Fatherhood at Work and at Home: An analysis of men's joint identifications with parenting and work

Author: Iyar Mazar

Persistent link: http://hdl.handle.net/2345/2602

This work is posted on eScholarship@BC,
Boston College University Libraries.

Department of Sociology

FATHERHOOD AT WORK AND AT HOME: AN ANALYSIS OF MEN'S JOINT
IDENTIFICATIONS WITH PARENTING AND WORK

a thesis

by

IYAR MAZAR

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

May 2012

Fatherhood at Work and at Home
An analysis of men's joint identifications with parenting and work
Iyar Mazar
Advisor Paul Schervish

Abstract
Men's experiences at home and at work are changing, bringing to light new ways in which fathers identify with these two realms. This research expands upon current understandings of paternal identity by analyzing the potential for overlap and reinforcement between men's attachments to work and parenting. In this analysis, non-hierarchical, independent measures of work and parenting identities are constructed from a recently surveyed sample of 726 "New fathers"—professional, high-earning white men with children under 18, a group arguably marked by the desire to be more involved in home life, yet also faced with high work demands. In order to determine the differences between men that report identifying strongly with both work and parenting from those that do not, I use multinomial logistic regression to capture the association between demographic traits, time spent in both roles, support from others, perceptions of enrichment and the odds of identifying strongly with either work and family, neither, or both. The results demonstrate that time spent in a role, support from coworkers and managers, and higher reports of enrichment between the spheres are all associated with a respondent's odds of reporting dually strong attachments to work and parenting. The findings yield both theoretical contributions and practical implications, providing 1) new understandings of how some fathers experience synergistic parenting and work identifications, 2) evidence that fathers' perceptions of workplace support and positive overlap between their roles are associated with reports of higher identification with both,

and 3) directions for future research that address how institutional practices in the

workplace relate to fathers' reports of dually strong role identifications.

associated with reports of higher identification with both, and 3) directions for future research that address how institutional practices in the workplace relate to fathers' reports of dually strong role identifications.

Introduction

　　Across the board, scholars agree that initial interest in American fathers was born out of changes in women's lives, namely, the dramatic increase of mothers entering the paid labor force (Barnett & Baruch, 1987). As a result, some argue that societal expectations of fatherhood have increased, thus drawing additional attention to men's roles in family life (La Rossa, 1988; Rane & McBride, 2000; Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001). Furthermore, the ever-growing body of literature on fathers continues to demonstrate that paternal involvement does in fact have a significant impact on children's well-being and outcomes, solidifying the topic of fatherhood as an important subject of study (Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Deutsch, Lussier, & Servis, 1993; Evans, 2004).

　　Scholars have also recognized that recent shifts in gender roles, family structure, and economic realities have not only had a profound impact on external expectations of fatherhood, but also on how men themselves experience and identify with parenting (Gerson, 1993; Day & Lamb, 2004). As men navigate the changing landscape of fatherhood, they also face increased expectations at work, a seemingly competing realm of life. Does work life then, necessarily compete with the identity of fatherhood, or can it derive from and reinforce that identity? Is it possible for men to report strong attachments to both work and parenting, and if so, how do these men differ from those that report strong attachments to either or neither role?

　　Despite the increasing expectations associated with work and fatherhood, research regarding paternal identity has focused mostly on its determinants and its effects (Bielby & Bielby, 1987; Rane & McBride, 2000; Fox & Bruce, 2001; Pleck and Stueve, 2004).

1

On the other hand, the meanings that men attach to fatherhood in the face of work demands are often overlooked (Duckworth & Buzzanell, 2009; Tichenor, McQuillan, Greil, Contreras, & Schreffler, 2011), and much of the literature that does exist emphasizes solely the notion of work-family conflict (Rothbard, 2001; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Therefore, this paper takes up the task of analyzing not only the meanings that men attach to fatherhood, but how they do so in relation to their roles at work, arguing for the possibility of identity overlap for some contemporary fathers.

Focusing on the duality of parenting and work identities yields important recommendations for how to better support working fathers, for, as others have suggested, the insights derived from studying paternal identity can be applied towards creating better programs and policies that help men meet the changing societal expectations of fatherhood (Rane & McBride, 2000). Specifically, this research evaluates perceptions of workplace support and enrichment between both realms, arguing that these could be strengthened in order to promote the efforts of men seeking to contribute more fully both at home and at work.

Identity, Meaning, and Fatherhood

Although the topic of fatherhood only recently began garnering scholarly interest within identity studies, sociologists have always been drawn to the study of roles and their boundaries. In the 1960s American sociologist Talcott Parsons wrote,

> …It is a commonplace, though a crucial one, that only in a limiting case does a single role constitute the entire interactive behavior of a concrete individual. The role is rather a sector in his behavioral system, and hence of his personality…it is largely when interpreted as this particular boundary-concept that the concept of role has an important theoretical significance for sociology (167).

2

Parsons was hardly alone in recognizing that there are multiple roles that characterize an individual's personality, behavior, and social life. Many theorists and researchers alike have analyzed how the boundaries between roles are experienced, internalized, negotiated, and blurred. While the majority of the literature on multiple roles focuses on the theory of depletion or conflict, arguing that individuals experience strain and stress when attempting to meet the demands of two or more roles, the concept of enrichment has also emerged within this field (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). While the former concepts depict human energy and resources as fixed, and therefore limiting individuals from being able to accommodate all of the demands from multiple roles fully, the latter concept of enrichment argues the opposite. Not only can individuals draw benefit and gratification from engaging in multiple roles, but role accumulation can also replenish/expand their energy and resources rather than diminish them (Sieber, 1974; Rothbard, 2001).

