149/fth.0703.249

Özdemir, Y. (2012). Parental behavioral and psychological control relationships to self-esteem, life satisfaction, depression, and antisocial behaviors. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *9*(2), 1581-1590. Retrieved from https://www.j-humansciences.com/ojs/index.php/IJHS/article/view/2280

Palkovitz, R. (2002). Involved fathering and child development: Advancing our understanding of good fathering. In C. Tamis-LaMonda & N. Cabrerra (Eds.), *Handbook of Father Involvement (*pp. 119-140). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Pasley, K., Petren, R. E., & Fish, J. N. (2014). Use of identity theory to inform fathering scholarship. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, *6*(4), 298-318. doi:10.1111/jftr.12052

Patterson, G. R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1984). The correlation of family management practices and delinquency. *Child Development, 55*(4), 1299-1307. doi:10.2307/1129999

Pederson, F. A. (1985). Research and the father: Where do we go from here? In S.M.H. Hanson & F. W. Bozett (Eds.), Dimensions of fatherhood (pp. 435-450). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Pellerone, M. (2015). Influence of identity, congruence of interest and coping strategy on decision making. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *191*, 1344-1348. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.465

Pennell, C., Whittingham, K., Boyd, R., Sanders, M., & Colditz, P. (2012). Prematurity and parental self-efficacy: The preterm parenting & self-efficacy checklist. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *35*(4), 678-688. doi:10.1016/j.infbeh.2012.07.009

Pettit, G. S., & Laird, R. D. (2002). Psychological control and monitoring in early adolescence: The role of parental involvement and earlier child adjustment. In B. K. Barber (Ed.), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents* (p. 97–123). American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10422-004

Pettit, G. S., Laird, R. D., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Criss, M. M. (2001). Antecedents and behavior-problem outcomes of parental monitoring and psychological control in early adolescence. *Child Development, 72*(2), 583-598. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00298

Pleck, J. H. (1985). Working wives, working husbands. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Pratt, C. C., McGuigan, W. M., & Katzev, A. R. (2000). Measuring program outcomes: Using retrospective pretest methodology. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *21*(3), 341-349. doi:10.1177/109821400002100305

Rane, T. R., & McBride, B. A. (2000). Identity theory as a guide to understanding fathers' involvement with their children. *Journal of Family Issues*, *21*(3), 347-366. doi:10.1177/019251300021003004

Rocca, C. H., Wilson, M. R., Jeon, M., & Foster, D. G. (2019). Stability of retrospective pregnancy intention reporting among women with unwanted pregnancies in the United States. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, *23*(11), 1547-1555. doi:10.1007/s10995-019-02782-9

Roche, K. M., Ahmed, S., & Blum, R. W. (2008). Enduring consequences of parenting for risk behaviors from adolescence into early adulthood. *Social science & medicine*, *66*(9), 2023-2034. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.01.009

Rohner, R. P. (1986). *The warmth dimension: Foundations of parental acceptance-rejection theory*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Rollins, B. C., & Thomas, D. L. (1979). *Parental support, power, and control techniques in the socialization of children* New York: Free Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Rosenberg self-esteem scale (RSE). *Acceptance and commitment therapy. Measures package*, *61*(52), 18. Retrieved from http://www.integrativehealthpartners.org/downloads/ACTmeasures.pdf#page=61

Ruholt, R. E., Gore, J., & Dukes, K. (2015). Is parental support or parental involvement more important for adolescents?. *Undergraduate Journal of Psychology*, *28*(1), 1-8. Retrieved from https://journals.uncc.edu/ujop/article/view/292

Sabatelli, R. M., & Mazor, A. (1985). Differentiation, individuation, and identity formation: The integration of family system and individual developmental perspectives. *Adolescence*, 20, 619-633.

Sevigny, P. R., & Loutzenhiser, L. (2010). Predictors of parenting self-efficacy in mothers and fathers of toddlers. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, *36*(2), 179-189. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2214.2009.00980.x

Schaefer, E. S. (1965). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. *Child Development, 36*(2), 413-424. doi:10.2307/1126465

Schludermann, E. H., & Schludermann, S. M. (1988). Children's Report on Parent Behavior (CRPBI-108, CRPBI-30) for older children and adolescents. *Winnipeg, MB, Canada: University of Manitoba*.

