Pollack, W. S., with Shuster, T. (2000). *Real boys' voices*. New York: Random House.
Pomerleau, A., Bolduc, D., Malcuit, G., & Cossette, L. (1990). Pink or blue: Environmental gender stereotypes in the first two years of life. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 22*(5-6), 359-367.
Pyke, K., & Coltrane, S. (1996). Entitlement, obligation, and gratitude in family work. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*(1), 60-82.
Remy, J. (1990). Patriarchy and fratriarchy as forms of androcracy In J. Hearn & D. H. J. Morgan (Eds.), *Men, masculinities and social theory* (pp. 43-54). London: Unwin Hyman.
Risman, B. (1989). Can men "Mother"? Life as a single father. In B. J. Risman & P. Schwartz (Eds.), *Gender in intimate relationships: A microstructural approach* (pp. 155-164). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
Robinson, J. P., & Godbey, G. (1999). *Time for life: The surprising ways Americans use their time* (2nd ed.). University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Rubin, G. (1975). The traffic in women: Notes on the "political economy" of sex. In R. Reiter (Ed.), *Toward an anthropology of women* (pp. 157-210). New York: Monthly Review Press.
Rubin, J., Provenzano, R., & Luria, Z. (1974). The eye of the beholder: Parents' views on sex of newborns. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 44*, 512-519.
Rubin, L. B. (1983). *Intimate strangers: Men and women together*. New York: Harper & Row.
Rubin, L. B. (1985). *Just friends: The role of friendship in our lives*. New York: Harper & Row.
Sabo, D. (1998). Masculinities and men's health: Moving toward post-Superman era prevention. In M. S. Kimmel & M. A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives* (4th ed., pp. 347-361). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Sanday, P. R. (1981) *Female power and male dominance: On the origins of sexual inequality.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Sanday, P. R. (1990). *Fraternity gang rape: Sex, brotherhood, and privilege on campus*. New York: New York University Press.
Schutz, A. (1970). *On phenomenology and social relations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Schwartz, P., & Rutter, V. (1998). *The gender of sexuality.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
Silverstein, O., & Rashbaum, B. (1994). *The courage to raise good men*. New York: Penguin.
Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (1999). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 1999 national report*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
Stacey, J. (1996). *In the name of the family: Rethinking family values in the postmodern age.* Boston: Beacon.
Stern, M., & Karraker, K. H. (1989). Sex stereotyping of infants: A review of gender labeling studies. *Sex Roles, 20*, 501-522.
Szockyj, E., & Fox, J. G. (1996). *Corporate victimization of women*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
Teachman, J. D. (1992). Intergenerational resource transfers across disrupted households: Absent fathers' contributions to the well-being of their children. In S. J. South & S. E. Tolnay (Eds.), *The changing American family: Sociological and demographic perspectives* (pp. 224-246). Boulder, CO: Westview.
Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
Weiss, G. (1995). Sex-selective abortion: A relational approach. *Hypatia, 10*(1), 202-217.
Weitzman, L. (1981). *The marriage contract: Spouses, lovers, and the law.* New York: Free Press.
West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society, 1*, 125-151.
Williams, E., Radin, N., & Allegro, T. (1992). Sex role attitudes of adolescents reared primarily by their fathers: An 11-year follow-up. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 38*, 457-476.
Wood, J. (1994). *Gendered lives: Communication, gender, and culture*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
Yellowbird, M., & Snipp, C. M. (1994). American Indian families. In R. L. Taylor (Ed.), *Minority families in the United States: A multicultural perspective* (pp. 179-201). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

15

FATHERHOOD AND MASCULINITIES

WILLIAM MARSIGLIO

JOSEPH H. PLECK

Much has been learned about the various dimensions of fatherhood during the past few decades, as is documented in several recent and expansive reviews (Lamb, 1997; Marsiglio, Amato, Day, & Lamb, 2000; Parke, 2002; J. H. Pleck, 1997). These diverse emotional, psychological, and behavioral dimensions involve men's attitudes about and experiences with being fathers prior to conception, during pregnancy, and throughout their children's lives (with behavior often being referred to as involvement or investment). Most of this scholarship has focused on fathers living in various Western industrialized countries (Hobson, 2002; Lamb, 1987), although researchers have studied fathering in Asian cultures such as China (Ho, 1987; Jankowiak, 1992) and Japan (Ishii-Kuntz, 1992, 1993, 1994; Shwalb, Imaizumi, & Nakazawa, 1987) as well as numerous nonindustrialized societies around the world (Coltrane, 1988; Engle & Breaux, 1998; Hewlett, 1992, 2000; Tripp-Reimer & Wilson, 1991). Another noteworthy comparative study examined fathering behaviors in a diverse mix of 18 countries (Mackey, 1985). Students of gender also may be interested in historical analyses of fathering that go beyond the scope of our review (Griswold, 1993; LaRossa, 1997; LaRossa & Reitzes, 1995; E. H. Pleck & Pleck, 1997).

Our primary aim in this review is to examine scholarship on fatherhood from a gendered and critical perspective. Although the literature that specifically addresses the relationship between masculinities and fatherhood is sparse, it is sufficient in scope to warrant a review and to allow us to propose a forward-looking research agenda. We supplement our review by incorporating literature that may not be informed explicitly by a critical gender perspective, but which still contributes to a gendered understanding of fatherhood. Our scope, however, does not allow us to discuss recent work on cultural representations of fatherhood in entertainment media and social marketing promoted by organizations with interests in fatherhood, and how gender displays are intertwined with the messages being conveyed (Coltrane & Allan, 1994; LaRossa, Gadgil, & Wynn, 2000; Lupton & Barclay, 1997).

Authors' note: Part of the work reported here was supported by the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, under Project No. ILLU-45-0329 to Joseph H. Pleck.

At the outset, we focus on debates about whether men as fathers can uniquely affect their children. We then consider how the style of men's fathering contributes to gendered social inequalities within and outside families/households. At numerous points, we accentuate how men's participation in systems of gendered social relations—both between and within genders—shapes their fathering opportunities, attitudes, and behavior. Next, we underscore how fathering occurs in various settings where circumstances associated with age, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and sexual orientation come into play. When viewed through a gender lens, we can see how these contexts create different opportunities and struggles for men as they think about and attempt to act as male parents. We conclude by suggesting avenues for future research that would advance our understanding of fatherhood from a critical gendered perspective.

As we take stock of the relevant literature, we emphasize several themes. Most important, we highlight the intersection among the main structures of social inequality—gender, race/ethnicity, and social class—while clarifying how these three factors affect the social construction of fatherhood images and the way men experience their lives as fathers. Consistent with recent theoretical work in the area of men and gender (Connell, 1995, 2000), fathering can be studied in connection to hegemonic masculinity as well as alternative constructions of masculinities that give meaning to men's everyday lives in diverse situations.

Just as it is critical to acknowledge the implications of multiple masculinities, we pay particular attention to the dual concerns of men as breadwinners and nurturing parents while focusing on the initial phases of the fathering life course. Fathers and their children typically spend three to six overlapping decades in their respective roles, but most fatherhood scholarship is restricted to the first 18 years of this joint father-child experience (but see Pillemer & McCartney, 1991; also Pfiefer & Sussman, 1991). Our review emphasizes fathering during these early years, although we suggest how future research can address a wider range of issues across the fathering life course.

Efforts to study fatherhood and promote father-relevant social policies have gone global in recent decades. Capturing the full breadth and depth of these initiatives is beyond our limited scope here. While we selectively review and integrate cross-cultural materials from industrialized and nonindustrialized societies into our assessment of the literature, much of what we cover is most salient to a U.S. context. In broad terms, the cross-cultural literature teaches us that there is considerable variation in how men act as fathers, that children can flourish in societies where different types of paternal models and expectations of children exist, and that gender as a social organizing principle is implicated in various ways throughout the world in structuring the opportunities for fathers to interact with and invest in their children. Hearn (2002) provides a useful review of men, fathers, and the state within an international context while advancing a critical perspective on studying men.

Finally, our review accentuates how knowledge about fathering is produced, disseminated, and evaluated. We take our cue from Stacey and Biblarz (2001), who showed how the production of knowledge can be assessed in a controversial area like sexual orientation and parenting. Being attentive to the social construction of knowledge about fathering is vital because, as those working closely in the field know, there are several hotly contested research and policy issues that challenge individuals to navigate the waters that muddle theory, research, and propaganda. Those debates that are most contentious focus on whether (and how) fathers matter to their children in unique and meaningful ways, the presumed positive value of marriage in fathers' lives, nonresident fathers' financial and interpersonal commitments to their children, and the potential danger that stepfathers may pose for their stepchildren. Not surprisingly, those who research and/or debate these issues often practice gender politics and swear allegiance to various brands of feminism, family and/or religious values, theoretical perspectives, or modes of scientific inquiry (Blankenhorn, 1995; Daniels, 1998; Dowd, 2000; Popenoe, 1996; Silverstein, 1996). Those stakeholders who are most effective in framing the key issues and paradigms in the minds of the research community, the general public, and policymakers can in various ways influence what is generally "known" about how fathers feel, think, and act. They do this by shaping the types of questions that researchers ask, the way research is conducted, and how research is presented, interpreted, and used by researchers, policymakers, social service professionals, and the general public alike. A critical review of the field, then, should pay attention not only to how fathering experiences are influenced by and shape gendered social structures and relations. It must also draw attention to the gender-related and ideological struggles among the knowledge producers that can confound research and political agendas within the field itself.

Is Fathering "Essentially" Different From Mothering?

One highly politicized issue central to a discussion linking fathering and masculinities revolves around the debate whether fathers, as men, are uniquely equipped with characteristics that differentiate their parenting styles and contributions to children from those of mothers. This debate is often couched in terms of essentialist (Silverstein & Auerbach, 1999) and social constructionist approaches (Brandth & Kvande, 1998, Lupton & Barclay, 1997; Marsiglio, 1995, 1998) to fatherhood. These discussions gain political and theoretical visibility because they are often associated with the illusive and controversial concept of "fatherlessness" (Blankenhorn, 1995) and the championing of evolutionary psychological approaches to understanding parenting (Popenoe, 1996).