Given this long standing interest in how roles are experienced by individuals, it's no surprise that when scholars began paying attention to fatherhood just a few decades ago, men's identifications with the parenting role became an important subject of study within the field (Marsiglio, Amato, Day, & Lamb, 2000: Pleck & Stueve, 2004). Recently, the concept of "New fatherhood" has been employed to depict men whose desire to be more involved in parenting has been greater relative to fathers from previous generations (LaRossa, 1988; Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 2000; Yeung, Sandberg, Davis-Kean, & Hofferth, 2001). The concept, some scholars argue, is only applicable to a subset of American fathers, namely, upper middle class professionals, and even then, there is

3

still much progress to be made in bridging the gap between how involved men say they'd like to be in parenting/home life and how involved they actually are (LaRossa, 1988).

Despite these shortcomings, "new" fathers—men who are parenting in this new social reality that characterizes fatherhood—are an interesting group due to their seemingly conflicting attachments to work and family. At the same time that expectations around fatherhood are rising, research has demonstrated that fathers, compared to men without children, are more likely to be employed and work more hours (Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 2000; Glauber, 2008). "New" fathers, in general, and especially those who are high-earning professionals with careers that often demand a greater amount of time and a higher level of commitment, also desire to be more involved in their children's lives and to go beyond simply providing for their needs financially. The "good provider" role, once central to the construction of fatherhood for white middle and upper class men, has slowly been losing legitimacy as the primary form of paternal involvement (Christiansen & Palkovitz, 2001; Tichenor, et.al, 2011). As Kathleen Gerson (1993) explains it, the good provider role, previously uncontested, is now very much up for debate in a time marked by ambiguity regarding what men's goals should be and the means of attaining them. The result, she argues, is that this "demise of a cultural consensus on the meaning of manhood has left men in a no man's land, searching for new meanings and definitions of maturity" (Gerson, 1993: 5).

However, the waning legitimacy of the "good provider" role may not be apparent in all men's role behaviors. The paradox of "New" fathers lies in the fact that they seem to have come to a new sense of identity or personal purpose as fathers but not necessarily

to the new set of behaviors or roles that accompany that identity. Many fathers today express a desire to be more actively engaged in child rearing and home work, but instead remain engaged in even increased paid work activity. Does this gap between stated aspiration and actual behaviors simply serve as evidence of hypocrisy? Or is there something more profound taking place, whereby, for some fathers, an actual increase in an identity aspiring to greater care for child and home leads in many cases to an honest expression of those aspirations by increased activity in paid work? In other words, the identity and role behavior that do not coincide from the viewpoint of an outside observer may in fact coincide for the fathers whose dedication to more time and effort in work roles actually grows out of their identity as one nurturing children, family, spouse, and home life.

Some recent research demonstrates the plausibility of the foregoing description of the potential for new identities of fatherhood to be carried out with an even greater intensity of paid work roles. For instance, when forced to rank among six aspects representing "good fatherhood", working fathers placed "providing financial security" almost evenly into all possible slots (among the five other choices of providing love and emotional support; being present; providing discipline; being a coach and mentor; taking part in daily childcare tasks), "…suggesting that there is a wide range of perceptions about how truly important financial support is, in a relative sense, in the definition of a 'good father'" (Center for Work & Family, 2011). Thus it might be expected that high earning, middle-upper class fathers experience their commitments to work and family in a unique way—recognizing the increasing expectations around paternal involvement

outside of financial support, yet also feeling required to invest time and effort into their careers in order to succeed professionally and provide for their children.

How then, in light of the changing social expectations of fatherhood and the increased commitment to paid work that seems to follow thereafter, do men experience their roles as parents, and why do their identifications with the role matter? Scholars argue that paternal identity serves as a precursor to men's involvement at home, whether involvement is defined in strictly behavioral terms, such as how much men share in childcare tasks, or in other cases, more fluidly to include intangible forms of involvement. In studying the determinants of the former definition of involvement, it is instrumental to understand paternal identity, for it is conceptualized as "one of several major factors influencing fathers' behavior, as well as giving their behavior meaning" (Pleck & Stueve, 2004: 84). Scholars also pay attention to paternal identity when involvement is defined as more than just fathers' behaviors at home, including intangible dynamics, say level of pride or joy in children's accomplishments, arguing that identity shapes this form of involvement as well (Bielby & Bielby, 1989; Rane & McBride, 2000; Fox & Bruce, 2001).

The former approach—finding a direct link between fathers' identifications and their parenting behaviors—has not produced consistent results, which some attribute to the ambiguity of the notion of "good fathering". Kaufman & Uhlenberg (2000) argue that the literature on fatherhood presents two opposing models for how men might define their role as parents. On the one hand, the traditional good provider role predicts that as men become fathers, their commitment to work increases in order to meet the financial

6

responsibility of supporting a family. Alternatively, as men have begun expressing the desire to be more involved in caregiving and family work, it could also be plausible for fathers to work less in order to be more present in their children lives.

This behavioral and conceptual conundrum has been examined more deeply in other research, where the variation in definitions of fatherhood across men has been noted as an important obstacle in coming to conclusions about fatherhood identity (Rane & McBride, 2000). The same level of identification with parenting could be reported by two men who exhibit opposite behaviors in line with the two models presented above. While one father who identifies strongly with parenting chooses to spend more time caring for his children than at work, another man, equally as committed to parenting but adhering to the good provider role, would instead spend more time at work (Pleck & Stueve, 2004: 85). Therefore, making a link between identification and behavior for men is difficult given these differences in how good fathering can be defined.