Schneewind, K. A. (1995). Impact of family processes on control beliefs. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies* (pp. 114-148). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Siegelman, M. (1965). Evaluation of Bronfenbrenner's questionnaire for children concerning parental behavior. *Child Development*, 36(1), 163-174. doi:10.2307/1126788

Simons, R. L., Beaman, J., Conger, R. D., & Chao, W. (1993). Childhood experience, conceptions of parenting, and attitudes of spouse as determinants of parental behavior. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55(1), 91-106. doi:10.2307/352961

Stattin, H., & Kerr, M. (2000). Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. *Child Development*, *71*(4), 1072-1085. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00210

Steele, J., & Barling, J. (1996). Influence of maternal gender-role beliefs and role satisfaction on daughters' vocational interests. *Sex Roles*, *34*(9-10), 637-648. doi:10.1007/BF01551499

Steinberg, L. (1990). Autonomy, conflict, and harmony in the family relationship. In: Feldman SS, Elliot GR, editors. *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (p. 255–276). Harvard University Press; Cambridge, MA.

Steinberg, L., & Silverberg, S. B. (1986). The vicissitudes of autonomy in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 841-851. doi:10.2307/1130361

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Darling, N., Mounts, N. S., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1994). Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, *65*(3), 754-770. doi:10.2307/1131416

Stryker, S. (1959). Symbolic interaction as an approach to family research. *Marriage and Family Living*, *21*(2), 111-119. doi:10.2307/348099

Stryker, S. (1968). Identity salience and role performance: The relevance of symbolic interaction theory for family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 558-564. doi:10.2307/349494

Stryker, S. (1980). *Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version*. Benjamin-Cummings Publishing Company.

Stryker, S. (1987). Identity theory: Developments and extensions. In K. Yardley & T. Honess (Eds.), *Self and identity: Psychosocial perspectives* (p. 89–103). John Wiley & Sons.

Stryker, S., & Burke, P. J. (2000). The past, present, and future of an identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 63(4),* 284-297. doi:10.2307/2695840

Stryker, S., & Serpe, R. T. (1982). Commitment, identity salience, and role behavior: Theory and research example. *Personality, roles, and social behavior* (pp. 199-218). Springer, New York, NY.

Stryker, S., & Serpe, R. T. (1994). Identity salience and psychological centrality: Equivalent, overlapping, or complementary concepts? *Social Psychology Quarterly, 57(1),* 16-35. doi:10.2307/2786972

Teti, D., & Gelfand, D. (1991). Behavioral competence among mothers of infants in the first year: The mediational role of maternal self-efficacy. *Child Development. 62(5),* 918–929. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1991.tb01580.x

Thoits, P.A. (2011). Mechanisms linking social ties and support to physical and mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 52(2),* 45-161. doi:10.1177/0022146510395592.

Trahan, M. H. (2017). Paternal self-efficacy and father involvement: A bi-directional relationship. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity. 19*(4), 624-634. doi:10.1037/men0000130

Thornberry, T. P. (2005). Explaining multiple patterns of offending across the life course and across generations. *ANNALS, American Academy of Political and Social Science, 602(1),* 156–194. doi:10.1177/0002716205280641

Thornberry, T. P., Freeman–Gallant, A., Lizotte, A. J., Krohn, M. D., & Smith, C. A. (2003).

    Linked lives: The intergenerational transmission of antisocial behavior. *Journal of*

    Abnormal Child Psychology, 31(2), 171–184. doi:10.1023/A:1022574208366

Umberson, D., & Williams, C. L. (1993). Divorced fathers: Parental role strain and

    psychological distress. *Journal of Family Issues*, *14*(3), 378-400.

    doi:10.1177/019251393014003003

Van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (1992). Intergenerational transmission of parenting: A review of studies

    in nonclinical populations. *Developmental Review*, *12*(1), 76-99. doi:10.1016/0273-

    2297(92)90004-L

Wethington, E., & Kessler, R. C. (1989). Employment, parental responsibility, and psychological

    distress: A longitudinal study of married women. *Journal of Family Issues*, *10*(4), 527-