In gender studies, the critique of "essentialism" has been an important recent theoretical development (Coltrane, 1994; Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1990). Essentialism provides a conceptual rubric under which to discuss several aspects of fatherhood that are fundamental to consider from a gender perspective. Silverstein and Auerbach (1999) identified and critically analyzed three component beliefs in an implicit "essentialist paradigm for fatherhood": (a) gender differences in parenting are universal and biologically based; (b) fathers' uniquely masculine form of parenting significantly improves developmental outcomes for children, especially for sons; and (c) the context in which fathers are most likely to provide for and nurture young children is heterosexual marriage. Their analysis caused quite a stir and was vigorously challenged in the popular press (Chavez, 1999; Horn, 1999).

As Silverstein and Auerbach noted, the essentialist view of fatherhood, particularly as expressed by Blankenhorn (1995) and Popenoe (1996), underlies recent neoconservative policy initiatives to promote marriage. This view also is reflected in organizations such as the Promise Keepers (Brickner, 1999; Claussen, 2000) and the National Fatherhood Initiative (Horn, 1995). The enormous empirical and theoretical literature relevant to these three beliefs is beyond the scope of this chapter to review in any depth. Thus, we will discuss only selected issues, especially ones Silverstein and Auerbach did not address and those that enable us to highlight the larger context within which knowledge in this area is socially constructed.

The Universality and Biological Basis of Gender Differences in Parenting

The hypothetical universality of gender-differentiated parental rearing of the young—that is, fathers being less involved—has been considered both across nonhuman primate species and cross-culturally among human societies. For the former, both Lamb, Pleck, Charnov, and Levine's (1985) and Silverstein and Auerbach's reviews suggest that gender-differentiated parental rearing of the young is far less universal than is popularly believed. Smuts and Gubernick (1992) provided evidence that this interspecies variation can be explained by a "reciprocity hypothesis," holding that fathers invest more in the young when females have more to offer fathers. For example, in species with multimale family groups, in which females therefore choose which males to copulate with, fathers invest more in the young than in species with one-male groups (Silverstein, 1993; see Belsky, 1993, for a critique). Though provocative, inferences to human populations based on these findings should be made cautiously.

Mackey (1985), drawing on his extensive observational and comparative work on human fathers in 18 countries, concluded that it is harder to stimulate men to be caregivers for children. Mackey noted, however, that once fathers begin to respond, they do so in a manner similar to women. Mackey additionally noted that when two or more men are in an all-male group, it is harder to motivate simultaneous caregiving responses from them than is the case when two

or more women are in an all-female gathering. Scholars also agree that there is actually significant variation across the world societies studied by anthropologists in fathers' level of involvement relative to mothers' (Hewlett, 1992; Mackey, 1985; Silverstein & Auerbach, 1999), a finding inconsistent with the essentialism perspective. Silverstein and Auerbach argued that this cross-cultural variation can be explained by the reciprocity hypothesis.

Those who conduct naturalistic observations of fathers living in nonindustrialized societies conceptualize fathers' behavior in terms of parental "investment," referring to activities that promote their offspring's survival. This construct is rooted in evolutionary and biosocial frameworks that emphasize ties between biology, gender, and reproductive strategies. These approaches recognize biology's role in shaping paternal behavior while attempting to explain diversities and commonalities in paternal experience between different societies. Although the anthropologists who use these frameworks tend not to refer explicitly to "essentialism," their models are consistent with at least some essentialist thinking. Many anthropologists, though reluctant to use these models, still view gender as a significant factor affecting paternal behavior because of its role in how cultures are modified to create various types of parenting opportunities and expectations. Without explicitly invoking the essentialist paradigm, Hewlett (1992) reviewed research based on naturalistic observation and concluded,

> While cross-cultural studies question some of the European and American research, this does not mean that all aspects of fathers' role are culturally relative. Fathers in all parts of the world do share certain characteristics: fathers provide less direct caregiving than mothers (but there may be some fathers within a culture that take on primary caregiving), fathers are expected to provide at least some economic support for their children, and fathers are expected to support the mother economically and/or emotionally. (p. xii)

He goes on to add that it is assumed that "fathers from all parts of the world are likely to have similar concerns about the safety, health, and tradeoffs between spending time with their children and doing things that attract and keep women (e.g., working to increase status, prestige or wealth)" (p. xv).

Fathers' Unique Contributions to Child Development

Central to the essentialist conception of fatherhood is the proposition that fathers, as men, contribute to the development of their children in a unique way. This idea has generated contentious controversy, informed by research on the consequences for children of "father absence" (or growing up in a single-parent female-headed family) as well as research about the effects on children of variation in fathers' characteristics and behavior in families with fathers present. The scholarly disagreements over the meaning of the research are considerable: Widespread social concern about the large and perhaps growing number of fathers who are disconnected from their children has led to a broader, highly politicized public debate about father absence and father involvement. Different stakeholders—conservatives, feminists, fathers' rights groups, policymakers concerned with teen pregnancy and other issues, and researchers of different persuasions—advance radically conflicting positions.

Father "absence." In discussions of father absence, several issues have emerged as particularly important. First, the concept is ill-defined both conceptually and operationally. The obvious, but deceptively simple, approach focuses on whether the child's father lives in the household or not. Because fathers' potential residence or nonresidence occurs from birth to late adolescence, the length of time the father lives or does not live with the child should of course be taken into account. But exactly how long does there need to be no father in the household for a child to be "father absent"? Does absence occurring for any reason count, or only for some reasons? Should a father's being away from home for a year because of military reserve service, or his being away from home 2 weeks out of 3 because he is a long-distance trucker or a sales representative, be considered father absence? How do we classify the child who lives with her father every other weekend and 2 summer months out of 3, and with her mother the rest of the time? What about the child of a teen father who lives nearby, visits his child frequently, and contributes economically to her upbringing? And is it only the residence or nonresidence of the *biological* father that is important?

In research, respondents usually will provide an answer when asked whether they grew up in a two-parent or single-parent family. However, this does not mean their answers correspond to something that can be clearly defined or reliably measured. Readers of Blankenhorn's (1995), Horn's (1995), and Popenoe's (1996) compendiums of the negative outcomes occurring more frequently among children of absent fathers may be impressed by the length of their lists, but they may not ask how meaningful it really is to reduce the diversity of children's living arrangements over time to the simple dichotomy of father presence or absence. If one broadens the concept from physical to psychological father absence, it becomes even more difficult to define and measure reliably.

Even if these difficulties could be set aside, the results of existing research on father absence do not unequivocally establish the detrimental effects often claimed. The context in which father absence occurs can be critically important. There is evidence, for example, that the outcomes associated with father absence in the children of adult single mothers often are markedly more positive than those occurring for children of teen single mothers, who tend to have less human capital (Edelman, 1986). The potential problems of father absence in the context of teen parenthood are, nonetheless, inappropriately generalized to father absence in all circumstances. Other scholars have noted that the consequences of father absence depend on whether social supports are present or absent (Wilson, 1989).

In addition, father absence typically co-occurs with, and its effects are thus confounded by, other circumstances such as teen parenthood, divorce, and in particular low income. Simply comparing father-absent and father-present groups can thus be misleading. An analogy is that university-affiliated teaching hospitals have markedly higher rates of cesarean sections than community hospitals, but when risk factors (e.g., poor health) are controlled for, university hospitals' rate of C-sections is no higher. In many studies, similarly, controlling for family income and other factors markedly reduces the apparent negative correlates of father absence. Blankenhorn (1995), Horn (1995), and Popenoe (1996) make their case entirely with simple comparisons between father-present and -absent groups, without controlling for or acknowledging the potential confounding effects of other differences between the two groups.

Among more sophisticated analyses, McLanahan and Sandefeur's (1994) *Growing Up With a Single Parent* is the recent large-scale empirical study of father absence most widely cited. Using data from four different national surveys, these authors found, with race, maternal education, and number of children in the family included in their statistical models, that father absence has marked negative effects on educational outcomes, early childbearing, and employment. Although family income is controlled in other studies, it is not controlled here. McLanahan and Sandefeur hold that potential confounding variables should be controlled only when they represent "selection" factors for father absence (i.e., factors helping explain why father absence occurs, but which cannot be "caused" by father absence, like race and low maternal education). They argue that conditions potentially caused by father absence, such as low income, should not be controlled; doing so would underestimate the extent to which father absence actually leads to negative child outcomes. Given the difficulties in creating policies to provide adequate incomes to single-parent mothers, their argument has some pragmatic merit—and McLanahan and Sandefeur's focus clearly is on the social policy implications of father absence, not on evaluating the essentialist argument that fathers have a unique positive effect on child development. However, the essentialist position implies that father absence should have negative consequences even when the lower family income associated with it is taken into account. The supporting evidence for this claim is weak.

Fathering in two-parent families. Other relevant research concerns the effects on children resulting from variation in fathers' characteristics and behavior in families with fathers present. Considerable research in the 1950s and 1960s examined how paternal characteristics such as "sex typing" (the degree to which fathers have "masculine" personality characteristics, for example, ambitious, dominant, self-reliant), warmth, and control were related to children's gender identity, school achievement, and psychological adjustment. The influence of fathers' sex typing was of particular interest because fathers were thought to be crucial in

promoting the development of children's, and especially sons', gender identities (J. H. Pleck, 1981). These studies generally find that a father's masculinity is much less important than his warmth and closeness with his child. In addition, the same characteristics in mothers are associated with positive outcomes in children. Thus, although this research finds that positive development is correlated with father behaviors, it does not suggest that development is associated with behaviors in fathers that are unique to male parents (Lamb, 1987).