On the other hand, studies that have focused on the identity formation process rather than its links to paternal involvement have demonstrated the need to understand paternal identity as subject to changes in social context and life transitions, as a more fluid rather than static concept (McBride, Brown, Bost, Shin, Vaughn, & Korth, 2005). Identity theory, which focuses on the salience (importance/intensity) of a role over others, has served as the theoretical framework for much of this research. According to Burke and Reitzes (1981) identities are defined as the "meanings one attributes to oneself in a role" (84) and can be conceived of as social products, formed and reinforced through social processes, reflexive and relational in nature.

7

This strain of research around paternal identity has focused on the importance of the parenting role for men, a role that often exists simultaneously with a variety of other roles (worker, brother, son, husband, teammate, etc.) that come about as a result of men's relationships with and responsibilities to others (Pleck & Stueve, 2004). Sieber (1974) defines a role as "…a pattern of expectations which apply to a particular social position and which normally persist independently of the personalities occupying the position" (569), and the idea then is that each role that an individual engages in is accompanied by a corresponding level of identification. This symbolic interactionism perspective championed by Stryker and Burke argues that these various identities that dwell in the self are organized hierarchically, resulting in some being more central than others (Stryker & Burke, 2000). It is assumed that men who show stronger commitments to fathering regard their parental role as central to their sense of self above any other role (Fox & Bruce, 2001).

This last piece is defined as a major premise of identity theory, which supports the notion that there is a direct link between identity salience and behavior, thus, individuals will behave in line with the expectations associated with the identities that are most meaningful to them (Rane & McBride, 2000; Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 2000). Because their time is limited, individuals use the salience of their identities as a basis for deciding how to allocate their resources, giving the most time to higher ranked identifications. So if the role of parent is less salient than that of worker, an individual will allot more time and energy to work than family. Yet deciding which comes first can be theoretically challenging, as scholars also recognize that the relationship between identity and

behavior is "complex and probably reciprocal" (Burke & Reitzes, 1981: 83).

Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, juggling the demands and expectations associated

with multiple roles can produce strain and stress for some, as well as provide rewards and

gratification for others (Rothbard, 2001).

Accepting that men can identify with and experience fatherhood in a variety of

ways, how are paternal identifications negotiated with men's other roles, for instance,

their role in the workplace? Having shed the role of primary breadwinner, the majority of

fathers today form part of dual earner partnerships, which has changed the expectations

of men in the family domain, namely, that they contribute to the everyday tasks of family

life, such as childcare. This is important, as scholars maintain that not only time spent in

a role, but also others' expectations of one in that role, serve to shape identity formation.

Expectations can be defined both as the external demands or responsibilities that one

perceives others ascribe to her or his roles, or what one believes the normative

expectations of the role are, in either case, highlighting the fact that identities are

relational and social (Bielby & Bielby, 1987; Fox & Bruce, 2001; Pleck & Stueve, 2004).

In their study of men and women's identifications with work and parenting,

Bielby and Bielby (1989) state, "…men appear to be able to form strong work identities

irrespective of their commitments to their families and vice versa" (784). So how do time

and expectations shape men's identifications if identity formation is not a zero-sum

game? One approach is to conceptualize identity in less rigidly hierarchical terms. Marks

and McDermid (1996), for instance, argue against the classic "geometry of the self" as

put forth by identity theory, where roles are ranked linearly in order of importance, or in

other depictions, as a series of rings rather where the core identity is at the center and other identities form the outer layers. In both cases, the visuals support the notion that individuals subscribe to just one core identity, and secondary roles vary in their importance to the self. Alternatively, Marks and McDermid propose the concept of role balance, or the notion that individuals are able to find various identities central to their sense of self depending on the context, and commit fully to more than one identity at different times/in different situations.

The concept of role balance, though not directly testable here, demonstrates the possibility of a more dynamic theoretical framework for understanding the identifications of men who express dually strong commitments to work and family. The approach taken up in this research is motivated but different from the concept of role balance, analyzing not the ways in which men attach meanings to work and family at different moments/times, but instead the possibility of a synergistic relationship between the dual identities associated with work and parenting. This aligns with the often overlooked perspective that Greenhaus and Powell (2006) argue for, where work and family can function not only as "enemies" but also as allies that enrich one another. Research in this vein, for instance, by Duckworth & Buzzanell (2009) in the Communications field has demonstrated that the meanings men associate with work and fatherhood can overlap as they negotiate their responsibilities in both roles.

Building off of the possibility that some "New" fathers may not only form strong attachments to both work and parenting, but also reinforce these attachments between realms, this quantitative study hopes to contribute new insights to the existing literature

10

on paternal identity, asking how fathers who form strong attachments to these two "competing realms"—parenting and work—differ from those who don't. Are time, support, and enrichment important aspects of men's identifications with work and family?

Models and Explanations

The main focus of this analysis is to determine how men who identify strongly with both parenting and work differ from those who seem to adhere more to a hierarchical identity structure. Three explanations are explored regarding fathers' identity formation processes: 1) that the traits that most embody "New" fatherhood, age, education, and earning potential, determine stronger identification with both work and home, 2) that increased time spent at both work and home are associated with reports of increased identification, and 3) that overlap between the spheres, in the form of self-reported levels of support and enrichment, are also associated with strong identification with both spheres. In paying attention to the men perhaps most marked by "New" fatherhood, as well as to their accounts of time, support, and enrichment in their dual roles, the aim is to contribute evidence that can shape existing theory and future practices in the home and workplace.