    546. doi:10.1177/019251389010004006

Whitbeck, L. B. (1987). Modeling efficacy: The effect of perceived parental efficacy on the self-

    efficacy of early adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *7*, 165-177.

    doi:10.1177/0272431687072004

White, L. (1994). Stepfamilies over the life course: Social support. In A. Booth and J. Dunn

    (Eds.), *Stepfamilies: Who benefits? Who does not*, (pp. 109-138). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence

    Erlbaum Associates

White, L., & Gilbreth, J. G. (2001). When children have two fathers: Effects of relationships

    with stepfathers and noncustodial fathers on adolescent outcomes. *Journal of Marriage*

    and Family, *63*(1), 155-167. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00155.x

White, M. J., & Kaufman, G. (1997). Language usage, social capital, and school completion among immigrants and native-born ethnic groups. *Social Science Quarterly, 78(2),* 385-398. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/42864344

Wijsbroek, S. A., Hale III, W. W., Raaijmakers, Q. A., & Meeus, W. H. (2011). The direction of effects between perceived parental behavioral control and psychological control and adolescents' self-reported GAD and SAD symptoms. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *20*(7), 361-371. doi:10.1007/s00787-011-0183-3

Yeung, W. J., Duncan, G. J., & Hill, M. S. (2000). Putting fathers back in the picture: Parental activities and children's adult outcomes. *Marriage & Family Review*, *29*(2-3), 97-113. doi:10.1300/J002v29n02_07

APPENDIX

Appendix A

Key Variable Descriptive Characteristics (N = 157)

Variables	M	SD	Range
Income	28,466	16,662.62	10,200 – 150,000
Role Salience	3.99	.22	2.88-4.00
Role Satisfaction	3.35	.54	1.88-4.00
Parenting Self-Efficacy	3.68	.37	2.14-4.00
FO[a] Support	2.57	.55	1.00-3.00
FO Behavioral Control	2.51	.54	1.00-3.00
FO Psychological Control	1.24	.36	1.00-3.00

[a]FO = Family of Origin

Appendix B

Family of Origin Parenting and New Fathers' Parenting Identities: Correlations (N = 157)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Income	–						
2. FO[a] Support	-.02	–					
3. FO Behavioral Control	-.12	.47**	–				
4. FO Psychological Control	-.10	-.56**	-.37**	–			
5. Parenting Self-Efficacy	.14	.27**	.09	-.22*	–		
6. Role Salience	.01	.08	.10	-.02	.37**	–	
7. Role Satisfaction	.30**	.13	.05	-.20*	.28**	.24**	–

[a]FO = Family of Origin
**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

Appendix C

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting New Fathers' Role Satisfaction

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Income	6.82E-6	.000	.27**	6.58E-6	.000	.26**
Support				-.16	.12	-.17
Psychological Control				-.27	.16	-.21
Behavioral Control				.09	.10	.12
R^2		.07			.12	
F for change in R^2		6.41**			2.75**	

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Appendix D

Summary of Simple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting New Fathers' Parenting Self-Efficacy

Variable	Parenting Self-Efficacy		
	B	*SE B*	*β*
Support	.17	.09	.25*
Psychological Control	-.09	.11	-.09
Behavioral Control	-.05	.07	-.07
R^2		.08	
F		3.36**	

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Appendix E

Summary of Simple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting New Fathers' Role Salience

	Role Salience		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Support	.03	.05	.08
Psychological Control	.04	.06	.06
Behavioral Control	.03	.04	.08
R²		.01	
F		.65	

p < .05. **p* < .01.

VITA

Shelby Taylor Clouthier is from Nashville, Tennessee. She attended the University of Tennessee in Knoxville. Shelby completed her Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology with a minor in Child and Family Studies in 2018. She remained at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville to obtain her Master of Science degree. Her Master of Science degree is in Child and Family Studies with a minor in Statistics and a certificate in International Children, Youth, and Families. While attending UT, Shelby served as both an Undergraduate and Graduate Research Assistant in the Center for Parenting. She also completed a practicum at the Episcopal School of Knoxville. Shelby is a member of the National Council on Family Relations and the Outreach and Engagement Chair for the Child and Family Studies Graduate Student Organization. Shelby graduated from the University of Tennessee in 2020 with her Master's and plans to work as a private school teacher or in an education related field.