More recent research focuses on the consequences for children of fathers' degree of contact with their children, more broadly termed "involvement" by Lamb, Pleck, Charnov, and Levine (1985, 1987; J. H. Pleck, Lamb, & Levine, 1985). Involvement is defined as "the amount of time spent in activities involving the child" (Lamb et al., 1985, p. 884) and includes three components: (a) engagement with the child (in the form of caretaking, or play or leisure), (b) accessibility to the child, and (c) responsibility for the care of the child, as distinct from the performance of care. Although Palkovitz (1997) has criticized Lamb et al. for assuming that father involvement must have positive effects on children, Lamb et al. explicitly argued that involvement might have positive effects on children only in specific contexts; for example, both mother and father want the father to be involved.

More recent work on the consequences of paternal involvement has shifted focus from simply the amount of involvement, implicitly "content-free," to the nature and quality of the involvement. In most research that finds a relationship between involvement and positive child outcomes, the involvement measures actually emphasize positive forms of interaction such as shared activities and helping children learn. Consequently, J. H. Pleck (1997) concluded that the concept of father involvement should be replaced by the concept of *positive* father involvement, as defined from the child's perspective. Amato and Rivera's (1999; see also Marsiglio et al., 2000) documentation of good childhood outcomes linked to positive paternal involvement illustrates two additional methodological improvements. Because paternal and maternal involvement may correlate, maternal involvement needs to be controlled for when testing relationships between father involvement and child outcomes. In addition, for associations between involvement and child outcomes to be convincing, the two variables should be assessed by different observers, rather than relying on fathers' reports of both. In relationships between children and nonresident fathers as well, fathers' feelings of closeness to their child and authoritative parenting (defined as the combination of clear discipline, monitoring, and emotional support), but not simply amount of contact, are positively related to children's grades and negatively associated with children's externalizing and internalizing symptoms (Amato & Gilbreth, 1999). Other recent research suggests positive effects associated with fathers' breadwinning (Amato, 1998). These effects, however, are modest in magnitude.

The essentialist argument holds that fathers' positive effects on children are independent of mothers', which this research supports. However, the essentialist argument also requires that fathers' effects be gendered, specifically male effects. The finding that the dimensions of paternal and maternal behavior that influence children positively are the same seems inconsistent with this premise (Lamb, 1986; Amato & Rivera, 1999). The comparison between children raised in mother-father families and those growing up with two lesbian parents provides another kind of evidence. This research provides little indication that those children whose two parents include a male are better off in terms of psychological or social adjustment than those whose two parents are both females. In fact, Stacey and Biblarz (2001) argue that researchers have defensively downplayed the evidence in these studies that the children of lesbian parents are better off. As we show later, some research suggests that compared with heterosexual fathers, gay fathers are more likely to be nurturing and less likely to be traditional in their parental style.

Most contemporary developmental researchers are skeptical of the idea that fathering (or any other single factor) is "essential," in the literal sense, to human development, as assessed by outcomes such as school performance and good social relationships. Their view is that development is impaired by "cumulative" risk, not by any one risk factor. A good illustration is Sameroff, Seifer, Barocas, Zax, and Greenspan's (1987) study of the association between risk factors such as low birth weight, poverty, having a single parent, poor schools, and the like, and adolescent IQ. Rather than focusing on specific factors, the researchers simply tabulated the total number of risk factors each individual experienced. Little difference was found in average IQ among children who experienced only one or two of these risk factors, compared with those who had none. For each additional risk factor beyond two, however, average IQ was 7 to 12 points lower. The general principle here is that the impact of any one factor, positive or negative, depends on the other factors present. This principle makes it more understandable why research generally finds that positive father involvement has only modest beneficial effects and that measures of father absence have only limited negative statistical effects.

Marriage and Other Relationship Contexts for Fathering

When considering the essentialist view on fathering, the question of whether heterosexual marriage is the "best" context for fathers to rear children typically is asked in terms of children's well-being (see Amato & Gilbreth, 1999, Marsiglio et al., 2000, and Stacey & Biblarz, 2001, for relevant reviews). Recent research has begun to explore whether biological (particularly married, coresidential) fathers interact with and contribute to their children differently from men who act as father figures in other types of contexts (Anderson, Kaplan, & Lancaster, 1999; Buchanan, Maccoby, & Dornbusch, 1996; Hofferth & Anderson, 2003) and whether there are differences in how stepfathers and nonresident fathers affect their children (White & Gilbreth, 2001). Although this research tends to support the assumption that children fare better on average when they live with a mother and biological, resident father, stepfathers (including cohabiting fathers in some cases) also can make meaningful contributions to children's well-being.

A related question, one more central to our review, is whether men reap positive benefits by being fathers (Nock, 1998) or by increasing their involvement with their children (Lamb, Pleck, & Levine, 1986), especially in a marital context. Numerous commentators have argued that marriage and having children helps to civilize and/or give meaning to men's lives, thereby affording children and men their best option for experiencing positive outcomes. Snarey (1993, p. 98) suggests that fathers are more likely to express their capacity for "establishing, guiding, or caring for the next generation" in the community at large, separate from their own children. Men's transition to parenting and active involvement with their children can help many men develop more nurturing personality traits (Hawkins & Belsky, 1989). Finally, although some studies show that positive paternal involvement can lead men to experience conflict, stress, and a lower self-esteem (especially with sons), these patterns do not appear to affect men's satisfaction with fathering (J. H. Pleck, 1997). Unfortunately, answers to these questions based on solid research are more difficult to come by than some persons either anticipate or are willing to admit.

One of the most widely discussed and politicized issues within the U.S. context involves nonresident fathers' financial and interpersonal commitments to their children (Griswold, 1993; see also Seltzer, 1998). Feminists, members of fathers' rights groups, persons who espouse traditional family ideologies, and others have weighed in on child support and visitation issues. Because the vast majority of nonresident parents are fathers, much of the debate about nonresident parents' responsibilities and rights has evolved around the issues of gender equity within a male-dominated economic system. Many believe that nonresident fathers in large numbers have reneged on their paternal breadwinning responsibilities. Other scholars, though, have struggled to refocus and sharpen the debate while raising public awareness about what they perceive to be a pervasive and distorted stereotypical image of "deadbeat dads" (Braver & O'Connell, 1998; Braver et al., 1993; Nielsen, 1999; Parke & Brott, 1999). These commentators are quick to stress mothers' gatekeeping roles; they suggest that many nonresident fathers are pushed away and often kept away from being involved with their children while being pressured to fulfill a detached breadwinner role.

Another controversial issue involves assertions about nonbiological fathers' treatment of their partners' children. It has become commonplace to assert that "stepfathers" and boyfriends are more likely to abuse the children of their romantic partners physically

and sexually than are the children's biological fathers (Blankenhorn, 1995; Booth, Carver, & Granger, 2000; Daly & Wilson, 1998). Some go so far as to say that "stepfathers are far more likely than [biological] fathers to do so [sexually molest children]" (Blankenhorn, 1995, p. 40). Although it appears that a majority of studies find that stepchildren are at greater risk of abuse (Giles-Sims, 1997), various researchers have challenged the validity of these claims (Malkin & Lamb, 1994; Sedlak & Broadhurst, 1996; see also Silverstein & Auerbach, 1999). The scientific jury is still out as to whether stepfathers' hypothesized lower incentive to invest in their nonbiological children, according to an evolutionary perspective, explains any of the possible differences between biological and nonbiological fathers' abuse patterns in a societal context where men's involvement with children generally is not valued. This is one area where less rhetoric and more careful analysis and sober discussion clearly are needed. Exuberant ideological support of heterosexual marriage is misleading when based on muddled findings regarding nonbiological fathers' mistreatment of children. At the very least, such an argument overlooks the reality that domestic violence and sexual abuse would be higher if women and their children were encouraged to stay in "bad" or abusive marriages.

Turning to outcomes for men, Nock (1998) recently analyzed U.S. national survey data to examine the relationship between different features of a prevailing normative conception of marriage and men's public achievements. Consistent with Gilmore's (1990) cross-cultural anthropological work on the culture of manhood, Nock suggested that adult men are expected to achieve their masculinity by being fathers to their wives' children, providers for their families, and protectors of their wives and children. According to Nock, his analyses support Gilmore's thesis because they show that married men fare better than their nonmarried counterparts when assessed on the basis of what he calls three traditional definitions of adult male achievement (income, weeks worked, and occupational prestige). He found that becoming a father in a marital context was associated with a slight increase in men's income levels with no additional changes due to subsequent children, an increase of 2 additional weeks of work (only for the first child), and a small increase in occupational prestige, with a slight decline when men have four or more children. An alternative reading of these data suggests that the changes are so slight as to be negligible, and they are open to other interpretations. For example, the small increase in income probably is more than offset by the additional expenses associated with having children. Furthermore, his analyses ignore the complex and alternative expressions of masculinity that have existed in U.S. culture in recent decades and have influenced growing numbers of men's and others' perceptions of manhood and success (Ehrenreich, 1983).

Fatherhood and Gender Inequality

The critical analysis of gender views families as an important locus in which gender inequality is created and maintained (Fox & Murry, 2000; Thompson & Walker, 1995). When fatherhood is viewed through the lens of gender, the most important question about it is "How is fatherhood linked to gender inequality?" We consider this question in two contexts: within marriage and cohabitation, and outside co-resident relationships where strong romantic commitments are less likely (divorce, unmarried parenthood).

Marriage and Cohabiting Relationships

Feminist analyses of families identify men's limited performance of domestic family responsibilities relative to women's as a manifestation of broader gender inequality (Coltrane, 1996; Ferree, 1990; McMahon, 1999; Osmond & Thorne, 1993). The extent to which married men do less in the family has been documented in "time diary" and other time-use studies beginning in the 1960s (J. H. Pleck, 1985). In addition to showing that married men perform substantially less housework and child care than married women, they demonstrated that married men also did no more of these family tasks if their wives were employed than if their wives were not employed. In addition, in two-earner families, wives' time in these family activities and paid work combined was considerably greater than their husbands', a phenomenon sometimes called employed wives' "second shift" (Hochschild, 1989).