Firstly, as stated earlier, much attention has been paid to the phenomenon of "New fatherhood". In this research, the concept refers not necessarily to men becoming parents for the first time, but to those men experiencing fatherhood in this new terrain, one marked by increased societal expectations of the role. Often associated with younger,

11

upper-middle class professionals, the concept of "New fatherhood" points to men who are more involved and engaged in parenting than their counterparts in prior generations were (La Rossa, 1988; Messner, 1993). Poignant critiques made by both La Rossa (1988) and Messner (1993), however, argue that this concept of "New fatherhood" may only signal, if anything, a change in attitudes about the role fathers should play in child-care, and does not equate to an actual increase in paternal involvement. While research supports the notion that men today express a greater desire to be involved in child-care than their fathers did, and actually are, to an extent, more involved at home now than they were before, scholars generally agree that the real changes have been in what men say they'd like to do and not necessarily in what they actually end up doing.

Yet even if thus far the change has only been in upper-middle class fathers hoping to be more involved in their children's lives and not in their actual behaviors, these hopes are nevertheless important, and likely to be met with conflicting demands from the workplace. Past research has demonstrated a positive association between family status and men's work efforts, specifically for men who fit into the concept of "New fatherhood". Kaufman & Uhlenberg (2000) argue that "Among men with professional jobs, being married and having children both lead to increases in work effort and a greater likelihood of being on a career track" (933) which could make living up the expectations of involved fatherhood especially difficult for these same men who may be the most drawn to it. Furthermore, the nature of work has not only become increasingly global and marked by around the clock connectivity, but is also now more insecure and vulnerable than ever before, factors that may make detachment from work difficult for

men that face these pressures (Duckworth & Buzzanell, 2009).

Despite their behavioral shortcomings, it might be expected that younger men with increased educational attainment and income—in effect, members of the upper-middle class—may exhibit stronger connections to both family and work than older, less educated, less financially successful men. Therefore, one explanation for men's identity formation process postulates that *because contemporary working fathers may internalize the increasing expectations associated with both realms, the demographic traits pertaining to "New fatherhood" such as education, income, and age, will be associated with increased identifications with work and parenting.*

Secondly, prior research has demonstrated that time matters. Bielby and Bielby (1989) argue that "…for both men and women, a strong engagement in work and family roles in terms of time demands, responsibilities, and the like leads to identification with those roles" (Bielby & Bielby, 1989: 786), establishing time spent at work and with children to be important for the identity formation process. A longitudinal study of father involvement demonstrated that early engagement in childcare led to sustained involvement later on (Aldous, Mulligan, & Bjarnason, 1998) further supporting the relevance of time to fatherhood. This brings about the second explanation—*because time spent in a role is positively related to identification, increased time spent with children and at work will be associated with stronger identifications with both realms.*

Finally, scholars have also argued that what is expected of individuals by others can dictate their ensuing behaviors, as they aim to reduce the discrepancy between how they see their role and how others perceive it (Pleck & Stueve, 2004). Fox and Bruce

13

(2001) specify that as a result of external expectations not only do one's behaviors change, but also "one's very definition of self" (395). This effect is not limited solely to expectations, but also includes support from others, which McCall and Simmons (1978) argue serves to shape identification. How does this pertain to paternal identity? Do men who feel that their spouses support their work endeavors and that, inversely, their colleagues and managers support their parenting endeavors show differences in their identifications as a result of bridging the gap, or at least attempting to bridge the gap, between expectation and reality?

Furthermore, past research has demonstrated that dual commitments to work and family roles can be enriching for some individuals. Rothbard (2001), for instance, finds this to be true of the women in her study, where their family roles enhanced their work engagement, and for men, family involvement did not negatively affect work engagement. Because of this evidence regarding enrichment, and of the fact that external expectations have been theorized as capable of shaping internalized identities, a third explanation states that *men who feel supported in their work and family relationships will identify more strongly with both roles. Additionally, men who report higher levels of reinforcement between the spheres of work and family, agreeing that experiences in one role enrich the other, will also express stronger identification with both work and fatherhood.*

The data for this analysis come from a 2011 survey conducted by the Boston College Center for Work and Family, which also served as the empirical basis for the publication *The New Dad: Caring, Committed, Conflicted*. Four Fortune 500 companies participated in the survey, which was accessible electronically to all male employees with at least one child aged eighteen or younger. The number of eligible men who chose not to participate in the study is unknown, however, of the 1670 men who began the survey, a total of 963 completed it, yielding a response rate of 57.6%. Respondents completed the survey between mid-January 2011 and mid-March 2011.

The sample is predominantly white (84%), well educated (73% hold a four year college degree or a Master's degree) and married (89%). The analysis and descriptive statistics refer only to these married men, as unmarried men were excluded due to the low numbers of such respondents. Seventy-three percent of respondents earn between $75,000-$200,000 per year and 60% are managers. Sixty-nine percent of respondents have spouses in the paid workforce, with 49% of spouses working 35-45 hours per week. Additional descriptive statistics are presented below in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	SD
Age (25-65 years)	42.66	7.45
Educational Attainment (1 = high school grad; 7 = PhD)	5.10	1.02
Race (0=Other; 1=White, non-Hispanic)	0.84	
Personal annual income (1= $25,000-$50,000; 5=over $200,000)	4.23	0.93
Occupational role (0=non-manager; 1=manager)	0.59	
Years employed at company (1= 1-5 years; 4=over 20 years)	3.52	1.05
Hours worked per week (1=35-45 hours; 3= more than 55 hours)	1.84	0.71
Number of Children (0-4+)[1]	2.28	0.90
Age of youngest child (0-18)	7.94	5.33
Hours spent with children per day (0-5+)[2]	2.56	1.23
Time off after birth/adoption of most recent child (0=no; 1=yes)	0.83	
Amount of time off after birth/adoption of most recent child (1=under 1 week; 4= 3+ weeks[3])	2.05	0.77
Opinions about the division of childcare (0=should not be equal; 1=should be equal)	0.65	
Actual division of childcare (0=unequal; 1=equal)	0.28	
Spouse's employment status (0=not in paid labor force; 1=in paid labor force)	0.69	
Spouse works part-time (0=no; 1=yes)	0.52	
Spouse works full-time (0=no; 1=yes)	0.48	
Spouse's personal annual income (1=less than $25,000; 5=more than $100,000)	2.07	1.32
Spouse's educational attainment (1 = high school grad; 7 = PhD)	4.69	1.27
Breadwinner status (0=wife earns more or equal income, 1= respondent is breadwinner)	0.81	
Coworker support scale (range 6-30, a=0.73)	24.24	3.25
Manager support scale (range 7-35 a=0.91)	26.62	5.52
Spouse/partner support scale (range 6-30, a=0.83)	23.57	3.67
Work-to-Family Enrichment Scale (range, 9-45 a=0.90)	28.86	5.89
Family-to-Work Enrichment scale (range 9-45, a=0.86)	32.97	4.68

The dependent measure, salience of work and family identities, is modeled by

---

[1] Respondents with more than four children were top coded.
[2] Respondents who reported spending more than 5 hours a day with their children were top coded. Respondents who reported values between 0 and 1 were recoded to 1.

16

self-reported responses that were combined to form two sum scales, one for each identity. Multi-item sum scales were used because as Gliem and Gliem (2003) explain, single item measures are often unreliable, cannot distinguish across fine degrees of an attribute, and lack the necessary theoretical scope for measuring a complex concept (83). Therefore, multi-item scales were used to create the dependent measure and were tested for internal reliability using Cronbach's α to ensure they met the guidelines endorsed by George and Mallery (2003), where values at or above 0.7 are considered acceptable (231).

The five indicators used for work identity are: "My work is very enjoyable"; "My work makes me feel good about myself"; "My work gives me a feeling of security"; "The work I do in my job is meaningful to me"; and "I consider work to be very central to my existence" (1= "strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree"). The work identity scale was created using the sum of these five indicators, where α=0.74. The lowest possible score one could receive on this scale (if he answered all questions) is 5, while the highest possible score is 25. The mean score was 17.85, therefore 18 was set as the cutoff point, establishing a binary variable where all respondents at or below a score of 18 received a score of 0, reflecting an average or below average central work identity, and those with scores at or above 19 received a score of 1, reflecting a more central work identity. The scale was missing 16 cases, which were dropped using listwise deletion. Descriptive statistics for this scale can be found in Table 2.

The seven indicators used for family identity are: "It is important to be a good caregiver to my child(ren)"; "I would like to be remembered for the quality of care I gave

---

[3] This question was asked only of the N=719 fathers who took time off. All non-respondents were recoded to the group mean.

to my child(ren)"; "If I considered taking a new job, I would consider how much that job would interfere with my ability to care for my child(ren)"; "My children are the number one priority in my life"; "I am proud of what I do for my children"; "Sacrificing for my children is part of parenthood", and "Overall, I am confident in my ability as a parent" (1= "strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree"). The sum of these seven variables was used to create the parenting identity scale, where α=0.70. The lowest possible score one could receive on this scale (if he answered all questions) is 7 and the highest possible score is 35. The mean score was 30.97, which was set as the cutoff point, thereby establishing a binary variable where all respondents at or below a score of 31 received a score of 0, reflecting an average or below average central parenting identity, and those with scores above 31 received a score of 2 reflecting a more central parenting identity (a score of 2 was used so that when added to the work scale score it would be possible to differentiate between categories). The scale was missing 8 cases, which were dropped using listwise deletion. Descriptive statistics for this scale can be found in Table 2.

These scales were combined to create four nominal categories that fathers could potentially fit into: identifying strongly (above average) with both fatherhood and work (23.06%), identifying strongly with work only but average/below average with fatherhood (23.06%), identifying strongly with fatherhood but average/low with work (26.64%), and finally, identifying at or below average with both roles (27.24%). These identifications are depicted in Table 3 as a cross-tabulation.

Table 2. Composite Scale Scores

Scale	Range	Mean	SD
Parenting Identity	18-35 (out of 35)	30.97	2.80
Work Identity	5-25 (out of 25)	17.85	3.20

18

Table 3. Identity groupings

	Average or low work score	Above average work score
Average or low parenting score	27.24%	23.06%
Above average parenting score	26.64%	23.06%

Finally, Table 4 below provides a breakdown of how respondents in these four groups understand the concept of "good fatherhood". Respondents were asked whether an aspect was "Not at all important", "Somewhat Important", "Important", "Very Important" or "Extremely Important" to the concept, and reflected below are the percentages of fathers in each group that agreed the aspect was very or extremely important to being a good father. Across the board, providing emotional support, love, being present, and serving a mentor in a child's life were consistently perceived as important facets of good fatherhood by respondents in all groups.

The majority of respondents agreed that the ability to provide financial security is important to being a good father, but the group that identified more strongly with work than with parenting was the most supportive of this association. On the other hand, more respondents that identified strongly with parenting over work considered taking part in daily childcare tasks as very/extremely important to good fatherhood, while this same aspect received the lowest level of support in the other three groups. Though not depicted in the table below, a majority of the respondents in every category agreed to feeling worried that they don't spend enough time with their children. Therefore, despite

19

differences across these groupings, fathers in this sample shared the values of emotional

support, love, and presence as important facets of good fatherhood.