Focusing more specifically on gender inequality and fathering (implicitly in the context of two-parent families), Polatnick (1973-1974) argued that because women are the rearers of children, they are powerless vis-à-vis men, and because women are powerless, they are rearers of children. As a result of men doing so little in the family, some wives do not take paid employment, and those who are employed tend to give their family responsibilities higher priority. This contributes to the barriers preventing women from advancing occupationally and from getting the benefits potentially accruing from employment in terms of economic independence, pension rights, social valuation, and self-worth. In addition, because fathers encourage masculine behaviors in sons and feminine behaviors in daughters more than do mothers (Crouter, McHale, & Bartko, 1993; Lytton & Romney, 1991), the way that fathers socialize their children may reproduce gender inequality. Thus, fatherhood is a key element in the "gender politics of family time" (Daly, 1996).

Recent work relevant to fatherhood and gender inequality in two-parent families makes evident several developments. Lamb et al.'s (1985) construct of paternal involvement has become a dominant concept used in describing what fathers do compared to mothers. Scholars have contested the level of fathers' involvement and the extent to which it is changing in married-parent families. Some researchers find that fathers' time spent with their children is not trivial and is greater than often thought. Averaging across 13 national or smaller-scale studies between the mid-1980s and the late 1990s, and expressing fathers' time as a proportion of mothers' time, married U.S. fathers averaged 44% of mothers' engagement time and 66% of mothers' accessibility time (J. H. Pleck, 1997). In children's time diaries in a 1997 national study, fathers were engaged with their 3- to 5-year-old children an average of 79 minutes per day on weekdays and 215 minutes on weekend days; fathers were accessible an additional 68 minutes per weekday and 184 minutes per weekend day. Corresponding averages for younger children were higher, and for older children only slightly lower (Yeung, Sandberg, Davis-Kean, & Hofferth, 2001).

Some evidence also suggests that married U.S. fathers' engagement and accessibility have increased in recent decades. For example, in 11 time-use studies conducted between the mid-1960s and the mid-1980s, fathers averaged about one third of mothers' engagement and half of their accessibility, both lower than the 44% and 66% noted above for the mid-1980s to the late 1990s (J. H. Pleck, 1997). Fathers' time with children also has increased in absolute terms (J. H. Pleck, 1997). Yeung et al. (2001) hold that because other factors besides gender influence paternal involvement, "a simple gender inequality theory is not sufficient in explaining the dynamics of household division of labor in today's American families" (p. 136).

Other scholars contest these interpretations. Hochschild's (1989, p. 4) report that time diary research showed that the average U.S. father spent only 12 minutes per day with his children received great play in the mass media (e.g., Skow, 1989), although this figure actually concerned fathers' time only on weekdays and was derived from 1965 data (J. H. Pleck, 1997). LaRossa (1988) evaluated the evidence for fathers' increased involvement as unconvincing, as did McMahon (1999), who went further to argue that this claim is complicit in maintaining male privilege.

Yet other scholars have assessed the construct of paternal involvement to be limited because, they argue, it is rooted in feminist-derived gender equity assumptions (Hawkins, Christiansen, Sargent, & Hill, 1993). These critics hold that involvement is defined implicitly as the way that mothers are involved with children, implying a "deficit perspective" for fathers (Palkovitz, 1997; see J. H. Pleck & Stueve, 2001, for a response). Taking a cross-cultural perspective, others observe that viewing fathers' involvement as a critical social indicator of gender equality is highly subject to cultural context, in effect assuming a Western/industrialized perspective (Hewlett, 1991). Clearly, father involvement in relation to gender inequality is subject to multiple interpretations.

Finally, research relevant to fathering and gender inequality has expanded its focus beyond married biological fathers to include both stepfathers and cohabiting biological fathers. Data on whether stepfathers are less involved than biological married fathers are at present somewhat inconsistent (Cooksey & Fondell, 1996; Hofferth, Pleck, Stueve, Bianchi, & Sayer, 2002; Marsiglio, 1991). As part of the growing recognition of "families formed outside of marriage" (Seltzer, 2000; Smock, 2000), cohabiting fathers (i.e., unmarried biological fathers residing with child and mother) are also beginning to

receive attention. In the limited data available, cohabiting U.S. fathers show lower average levels of engagement with their children than do married biological fathers, but cohabiting fathers are similarly accessible (Hofferth et al., 2002). If these findings are replicated, they raise the possibility that cohabitation accentuates parental gender inequity, consistent with other feminist concerns about cohabitation.

Fathering Outside Co-Resident Relationships

Divorced fathers. Divorce and its aftermath represent an important arena in which fathers' behavior potentially both reflects and contributes to gender inequality, one explored in numerous qualitative and other studies (e.g., Arendell, 1992, 1995; Braver & O'Connell, 1998; Braver, Wolchik, et al., 1993; Catlett & McKenry, in press; Emery, 1999; Maccoby & Mnookin, 1992; see Griswold, 1993, pp. 260-265 for a historical perspective). In the last two decades, joint *legal* custody has become the statistical norm. In 9,500 divorce settlements in Wisconsin, it rose from 18% in 1980 to 81% in 1992, with about half the latter being 50/50 splits and the remainder ranging from 30/70 to 49/51. However, joint *physical* custody increased over this period from 2% to only 14%. Divorced fathers' rate of sole legal and physical custody has remained stable at about 10% (Melli, Brown, & Cancian, 1997). Some researchers, noting that when custody is contested, it is resolved in favor of the father between one third and one half of the time, have concluded that fathers have a gender-based advantage in getting custody (Polikoff, 1983). However, these statistics pertain to the small subset of divorces in which custody is contested, which overrepresents situations where the father has a good "case." As court-mandated mediation has become increasingly common in divorce, debate also has arisen about the extent to which it might privilege fathers (Okin, 1989). At the same time, mediation is associated with greater father contact as long as 9 years postdivorce (Dillon & Emery, 1996).

The majority of U.S. divorced fathers have relatively little contact with their children. Data from the 1981 National Survey of Children showed that half of all children from divorced families had not seen their father in the past year, and only one child in six saw their father once a week or more (Furstenberg & Cherlin, 1991). More recent data, from the 1992-1994 National Survey of Families and Households, based on nonresident fathers' reports and not controlling for whether the father had been married to the child's mother, revealed that 24% had been with their child only once or not at all in the last year and 23% saw the child at least weekly (Manning & Smock, 1999). There is vehement debate about the extent to which these low average rates of contact result from mothers' "gatekeeping" versus fathers' own loss of interest (Braver & O'Connell, 1998; Braver et al., 1993; Doherty, Kouneski, & Erickson, 1998; Ihinger-Tallman, Pasley, & Buehler, 1993; Walker & McGraw, 2000). One factor is fathers' formal visitation rights. According to a 1996 federal survey of a national sample of custodial mothers (including never-married as well as divorced mothers), one in four fathers had no legal right to see their children (joint legal or physical custody, or visitation privileges). Among those with joint custody, 85% saw their children in the last year, and among those with visitation rights, 75% did (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999). In addition, about one third of nonresident fathers have children in new families.

Fathers' payment or nonpayment of child support has profound implications for gender equality. Unfortunately, data on child support compliance often are summarized without distinguishing between divorced fathers and nonmarried fathers. Detailed tabulations from the 1996 federal survey indicate that among divorced fathers subject to support awards, 73% paid some child support in that year (Graham & Beller, 2002; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999), and this percentage has risen slowly but steadily. However, only 68% of divorced fathers were required to pay support. Taking this into account, 48% of all divorced mothers received any child support. Among divorced mothers receiving any support, the average amount received was relatively low, $4,046. Some assume that if all fathers paid the full child support they are ordered by the court to pay, the proportion of single-parent female-headed families living in poverty would be reduced dramatically; however, this may not be the case. As Krause (1989) put it, "while very impressive progress in child support collection from absent parents has been made, the very progress seems to have led us to overestimate, and consequently overemphasize, the financial support that can be obtained from absent parents" (p. 398).

Unmarried, nonresident fathers. In the United States over the last two decades, there has been heightened concern about the rising numbers of unmarried mothers. Although an increasing percentage of these mothers are adults, social concern focuses predominantly on *teenage* mothers raising children on their own (Luker, 1996). The fathers of the children of teenage mothers have less contact with their children and pay less child support than other nonresident fathers (Graham & Beller, 2002). These patterns may contribute to higher levels of gender inequality in these situations.

Lerman and Ooms (1993) and others use the term "young unwed fathers" rather than "teen fathers" to describe the procreating partners of teenage mothers because in a high proportion of cases, these men are 20 years of age or older. From a critical gender perspective, this finding raises an important question: When the father is older than the teenage mother, how often is sexual coercion involved? Although the answer to that question is unclear, the data do reveal that the average age difference is small and only a small proportion of these relationships involve persons who are more than 2 years apart in age (Darroch, Landry, & Oslak, 1999; Lindberg, Sonenstein, Ku, & Martinez, 1997).

Gendered Fathering Contexts

When men conceptualize fatherhood, become fathers, and act as fathers, they do so within larger social and cultural contexts, many of which intersect with systems of gender relations. These specific settings are influenced by men's human capital and personal characteristics as well as others' interpretations of them. In this section, we briefly review how fathering experiences are connected to factors such as age, race/ethnicity, economic standing, and sexual orientation. These factors can affect men's opportunities to achieve particular masculine ideals associated with fathering.