Table 4. Very/Extremely Important Aspects of Being a Good Father by Group[4]

Group	Provide financial security	Provide discipline	Be involved and present in your child's life	Provide love and emotional support	Be a teacher, guide, and coach	Do your part in the day-to-day childcare tasks
Dual Average/Low Identification	66.23%	71.06%	92.51%	93.86%	92.98%	54.39%
Higher Work Identification	85.39%	71.43%	90.57%	93.19%	95.92%	57.37%
Higher Parenting Identification	76.68%	81.98%	99.1%	100.0%	100.0%	81.62%
Dual Above Average Identification	83.22%	81.46%	95.07%	98.45%	98.96%	76.68%

Methodology

In multinomial logistic regression, the analytical strategy employed in this paper,

several predictors are used to determine how they affect the odds of a respondent's group

membership in one of the nominal category presented above. The predictors in this study

include "New fatherhood" measures such as the ones mentioned earlier—age, education,

income—along with number of children and age of youngest child. These two latter

variables could also be considered related to the time hypothesis, since having

younger/more children could also come with increased childcare responsibilities and

commitments. The specific time related variables are years employed at company, hours

worked per week, hours spent with children on an average workday, having taken time

off after the birth/adoption of most recent child, amount of time taken off, and the actual

division of childcare (equal versus unequal). Since the men who did not take any time off

---

[4] Percentages represent the number of respondents that indicated the aspect was extremely/very important
to being a good father.

after the birth of their last child were not asked the length of their time off, they were given the mean score for the variable. Finally, although the actual division of children is based on the respondents' perceptions of the division, this variable still might indicate that these men spend more time with children than those men who do not perceive it to be equal.

The set of relational variables include respondents' perceived level of coworker and manager support for family obligations, their perceptions of their spouses' support for work obligations, whether a respondent's spouse is employed for pay, the spouse's income, the respondents' ideas about how childcare ought to be divided, and the level of reported enrichment experienced between family and work spheres. Unlike the actual division of childcare, beliefs about how childcare should ideally be divided could possibly be related to how a respondent views expectations of parenting. Instead of relative earnings or the magnitude of difference between the respondents' earnings and their spouses', spouses' absolute income was used, as prior research has demonstrated that this approach also serves as a valid predictor of how couples negotiate housework (Gupta, 2007). Men whose partners did not work were not asked to provide their spouse's income and therefore were recoded into the bottom group representing a spouse's annual income of $0-$25,000. Finally the two enrichment scales were constructed from nine variables each that asked men how much their roles at work and home contribute positively to their experiences in the opposite sphere. All of variables that form part of the constructed scales are outlined in Appendices B and C.

21

Prior to running the analysis, a check for missing data was conducted and determined that responses were Missing at Random. Eighty-five percent of the sample provided responses to the variables used in the model, and no pattern of was greater than 5%. The variable missing the most data was age with thirty-nine missing values. In an effort to retain missing data, an initial multinomial logistic regression was run after subjecting the predictors listed above to the ICE multiple imputation procedure. This chain equation works to predict each missing value using all of the other variables in the model, resulting in an N of 837 after imputation, down from the sample's initial N of 963 due to dropping the 111 unmarried men and because the outcome variable was not imputed (missing responses=22).

The results of this preliminary analysis were largely consistent with the second analysis run relying on listwise deletion, where any case with a missing value is excluded from the analysis. This similarity justifies the use of the non-altered model, with an N of 726, rather than the imputed model (for those results, see Appendix A). Finally, because the cases in the sample are not independent—all respondents are employed at one of four companies—standard errors were adjusted using clustering to account for any differences in work environment.

Results

The results of the multinomial logistic regression are presented in Table 5, which can be read as a series of binary regressions between each of the identification groups, low/low, low family/high work, and low work/high family and the reference group, high

work/high family identification. The odds ratios in Table 4 should be interpreted as follows: coefficients larger than one represent increased odds of belonging to the comparison group rather than the reference group, high identification on both scales, whereas coefficients smaller than one represent decreased odds of being in the comparison group. Finally, it should be noted that the log-likelihood increases from -1004.21 when solely the outcome variable is included to -845.32 for the full model that includes all of the predictors.

Paying attention to the first comparison, the average/low identification with both work and family group, it is evident that several predictors increase the odds of a respondent falling into the group of men who identify high on both parenting and work scales. Taking any amount of time off after the birth/adoption of a child increases the odds that a father will identify strongly with both work and parenting by 53%, and the more time taken off work by a father also increases the odds by 24%. For every additional hour that men spend with their children on a given weekday, the odds of being in the high/high group increase by 10%. On the other hand, a respondent who states a one unit increase in his work hour grouping also shows increased odds of belonging to the dually high group by 54%.

Finally, support matters. An increase in perceived support levels on the manager and coworker scales leads to increased odds of identifying with both work and family by 7% each. Regarding enrichment across work and family spheres, a one-unit increase in the work-to-family enrichment scale also increased the odds of identifying more strongly

23

with both roles by 14%. While the directionality was similar for the family-to-work enrichment scale, this relationship was not statistically significant.

Many similar variables remain significant predictors of membership in the strong work/average or low family group versus the dually strong identification group. Again, increased time spent with children each day increases the odds of membership in the high work/high family identification group rather than the higher work identification group, this time by 28%. Although the sheer act of having taken time off after childbirth/adoption is not a significant predictor of group membership in this comparison, the actual amount of time taken is, where a one unit increase in time off groupings increases the odds of being in the high/high group by 24%. Also, respondents who reported an equal division of childcare show a 51% increase in odds of belonging to the dually strong identification group.

Finally, none of the support scales are statistically significant predictors of group membership at the 5% level in this comparison between the higher work than family identification group and the dually high identification group. However, enrichment does play a role, where higher scores on the family-to-work enrichment scale are associated with increased odds of belonging to the dual identification group by 9%.