Being "Too" Young

Many males who become fathers as teenagers or young adult men come face to face with their inability to live up to being a family breadwinner, a crucial component for most models of adult masculinity (Marsiglio & Cohan, 1997). Those with limited education and work experience often struggle with feeling disconnected from their father identities and children because of their poor economic prospects for the foreseeable future (Achatz & MacAllum, 1994; Kiselica, 1995). This pattern is exacerbated for African American and Hispanic young males, whose educational credentials and employment opportunities tend to be less promising than those for whites in the U.S. context. Males tend to feel more inadequate when their children's mothers and maternal grandparents voice their dissatisfaction with their meager financial child support (Furstenberg, 1995). Adolescents who become young fathers also quickly discover that their current masculinity assets (e.g., physical appearance and prowess) are of little use as they make the transition to the adultlike status associated with being a father.

In addition, as young men they are unlikely to possess many of the parental and interpersonal skills, such as "emotional literacy," that would enable them to confront successfully the challenges of caring for their children and managing their relationships with their partners (Brody, 1985; Goodey, 1997). Although the culture of boyhood for the most part does not encourage males to develop parental skills and effective interaction styles for their romantic relationships, some boys and young men are still able to develop these skills and incorporate them into how they treat their children and partners. Several small-scale studies have shown that some young fathers are clearly committed to being involved with their children in positive ways (Allen & Doherty, 1996; Christmon, 1990; Rivara, Sweeney, & Henderson, 1986).

Although some research finds that a small percentage of young men see paternity as an emblem of masculinity (Sonenstein, Stewart, Lindberg, Pernas, & Williams, 1997), many young men apparently recognize that being a "man" involves more than siring a child. For example, one qualitative study reported that young men who were 16 to 30 years of age were often quick to assert that any man can make a baby, but males who really want to demonstrate their manhood do so by assuming financial responsibilities for their children and are involved in their everyday lives (Marsiglio & Hutchinson, 2002).

Men of Color

Circumstances associated with race and ethnicity in the United States may affect how men view fatherhood and are involved with their children, although rigorous research in this area is rather limited and the confounding of socioeconomic status and race/ethnic variables is a common shortcoming within this research area (Mirandé, 1991). Cochran (1997) suggests that "fatherhood for African American men cannot be separated from their shared culture and sociohistorical background, institutional racism, and the marginal status of African American males" (p. 343). Meanwhile, during the past several decades the stereotypical image of machismo has been advanced and challenged as an important factor affecting Latino men's involvement in family life (Carroll, 1980; Mirandé, 1991; Zambrana, 1995). Research exploring the possible connections between other race/ethnic categories and fathering within the United States is sparse.

Viewed through a gender lens, perhaps the most significant contextual issue for understanding African American men's approach to fatherhood is that black men, on average, represent a relatively disadvantaged subpopulation. Proportionately speaking, they are more likely to be unemployed, be imprisoned, have poor access to health care and a shorter life expectancy, be victims of fatal crimes, and have less education than their white and Latino counterparts (Majors & Gordon, 1994). Because African American men are disproportionately disadvantaged, with fewer opportunities to achieve and display their manhood using mainstream strategies, they are more likely than their white counterparts to rely on risk-taking behaviors and the "cool pose" (Majors & Billson, 1992) to express their male identities. The difficulties they encounter in fulfilling the family provider role are related in complex ways to assuming full-time parenting roles (Hamer & Marchioro, 2002) and psychosocial functioning problems (Bowman & Sanders, 1998). The strategies they adopt to confront their role strain may shift across the life course. Though less pronounced, relatively similar patterns and dynamics may be a part of Latino men's lives (Mirandé, 1997). Not surprisingly, some men of color who feel marginalized within society see creating children as one of the few legal ways they can achieve an adult masculine status (Majors & Billson, 1992).

Available research does not allow us to say definitively whether men of color interact with their children in unique ways that are truly independent of their socioeconomic status and family structure circumstances. It does seem apparent, though, that men of color have unique opportunities to mentor their children into a social world tainted with prejudice, a world, for example, where being young, African American, and male is often associated with negative stereotypes and suspicion. Thus, men's paternal role as teacher of race/ethnic relations may be especially salient to fathers' interactions with their sons. Educating sons on what it means to be a black or Latino man in a white society where hegemonic forms of masculinity reign is an experience that speaks to how fathers' experiences can be affected directly by their race/ethnic identity. Unfortunately, this question has not received systematic scholarly attention.

Social Class

Most research on fathering that addresses some aspect of social class deals with men who are financially disadvantaged, although several studies have attempted to show how other facets of social class may be related to men's lives as fathers (Erickson & Gecas, 1991). As we've alluded to above, when men are unemployed or underemployed, they often find it difficult to feel good about themselves as fathers because the provider role continues to be an important feature of hegemonic images of masculinity and men's fathering experience (Bowman & Sanders, 1998; Christiansen & Palkovitz, 2000). Although poverty issues disproportionately influence men of color and are therefore intertwined with subcultural issues, numerous white fathers also deal with feelings of inadequacy as breadwinners.

Having money is important not only for those fathers who are living with their children; men's socioeconomic standing also can influence how fathers negotiate and manage their fathering experience during those times when they live apart from their children. Money begets power, and those men fortunate enough to have adequate incomes are better positioned to orchestrate their paternal identities, fathering activities, and family arrangements so they can display their masculinity vis-à-vis their contributions to family life. For example, in their qualitative study of divorced fathers, Catlett and McKenry (in press) found that those men with the highest incomes were best equipped to achieve the often conflicting outcomes of being an adequate provider and a nurturing caregiver. Maintaining these dual roles was essentially impossible for the poorest fathers and quite difficult for the middle-income fathers as well. Middle-income fathers may actually experience more tension postdivorce than low-income fathers because the former experience a steeper decline in their ability to perform the provider role postdivorce.

Along a somewhat different line, Cooper (2000) provided an intriguing qualitative analysis of what she termed a "nerd masculinity" that has recently emerged in connection to the work styles found within the Silicon Valley economy. To achieve this new type of gendered subjectivity,

> men must be technically brilliant and devoted to work. They must be tough guys who get the job done no matter what. Fathers so identify with these qualities that their desire to work all the time is experienced by them as emanating from their own personality traits rather than from co-worker or management expectations. (p. 403)

Her analysis shows that this new masculinity operates as a "key mechanism of control in high-tech workplaces that rely on identity-based forms of control and that the enactment of this new masculinity impacts the way fathers think about, experience, and manage their work and family lives" (p. 379). In practical terms, fathers who embrace this nerd masculinity adopt work-family practices in which they do not talk about work-family conflicts in order to give the impression—not always the reality—that work is their top priority. Fathers also allow their worker mentality as a "go-to guy" to influence the way they think about and experience their lives at home. This can be seen in "their use of market language to make sense of their personal relationships as well as their desire to fit family needs within a capitalist paradigm" (p. 403).

Being Gay

Given the centrality of heterosexuality to hegemonic masculinity, public perceptions of fatherhood typically emphasize a heterosexual bias as well. A fundamental challenge to this mainstream conception of masculinity is instigated by biological fathers who self-identify as gay. Similarly, anecdotal evidence of how gay step- and adoptive fathers are viewed by the general public suggests that these men are performing roles inconsistent with mainstream notions that masculinity can be achieved through fatherhood.

The largest category of gay fathers includes men who have had children within marriages but are now divorced (Green & Bozett, 1991). However, a growing percentage of gay men appear to be pursuing parenthood after they have already established their gay identities (Patterson, 2000). This latter trend implies that as the social stigma associated with same-gender partnerships continues to lessen, future cohorts of gay men may be less inclined to pursue the marital emblem of masculinity, and some will still want to experience fatherhood. Given the financial costs and practical hurdles that unmarried gay men will encounter in trying to achieve biological fatherhood, the overall proportion of gay biological fathers may actually decline over time (Stacey & Biblarz, 2001).

Patterson and Chan's (1997) recent review of the gay fatherhood literature shows that research in this area is rather sparse and largely based on highly restricted samples of white, well-educated, affluent men living in large cities. Interpreting these studies' findings must occur in full view of the complex reality that "sexual desires, acts, meanings, and identities are not expressed in fixed or predictable packages" (Stacey & Biblarz, 2001, p. 165). Unfortunately, little of this research focuses directly on masculinity themes. The research that does have implications for gender research tends to consider whether gay fathers treat their children differently than either heterosexual fathers or lesbians, and whether children's attitudes and behaviors related to gender are affected. One underlying question guiding this research is this: To what extent and in what ways does gender and sexual orientation affect how gay men parent?

Although the limited research has not found drastic differences in the ways heterosexual fathers and gay fathers "do fathering," some research suggests that gay fathers may be more nurturing and less traditional in their parenting in general (Bigner & Jacobsen, 1989, 1992; Scallen, 1982, cited in Flaks, 1994). In light of

these tentative findings, Patterson and Chan (1997) speculated that gay fathers may have parenting styles that are more consistent with authoritative parenting. In one study comparing gay and lesbian parents, gay fathers were more likely to encourage their children to play with sex-typed toys (Harris & Turner, 1985/1986).

Although most research focuses on biological gay fathers, Crosbie-Burnett & Helmbrecht (1993) studied 48 gay stepfamilies that included the father, his male lover or partner, and at least one child who cohabited or visited the household. These researchers found that whereas 96% of gay fathers indicated that they were open about their sexual orientation with heterosexual friends, only 46% of their adolescent children reported that their heterosexual friends knew about their father's sexual orientation. Some children have shown concern that they will be perceived to be homosexual if others know about their fathers' sexual identities (Bozett, 1980, 1987). The limited research from small-scale studies attempting to show whether living in gay fathers' households influences children's sexual orientation does not suggest any clear-cut pattern (Bailey, Bobrow, Wolfe, & Mikach, 1995).

Avenues for Future Research

Other publications (see the citations in the opening paragraph) outline extensive agendas for future fatherhood research. Thus, we comment here on issues directly involving a gendered approach to fathering, while accentuating fathers' diverse circumstances. We stress the need to examine if and how fathers uniquely influence their children, how fathering affects gender equity inside and outside families, and how men's fathering is influenced by contextual factors. Future research, informed by theoretical discussions in the fields of "men and masculinities" and "fatherhood," needs to explore more fully the complex ways that gender intersects with age, race, class, and sexual orientation to form the social landscape upon which fathers navigate. In several places, we have highlighted how processes associated with the production of knowledge have influenced research on fathering; similar concerns are vital to keep in mind when proposing new research.

Scholars interested in understanding fathers should realize that within the field of family studies, "new theoretical models conceptualize families as systems affected by, and effecting change in, reciprocal influences among social, behavioral, and biological processes" (Booth et al., 2000, p. 1018). Recent technological advances allow researchers to examine in more rigorous ways these complex processes, including fathers' potentially unique ways of interacting with children. Many social constructionists and feminists are content to emphasize cultural forces inside and outside the home, downplaying possible biologically based differences in men's and women's behaviors and information processing. Some fear that paradigms emphasizing either behavioral endocrinology, behavior genetics, or evolutionary psychology will be used to justify a deterministic or "essentialist" model of parenting and gender relations. They assume that such a model would provide the groundwork for a conservative political philosophy toward gender inequities. In our view, studying social and cultural forces will provide deeper and broader insights about men's complex experiences as fathers; however, researchers would be remiss to discourage explorations of the "possible" biosocial dimensions of fathering (parenting).

Recent heated debates about whether fathers provide unique or essential contributions to their children's development focus on possible parenting differences between men and women. These debates also draw attention to comparisons between men within and outside the United States. Research on U.S. fathers shows that they tend to play differently with their children than mothers; however, we do not yet understand precisely why this happens. We do know that culture plays a major role in shaping parenting styles that vary by gender. For example, compared with fathers in the United States, fathers in some countries are discouraged from playing with their children or do so in ways in which they are less aggressive and encourage less risking (Hewlett, 1992).

One important research issue is identifying why some males are more likely than others to move beyond traditional forms of gender socialization and become involved with their children and partners in ways that embrace the "nurturant" father model. Likewise, additional research is needed to better understand how changing structural, cultural, social, and psychological factors influence how men and women negotiate their contributions to parenting and domestic labor as well as their "agreements" about child custody, support, and visitation. These negotiations have implications for gender equity within the diverse romantic relationships, families, and household arrangements relevant to children's well-being. Given the controversial nature of these value-laden issues, interested parties must be vigilant in monitoring how knowledge in these areas is produced, disseminated, and interpreted.

Drawing on a sociological perspective, one fruitful area of inquiry could focus on how fathers' interactions with their children are shaped by their involvement in different gendered organizational and social contexts. A number of these settings have been and will continue to be affected by the debates and activities of the Fatherhood Responsibility Movement (Gavanas, 2002). Prime sites for such research include several social movements including Promise Keepers (Silverstein, Auerbach, Grieco, & Dunkel, 1999) and fathers' rights groups (Bertoia & Drakich, 1993) in which gendered ideologies of family life are featured prominently. Another intriguing site includes group counseling sessions for violent men (Fox, Sayers, & Bruce, 2001). Research on other settings flavored by a distinctive masculine culture (e.g., the military, law enforcement, prison) could provide valuable insights. We need to learn more about how fathers, as men, manage their impressions to others inside various organizational and social settings that transcend the typical family/household setting (Marsiglio & Cohan, 2000). Viewed in this light, father involvement can be examined as a socially constructed performance that implicates how the gender order both supports and discourages fathers' involvement with their children.

Paternity leave policies (and parental leave policies more generally) are an important aspect of the gender order that should generate policy-oriented research in various industrialized countries (Haas & Hwang, 1995; Hobson, 2002). Policymakers in the various European countries, the United States, and elsewhere have shown some interest in recent years in providing options for both mothers and fathers to leave their jobs temporarily to care for their newborn or sick children. Researchers should be concerned with what people think about these policies as they relate to fathers, what factors influence fathers' use, and the consequences for men's, women's and children's lives when men take advantage of them (J. H. Pleck, 1993; Wisensale, 2001).

Future research targeting fathers from a gender perspective should be enhanced as the amount, type, and quality of survey data continues to improve (Day & Lamb, 2004; Federal Interagency Forum and Child and Family Statistics, 1998) and scholars advance their knowledge about how to conduct qualitative research with men as men (Schwalbe & Wolkomir, 2002) and with men as fathers (Marsiglio, 2004a; Marsiglio & Cohan, 2000). Collecting data that can inform a critical gender analysis of fathering will require researchers to sharpen their understanding of how men's potential interests in presenting a "masculine self" can influence the research process. Researchers need to explore ways of collecting more accurate and richer data about paternity, nonresident fathering, child support, stepfathering, child abuse, breadwinning, and other issues that challenge male research participants to confront their vulnerabilities. For example, survey researchers should conduct methodological experiments on how men respond to using CASI (computer-assisted survey interview) technology. Does its use alter fathers' willingness to report more accurately their attitudes, feelings, and behaviors related to fathering? Qualitative researchers who interview (or observe) fathers and men who are thinking about having children can also advance their respective methods for studying these populations by sharing their self-critiques of their research process (Marsiglio, 2004b; Marsiglio & Hutchinson, 2002).

Researchers must also address the complex realities of contemporary men's lives. These realities include the diverse and dynamic ways men move in and out of both relationships and households involving children; how gendered social structures (e.g., work, prison) and processes (e.g., negotiating child care or visitation) within and outside a family context influence how men are involved with their children; and how fathers' resources, perceptions, and ways of interacting with their children may change over the duration of fathers' and children's shared life course. These realities call for researchers to develop meaningful ways of capturing men's presence and involvement in children's lives that ensure confidence that research findings have not been tainted by ideological or political motives.

Ultimately, if gender scholars collectively wish to study men's lives as fathers in a

comprehensive fashion, they should expand their vision of fatherhood. Men need to be studied not just as fathers of minor children but also as gendered beings capable of imagining and creating human life. Similarly, men interact with, care for, and are provided care by their adult children. Thus, focusing on how gender affects the evolution of men's lives as persons capable of procreation and fathering places fathers' lives squarely within developmental and life-course perspectives. Those who use these perspectives need to be sensitive to the ways that context matters. Of course, the immediacy of certain social policy concerns about child outcomes, as well as the selective availability of funding, will inspire most researchers to study the types of issues that have been examined most frequently. Family and gender scholars should be encouraged, though, to expand their vision of fatherhood and venture beyond these traditional agendas.

REFERENCES

Achatz, M., & MacAllum, C. A. (1994). *The young unwed fathers demonstration project: A status report.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Allen, W. D., & Doherty, W. J. (1996). The responsibilities of fatherhood as perceived by African American teenage fathers. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 77,* 142-155.

Amato, P. (1998). More than money? Men's contribution to their children's lives. In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Men in families: When do they get involved? What differences does it make?* (pp. 242-278). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Amato, P., & Gilbreth, J. G. (1999). Nonresident fathers and children's well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61,* 557-573.

Amato, P., & Rivera, F. (1999). Paternal involvement and children's problem behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61,* 375-384.

Anderson, K. G., Kaplan, H., & Lancaster, J. (1999). Paternal care by genetic fathers and stepfathers I: Reports from Albuquerque men. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 20,* 405-431.

Arendell, T. (1992). Father absence: Investigations into divorce. *Gender & Society, 6,* 562-586.

Arendell, T. (1995). *Fathers and divorce.* Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.

Bailey, J. M., Bobrow, D., Wolfe, M., & Mikach, S. (1995). Sexual orientation of adult sons of gay fathers. *Developmental Psychology, 31,* 124-129.

Belsky, J. (1993). Promoting father involvement—An analysis and critique: Comment on Silverstein. *Journal of Family Psychology, 7,* 287-292.

Bertoia, C., & Drakich, J. (1993). The fathers' rights movement: Contradictions in rhetoric and practice. *Journal of Family Issues, 14,* 592-615.

Bigner, J. J., & Jacobsen, R. B. (1989). Parenting behaviors of homosexual and heterosexual fathers. In F. W. Bozett (Ed.), *Homosexuality and the family* (pp. 173-186). New York: Harrington Park.

Bigner, J. J., & Jacobsen, R. B. (1992). Adult responses to child behavior and attitudes toward fathering: Gay and nongay fathers. *Journal of Homosexuality, 23,* 99-112.

Blankenhorn, D. (1995). *Fatherless America: Confronting our most urgent social problem.* New York: Basic Books.

Booth, A., Carver, K., & Granger, D. A. (2000). Biosocial perspectives on the family. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62,* 1018-1034.

Bowman, P. J., & Sanders, R. (1998). Unmarried African American fathers: A comparative life span analysis. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 29,* 39-56.

Bozett, F. W. (1980). Gay fathers: How and why they disclose their homosexuality to their children. *Family Relations, 29,* 173-179.

Bozett, F. W. (1987). Children of gay fathers. In F. W. Bozett (Ed.), *Gay and lesbian parents* (pp. 39-57). New York: Praeger.

Brandth, B., & Kvande, E. (1998). Masculinity and child care: The reconstruction of fathering. *The Sociological Review, 46,* 293-313.

Braver, S. L., & O'Connell, D. (1998). *Divorced dads: Shattering the myths.* New York: Tarcher/Putnam.

Braver, S. L., Wolchik, S. A., Sandler, I. N., Sheets, V., Fogas, B., & Bay, R. C. (1993). A longitudinal study of noncustodial parents: Parents without children. *Journal of Family Psychology, 7,* 9-23.

Brickner, B. W. (1999). *The Promise Keepers: Politics and promises.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Brody, L. R. (1985). Gender differences in emotional development: A review of theories and research. *Journal of Personality, 53,* 102-149.