In the final comparison between the group identifying more strongly with parenting than work versus those identifying strongly with both realms, some of the same relational predictors serve to determine group membership. As in the first comparison, coworker and managerial support are significant predictors, where higher reports of support increase the odds falling into the reference group by 6% and 7% respectively. As

in the second comparison, higher levels of reported enrichment from the sphere men were less identified with to the sphere they reported stronger identification with was associated with higher odds of belonging to the dual identification group. In this case, the work-to-family enrichment scale is significantly associated with group membership odds, where a one unit increase on this scale is associated with a 19% increase in the odds of belonging to the dually high identification group rather than the stronger parenting identification group.

These three comparisons begin to paint a picture of the men in the high work and parenting identity group. The odds of belonging to the first group (low/low) are decreased for men who work more hours, who took time off after the birth of their last child, spend more time with their children, and report more support from their managers and supervisors. The odds of belonging to the high/high identification group rather than the stronger work identification group are influenced, again, by the amount of time taken off after the birth of a child and by the subsequent time spent with one's children each day thereafter. For men who identify more strongly with fatherhood than work, reporting increased support from coworkers and supervisors increases the odds of belonging to the group that identifies strongly with both work and parenting. Across the comparisons, in all but one of the statistically significant relationships, higher levels of reported enrichment increased the odds of belonging to the dually strong identification group, indicating that enrichment is in fact part of the identity formation process.

Table 5. Multinomial Logistic Regression, Odds of Identifying Strongly with both Work and Fatherhood

	Average/low work and family identification (*N*=228)	Stronger work identification (*N*=193)	Stronger family identification (*N*=223)
	vs. Above average work and family identification (*N*=193)		
	Odds Ratio (95% C.I.)	Odds Ratio (95% C.I.)	Odds Ratio (95% C.I.)
Demographic variables			
Age (25-65 years)	0.98 (0.93-1.03)	0.98 (0.94-1.02)	0.96 (0.91-1.01)
Educational Attainment	1.04 (0.86-1.25)	1.05 (0.94-1.17)	0.86 (0.34-1.02)
Personal annual income	1.09 (0.67-1.79)	1.26 (0.97-1.64)	1.14 (0.80-1.63)
Number of Children	1.10 (0.84-1.45)	1.01 (0.71-1.45)	1.19 (0.93-1.52)
Age of youngest child	1.00 (0.95-1.06)	1.05 (1.02-1.08)	1.01 (0.98-1.04)
Time variables			
Years employed at company	1.04 (0.86-1.25)	0.97 (0.82-1.15)	0.97 (0.84-1.11)
Hours worked per week	0.46** (0.29-0.75)	0.95 (0.77-1.18)	0.59 (0.34-1.02)
Taking time off after birth of child	0.47*** (0.32-0.69)	1.14 (0.73-1.77)	0.96 (0.64-1.37)
Amount of time off after birth of child	0.76* (0.60-0.97)	0.76* (0.61-0.92)	0.93 (0.75-1.15)
Actual division of childcare	0.87 (0.54-1.40)	0.49* (0.30-0.82)	0.98 (0.64-1.50)
Hours spent with children per day	0.80*** (0.71-0.90)	0.72*** (0.68-0.76)	1.02 (0.83-1.25)
Relational variables			
Opinions about division of childcare	0.79 (0.54-1.14)	1.15 (0.71-1.86)	1.25 (0.73-2.15)
Spouse's employment status	1.20 (0.69-2.32)	1.79 (0.78-4.08)	1.12 (0.54-2.30)
Spouse's income	1.11 (0.82-1.49)	0.89 (0.71-1.12)	0.91 (0.71-1.16)
Coworker support scale	0.93** (0.89-0.98)	0.98 (0.96-1.01)	0.94*** (0.93-0.96)
Manager support scale	0.93*** (0.91-0.96)	0.96 (0.92-1.01)	0.93*** (0.91-0.96)
Spouse/partner support scale	0.94 (0.88-1.02)	0.96 (0.88-1.05)	1.01 (0.93-1.09)
Family-to-Work Enrichment	0.95 (0.90-1.00)	0.91* (0.84-0.98)	1.03 (0.97-1.09)
Work-to-Family Enrichment	0.86*** (0.82-0.90)	1.04* (1.00-1.08)	0.81*** (0.77-0.85)
N			726

Note. Statistics are clustered to account for the four companies represented. **p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤.0*

26

Discussion

  The analysis above analyzes the validity of the explanations presented earlier regarding time, support, enrichment, and "New" fatherhood. Increased time spent with children was in fact significantly associated, at least in two of the comparisons, with identifying strongly with both work and parenting. Associations, however, do not warrant causal interpretations, making it impossible to determine whether spending additional hours at work and with children causes men to feel more identified with both realms or if the men that initially possess these strong identifications then elect to spend more time in both roles. Though indiscernible which is the case, it is still worth acknowledging that the results support that time and identification are interrelated.

  The significance of time is not a surprising result, however, the relationship between perceived support from coworkers and managers and the odds of group membership is worth unpacking further. The fact that support for a respondent's opposite role is associated with belonging to the high/high identification group—in the case of managers and coworkers, support for the respondent's parenting obligations—provides further evidence for the relational nature of identities beyond that of others' expectations, which has already been covered in the literature. Unlike time, it is easier to presume that reported levels of support are precursors to identification and not vice versa. Though it's possible that men who perceive or demand higher levels of support are already more strongly identified with their roles, it's more in line with the theory to interpret increased support as helping men bridge the gap between their internalized understandings of their roles and the external expectations they face.

27

The fact that higher reports of enrichment, or perceived positive associations between one's role at home and at work were significant in predicting group membership provides evidence that identities can overlap and reinforce one another. The odds of belonging to the dually strong identification group were influenced by how strongly respondents felt that their parenting and working roles improved their experiences in the opposite sphere. This indicates that some fathers perceive these two roles as complementary in many ways, and not as strictly oppositional. These reports of enrichment are irrespective of how time much fathers commit to either role, but reinforce the association between overlapping support/enrichment across roles and increased odds of stronger dual identification.