Buchanan, C. M., Maccoby, E. E., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1996). *Adolescents after divorce.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carroll, J. C. (1980). A cultural consistency theory of family violence in Mexican-American and Jewish-ethnic groups. In M. A. Strauss & G. T. Hotaling (Eds.), *The social causes of husband-wife violence* (pp. 68-81). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Catlett, B. S., & McKenry, P. C. (in press). Class-based masculinities: Divorce, fatherhood, and the hegemonic ideal. *Fathering: A Journal of theory, research, and practice about men as fathers.*

Chavez, L. (1999, July 22). Fatherhood going to the apes—literally. *Jewish World Review.* Retrieved from http://www.jewishworldreview.com

Christiansen, S. L., & Palkovitz, R. (2000). Why the "good provider" role still matters: Providing as a form of paternal involvement. *Journal of Family Issues, 22,* 84-106.

Christmon, K. (1990). Parental responsibility of African-American unwed adolescent fathers. *Adolescence, 25,* 645-653.

Claussen, D. S. (2000). *The Promise Keepers: Essays on masculinity and Christianity.* Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co.

Cochran, D. L. (1997). African American fathers: A decade review of the literature. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 78,* 340-350.

Coltrane, S. (1988). Father-child relationships and the status of women: A cross-cultural study. *American Journal of Sociology, 93,* 1060-1095.

Coltrane, S. (1994). Theorizing masculinities in contemporary social science. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 39–60). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Coltrane, S. (1996). *Family man: Fatherhood, housework, and gender equity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Coltrane, S., & Allan, K. (1994). "New" fathers and old stereotypes: Representations of masculinity in 1980s television advertising. *Masculinities, 2,* 1-25.

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W. (2000). *The men and the boys.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cooksey, E. C., & Fondell, M. M. (1996). Spending time with his kids: Effects of family structure on fathers' and children's lives. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58,* 693-707.

Cooper, M. (2000). Being the "go-to-guy": Fatherhood, masculinity, and the organization of work in the Silicon Valley. *Qualitative Sociology, 23,* 379-405.

Crosbie-Burnett, M., & Helmbrecht, L. (1993). A descriptive empirical study of gay male stepfamilies. *Family Relations, 42,* 256-262.

Crouter, A. C., McHale, S. H., & Bartko, W. T. (1993). Gender as an organizing feature in parent-child relationships. *Journal of Social Issues, 49,* 161-174.

Daly, K. (1996). Spending time with the kids: Meanings of family time for fathers. *Family Relations, 45,* 466-476.

Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1998). *The truth about Cinderella: A Darwinian view of parental love.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Daniels, C. R. (1998). *Lost fathers: The politics of fatherlessness in America.* New York: St. Martin's.

Darroch, J. E., Landry, D. J., & Oslak, S. (1999). Age differences between sexual partners in the United States. *Family Planning Perspectives, 31*(4), 160-167.

Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (2004). *Conceptualizing and measuring fathering involvement.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dillon, P., & Emery, R. E. (1996). Divorce mediation and resolution of child custody disputes: Long-term effects. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 66,* 131-140.

Doherty, W. J., Kouneski, E. F., & Erickson, M. F. (1998). Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual framework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60,* 277-292.

Dowd, N. E. (2000). *Redefining fatherhood.* New York: New York University Press.

Edelman, M. W. (1986). *Families in peril: An agenda for social change.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ehrenreich, B. (1983). *The hearts of men: American dreams and the flight from commitment.* New York: Anchor.

Emery, R. E. (1999). *Marriage, divorce, and children's adjustment* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Engle, P. L., & Breaux, C. (1998). Fathers' involvement with children: Perspectives from developing countries. *Social Policy Report, 12*(1), 1-23.

Erickson, R. J., & Gecas, V. (1991). Social class and fatherhood. In F. W. Bozett & S. M. H. Hanson (Eds.), *Fatherhood and families in cultural context* (pp. 114-137). New York: Springer.

Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. (1998). *Nurturing fatherhood: Improving data and research on male fertility, family formation, and fatherhood.* Washington, DC: Author.

Ferree, M. M. (1990). Beyond separate spheres: Feminism and family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52,* 866-884.

Flaks, D. (1994). Gay and lesbian families: Judicial assumptions, scientific realities. *William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal, 3,* 345-372.

Fox, G. L., & Murry, M. V. (2000). Gender and families: Feminist perspectives and family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62,* 1160-1172.

Fox, G. L., Sayers, J., & Bruce, C. (2001). *Beyond bravado: Redemption and rehabilitation in the fathering accounts of men who batter.* Unpublished manuscript, Department of Child

and Family Studies, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Furstenberg, F. F. (1995). Fathering in the inner city: Paternal participation and public policy. In W. Marsiglio (Ed.), *Fatherhood: Contemporary theory, research, and social policy* (pp. 119-147). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Furstenberg, F. F., & Cherlin, A. J. (1991). *Divided families: What happens to children when parents part.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gavanas, A. (2002). The fatherhood responsibility movement: The centrality of marriage, work and male sexuality in reconstructions of masculinity and fatherhood. In B. Hobson (Ed.), *Making men into fathers: Men, masculinities and the social politics of fatherhood* (pp. 213-242). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Giles-Sims, J. (1997). Current knowledge about child abuse in stepfamilies. *Marriage & Family Review, 26,* 215-230.

Gilmore, D. D. (1990). *Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Goodey, J. (1997). Boys don't cry: Masculinities, fear of crime, and fearlessness. *British Journal of Criminology, 37,* 401-418.

Graham, J. W., & Beller, A. H. (2002). Nonresident fathers and their children: Child support and visitation from an economic perspective. In C. S. Tamis-LeMonda & N. Cabrera (Eds.), *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 431-453). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Green, G. D., & Bozett, F. W. (1991). Lesbian mothers and gay fathers. In J. C. Gonsiorek & J. D. Weinrick (Eds.), *Homosexuality: Research implications for public policy* (pp. 197-214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Griswold, R. L. (1993). *Fatherhood in America: A history.* New York: Basic Books.

Gutmann, M. C. (1996). *The meanings of macho: Being a man in Mexico City.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Haas, L., & Hwang, P. (1995). Company culture and men's usage of family leave benefits in Sweden. *Family Relations, 44,* 28-36.

Hamer, J., & Marchioro, K. (2002). Becoming custodial dads: Exploring parenting among low-income and working-class African American fathers. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 64,* 116-129.

Hare-Mustin, R. T., & Marecek, J. (1990). *Making a difference: Psychology and the construction of gender.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Harris, M. B., & Turner, P. H. (1985/1986). Gay and lesbian parents. *Journal of Homosexuality, 12,* 101-113.

Hawkins, A. J., & Belsky, J. (1989). The role of father involvement in personality change in men across the transition to parenthood. *Family Relations, 38,* 378-384.

Hawkins, A. J., Christiansen, S. L., Sargent, K. P., & Hill, E. J. (1993). Rethinking fathers' involvement in child care. *Journal of Family Issues, 14,* 531-549.

Hearn, J. (2002). Men, fathers and the state: National and global relations. In B. Hobson (Ed.), *Making men into fathers: Men, masculinities, and the social politics of fatherhood* (pp. 245-272). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hewlett, B. S. (1991). *Intimate fathers: The nature and context of the Alka Pygmy paternal infant care.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hewlett, B. S. (1992). *Father-child relations: Cultural and biosocial contexts.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Hewlett, B. S. (2000). Culture, history, and sex: Anthropological contributions to conceptualizing fathering involvement. *Marriage & Family Review, 29,* 59-73.

Ho, D. Y. F. (1987). Fatherhood in Chinese culture. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father's role: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 227-245). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hobson, B. (2002). *Making men into fathers: Men, masculinities and the social politics of fatherhood.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hochschild, A. (1989). *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home.* New York: Viking.

Hofferth, S. L., & Anderson, K. G. (2003). Are all dads equal? Biology versus marriage as a basis for parental investment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 65,* 213-232.

Hofferth, S. L., Pleck, J. H., Stueve, J. L., Bianchi, S., & Sayer, L. (2002). The demography of fathers: What fathers do. In C. S. Tamis-LeMonda & N. Cabrera (Eds.), *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 63-90). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Horn, W. (1995). *Father facts 2* (Rev. ed.). Lancaster, PA: National Fatherhood Initiative.

Horn, W. (1999, July 7). Lunacy 101: Questioning the need for fathers. *Jewish World Review.* Retrieved from http://www.jewishworldreview.com

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

Ishii-Kuntz, M. (1992). Are Japanese families "fatherless"? *Sociology and Social Research, 76,* 105-110.

Ishii-Kuntz, M. (1993). Japanese families: Work demands and family roles. In J. C. Hood (Ed.), *Men, work, and family* (pp. 45-67). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ishii-Kuntz, M. (1994). Paternal involvement and perception toward fathers' roles: A comparison between Japan and the United States. *Journal of Family Issues, 15,* 30-48.

Jankowiak, W. (1992). Father-child relations in urban China. In B. S. Hewlett (Ed.), *Father-child relations: Cultural and biosocial contexts* (pp. 345-363). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Kiselica, M. A. (1995). *Multicultural counseling with teenage fathers: A practical guide.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Krause, H. D. (1989). Child support reassessed: Limits of private responsibility and the public interest. *University of Illinois Law Review, 1989,* 367-398.

Lamb, M. E. (1986). The changing roles of fathers. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father's role: Applied perspectives* (pp. 3-27). New York: Wiley.

Lamb, M. E. (Ed.). (1987). *The father's role: Cross-cultural perspectives.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lamb, M. E. (Ed.). (1997). *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed.). New York. Wiley.

Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J. H., Charnov, E. L., & Levine, J. A. (1985). Paternal behavior in humans. *American Zoologist, 25,* 883-894.

Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J. H., Charnov, E. L., & Levine, J. A. (1987). A biosocial perspective on paternal behavior and involvement. In J. B. Lancaster, J. Altmann, A. S. Rossi, & L. R. Sherrod (Eds.), *Parenting across the life span: Biosocial perspectives* (pp. 111-142). Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.

Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J., & Levine, R. (1986). Effects of increased paternal involvement on fathers and mothers. In C. Lewis & M. O'Brien (Eds.), *Reassessing fatherhood* (pp. 108-125). London: Sage.

LaRossa, R. (1988). Fatherhood and social change. *Family Relations, 37,* 451-458.

LaRossa, R. (1997). *The modernization of fatherhood: A social and political history.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LaRossa, R., Gadgil, J. M., & Wynn, G. R. (2000). The changing culture of fatherhood in comic strip families: A six-decade analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62,* 375-387.

LaRossa, R., & Reitzes, D. C. (1995). Gendered perceptions of father involvement in early 20th century America. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57,* 223-229.

Lerman, R. I., & Ooms, T. J. (1993). *Young unwed fathers: Changing roles and emerging policies.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lindberg, L. D., Sonenstein, F. L., Ku, L. T., & Martinez, G. (1997). Age differences between minors who give birth and their adult partners. *Family Planning Perspectives, 29*(2), 61-66.

Luker, K. (1996). *Dubious conceptions: The politics of teenage pregnancy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lupton, D., & Barclay, L. (1997). *Constructing fatherhood: Discourses and experiences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lytton, H., & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 109,* 267-296.

Maccoby, E. E., & Mnookin, R. H. (1992). *Dividing the child: Social and legal dilemmas of custody.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mackey, W. C. (1985). *Fathering behaviors: The dynamics of the man-child bond.* New York: Plenum.

Majors, R. G., & Billson, J. M. (1992). *Cool pose: The dilemmas of black manhood in America.* New York: Lexington Books.

Majors, R. G., & Gordon, J. U. (1994). *The American black male: His present status and his future.* Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Malkin, C. M., & Lamb, M. E. (1994). Child maltreatment: A test of sociobiological theory. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 25,* 121-134.

Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (1999). New families and nonresident father-child visitation. *Social Forces, 78,* 87-116.

Marecek, J. (1995). Gender, politics, and psychology's ways of knowing. *American Psychologist, 50,* 162-163.

Marsiglio, W. (1991). Paternal engagement activities with minor children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53,* 973-986.

Marsiglio, W. (1995). Fathers' diverse life course patterns and roles: Theory and social interventions. In W. Marsiglio (Ed.), *Fatherhood: Contemporary theory, research, and social policy* (pp. 78-101). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marsiglio, W. (1998). *Procreative man.* New York: New York University Press.

Marsiglio, W. (2004a). Studying fathering trajectories: In-depth interviewing and sensitizing concepts. In R. D. Day & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Conceptualizing and measuring fathering involvement* (pp. 61-82). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Marsiglio, W. (2004b). *Stepdads: Stories of love, hope, and repair.* Boulder, Co: Rowan & Littlefield.

Marsiglio, W., Amato, P., Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. (2000). Scholarship on fatherhood in the 1990s and beyond. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62,* 1173-1191.

Marsiglio, W., & Cohan, M. (1997). Young fathers and child development. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed., pp. 227-244, 373-376). New York: Wiley.

Marsiglio, W., & Cohan, M. (2000). Contextualizing father involvement and paternal influence: Sociological and qualitative themes. *Marriage & Family Review, 29,* 75-95.

Marsiglio, W., & Hutchinson, S. (2002). *Sex, men, and babies: Stories of awareness and responsibility.* New York: New York University Press.

McLanahan, S., & Sandefeur, G. (1994). *Growing up with a single parent: What hurts, what helps.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McMahon, A. (1999). *Taking care of men: Sexual politics in the public mind.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Melli, M. S., Brown, P. R., & Cancian, M. (1997). Child custody in a changing world: A study of postdivorce arrangements in Wisconsin. *University of Illinois Law Review, 49,* 773-800.

Mirandé, A. (1991). Ethnicity and fatherhood. In F. W. Bozett & S. M. H. Hanson (Eds.), *Fatherhood and families in cultural context* (pp. 53-82). New York: Springer.

Mirandé, A. (1997). *Hombres y machos: Masculinity and Latino culture.* Boulder, CO: Westview.

Nielsen, L. (1999). Demeaning, demoralizing, and disenfranchising divorced dads: A review of the literature. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 31,* 139-177.

Nock, S. L. (1998). *Marriage in men's lives.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Okin, S. M. (1989). *Justice, gender, and the family.* New York: Basic Books.

Osmond, M. W., & Thorne, B. (1993). Feminist theories: The social construction of gender in families and society. In P. G. Boss, W. H. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 591-625) New York: Plenum.

Palkovitz, R. (1997). Reconstructing "involvement": Expanding conceptualizations of men's caring in contemporary families. In A. J. Hawkins & D. C. Dollahite (Eds.), *Generative fathering: Beyond deficit perspectives* (pp. 200-216). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Parke, R. D. (2002). Fathers and families. In M. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting* (2nd ed., pp. 27-73). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Parke, R. D., & Brott, A. (1999). *Throwaway dads: The myths and barriers that keep men from being the fathers they want to be.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Patterson, C. J. (2000). Family relationships of lesbian and gay men. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62,* 1052-1069.

Patterson, C. J., & Chan, R. W. (1997). Gay fathers. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed., pp. 245-260). New York: Wiley.

Pfiefer, S. K., & Sussman, M. B. (Eds.). (1991). *Families: Intergenerational and generational connections.* Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.

Pillemer, K., & McCartney, K. (1991). *Parent-child relations throughout life.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pleck, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1997). Fatherhood ideals in the United States: Historical dimensions. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (pp. 33-48). New York: Wiley.

Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

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

Pleck, J. H. (1993). Are "family-supportive" employer policies relevant to men? In J. C. Hood (Ed.), *Men, work, and family* (pp. 217-237). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pleck, J. H. (1997). Paternal involvement: Levels, sources, and consequences. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed., pp. 66-103, 325-332). New York: Wiley.

Pleck, J. H., Lamb, M. E., & Levine, J. A. (1985). Epilog: Facilitating future change in men's family roles. *Marriage and Family Review, 9,* 11-16.

Pleck, J. H., & Stueve, J. L. (2001). Time and paternal involvement. In K. Daly (Ed.), *Minding the time in family experience: Emerging perspectives and issues* (pp. 205-226). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.

Polatnick, M. (1973-1974). Why men don't rear children: A power analysis. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 18,* 45-86.

Polikoff, N. (1983). Gender and child-custody determinations: Exploding the myths. In I. Diamond (Ed.), *Families, politics, and public policy: A feminist dialogue on women and the state* (pp. 183-202). New York: Longman.

Popenoe, D. (1996). *Life without father.* New York: Free Press.

Rivara, F., Sweeney, P., & Henderson, B. (1986). Black teenage fathers: What happens when the child is born? *Pediatrics, 78,* 151-158.

Sameroff, A., Seifer, R., Barocas, R., Zax, M., & Greenspan, S. (1987). Intelligence quotient scores of 4-year-old children: Social-environmental risk factors. *Pediatrics, 79,* 343-350.

Schwalbe, M. L., & Wolkomir, M. (2002). Interviewing men. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context & method* (pp. 203-219). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sedlak, A. J., & Broadhurst, D. D. (1996). *Third national incidence study of child abuse and neglect.* Washington, DC: National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Seltzer, J. A. (1998). Father by law: Effects of joint legal custody on nonresident fathers' involvement with children. *Demography, 35,* 135-146.

Seltzer, J. A. (2000). Families formed outside of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62,* 1247-1268.

Shwalb, D. W., Imaizumi, N., & Nakazawa, J. (1987). The modern Japanese father: Roles and problems in a changing society. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father's role: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 247-269). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Silverstein, L. B. (1993). Primate research, family politics, and social policy: Transforming "cads" into "dads." *Journal of Family Psychology, 7,* 267-282.

Silverstein, L. B. (1996). Fathering is a feminist issue. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20,* 3-37.

Silverstein, L. B., & Auerbach, C. F. (1999). Deconstructing the essential father. *American Psychologist, 6,* 397-407.

Silverstein, L. B., Auerbach, C. F., Grieco, L., & Dunkel, F. (1999). Do Promise Keepers dream of feminist sheep? *Sex Roles, 40,* 665-688.

Skow, J. (1989, August 7). The myth of male housework. *Time,* 62.

Smock, P. J. (2000). Cohabitation in the United States: An appraisal of research themes, findings and implications. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26,* 1-20.

Smuts, B. B., & Gubernick, D. J. (1992). Male-infant relationships in nonhuman primates: Paternal investment or mating effort? In B. S. Hewlett (Ed.), *Father-child relations: Cultural and biosocial contexts* (pp. 1-30). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Snarey, J. (1993). *How fathers care for the next generation: A four-decade study.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sonenstein, F. L., Stewart, K., Lindberg, L. D., Pernas, M., & Williams, S. (1997). *Involving males in preventing teen pregnancy: A guide for program planners.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Stacey, J., & Biblarz, T. J. (2001). (How) does the sexual orientation of parents matter? *American Sociological Review, 66,* 159-183.

Thompson, L., & Walker, A. (1995). The place of feminism in family studies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57,* 847-865.

Tripp-Reimer, T., & Wilson, S. E. (1991). Cross-cultural perspectives on fatherhood. In F. W. Bozett & S. M. H. Hanson (Eds.), *Fatherhood and families in cultural context* (pp. 1-27). New York: Springer.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1999). *Child support for custodial mothers and fathers: 1995* [Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 196]. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Walker, A. J., & McGraw, L. A. (2000). Who is responsible for responsible fathering? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62,* 563-569.

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 the Family, 63,* 155-167.

Wilson, M. N. (1989). Child development in the context of the black extended family. *American Psychologist, 44,* 380-385.

Wisensale, S. K. (2001). *Family leave policy: The political economy of family and work in America.* New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Yeung, W. J., Sandberg, J. F., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Hofferth, S. L. (2001). Children's time with fathers in intact families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 63,* 136-154.

Zambrana, R. E. (1995). *Understanding Latino families.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.