Finally, none of the "New fatherhood" measures proved to be significant in this analysis, which is likely due to the lack of variance in this extremely homogenous sample. This makes it difficult to uncover any potential differences in identification among these men based on demographics, as the range of possible differences are not represented (such as including a broader range of industries or men with older children) or not known in the data (their geographic location or sexual orientation, for instance). These differences are masked in this analysis, and therefore no conclusions can be made about how "New Fatherhood" is associated with identifications with work and parenting.

The findings serve to answer some questions, yet also spark many more. Is it possible to predict which men report higher levels of enrichment and support? Are men's perceptions of support at the organizational level also associated with increased identification with both work and parenting? If so, how can workplace policies be

harnessed to further promote experiences of synergy between work and home roles for today's working fathers?

Conclusion

This study began by asking how men who identify strongly with both work and fatherhood differ from those who do not, arguing that it is important to look at not only how these identities compete, but they may reinforce one another. The findings demonstrate that for some fathers, this overlap is possible, thus contributing a new understanding of how working men can experience fatherhood. Studying men's reported attachments to these roles helps to fill a persistent gap in the literature on fatherhood, in which Tichenor, et. al. (2011) argue that, "…there has been great interest in fathering behavior…but less attention has been paid to how important fatherhood is to individual men, or to the factors associated with differences in the importance of fatherhood among men" (232). This paper contributes to the existing but limited understanding of the importance of fatherhood to working to men and provides insight into possible variations in their identifications. While some men may identify more strongly with work or family, or with neither, others seem to draw meanings from both realms and experience overlap between their identifications.

These findings were only possible because the analysis relied upon on data that measures identity in a non-hierarchical fashion, allowing for an understanding not only of how the realms of work and family compete, but also how they may dialectically overlap and mutually shape one another. In developing the methodology for this study, it was

29

instrumental to use data that allowed for the construction of independent scales

measuring work and parenting identifications, rather than rankings that require

respondents to pit the two against each other. This approach—allowing for dually strong

identifications—was necessary in order to analyze the factors associated with men's odds

of stating that they perceive both work and fatherhood as central to their sense of self

(Tichenor et.al, 2011). Analyzing both realms in conjunction, rather than in competition,

is in line with Kaufman and Uhlenberg's (2000) argument that in order "...to anticipate

how parenthood might affect work effort, a starting place is to ask how individuals

identify with these two roles" (932). Unlike prior research, where the focus has been

attempting to understand *which* roles working fathers identify with, this approach looks

at *how* these identities exist, an important distinction that allows for insights into how

they can overlap.

Studying work and parenting identities in this way produces results that challenge

the notion of separate domains illustrated in previous research. For instance, in Bielby

and Bielby's (1989) work on identification, they argue that unlike the women in their

sample, men were able to form attachments to work and parenting independently of their

commitments and responsibilities in the opposite realm. While this may be true, the study

did not look at accounts of overlapping experiences between the two, which this research

demonstrates is possible for some working fathers. Increased reports of support and

enrichment in the opposite domain, for instance, shaped respondents' levels of

identification with work and parenting, providing further evidence for the notion that

these roles are interconnected for men, perhaps because both roles express a common identity of care for family.

This analysis of men's identifications with fatherhood and work is not without limitations. Firstly, the sample is extraordinarily specific and speaks only to a subset of American fathers, though intentionally so. That being said, the homogeneity in this sample provides only a limited understanding of paternal identification for "New fathers", as many men's realities are not captured in this sample. The data was limited in that it only allowed for the analysis of currently married men due to the small number of unmarried men in the sample, thus excluding the experiences of single, divorced, or widowed fathers, whose identifications with parenting and work might be especially germane to study in the context of time and support. It's also unknown whether any fathers are in same-sex partnerships, which again, might have depicted different experiences of time and support. Furthermore, this cross-sectional data does not provide any insight as to how identifications change over time and situations, therefore, future research could rely on a longitudinal, more representative sample in order to expand upon understandings of how support, overlap, time, and societal expectations of fatherhood are associated with the dual identities of working fathers.

It's also worth pointing to some additional limitations, for instance, the model contains less information about home life, such as how long the respondents have been married, whether they have reliable childcare, or how stressful their spouse's occupation is, because it was mostly unavailable in the data. Furthermore, the data is based on self-reported responses, which are subject to the respondent's perception and unverifiable,

31

and likely to have been influenced by the environment in which they took the survey. The respondents had access to the survey online, meaning they could complete it either at work, at home, or elsewhere, a fact that would allow for either identity to be more or less salient depending on their location as the answered they questions.

This model is better for comparing the differences between the men who scored low or average on both work and family identification and those who scored high on both. It's less accurate for predicting the differences between men who scored high on either work or family identification and average/low on the other with the dually high group, which may be attributable to a number of factors. Perhaps, as mentioned earlier, because men define fatherhood so differently, it's difficult to discern how their actions relate to their identifications. Of the fathers that spend long hours at work each week in this sample, some might be doing so because they believe it makes them a better parent, others might stay late because they are overly committed to their jobs, whereas it's likely a third group is working harder because of the current economic climate which has produced very real fears of job loss and financial insecurity. Yet these potential differences are muted in these findings, which cannot ascertain the reasons behind the respondents' behaviors.

Finally, methodological limitations must be addressed, one being the lack of a direct measure of identity, hence the usage of constructed scales. Defining identity is subject to individual interpretation, and therefore the items perceived to be important for measuring identity in this instance could easily differ depending on this subjectivity, which may in fact serve as a useful comparison to focus on when challenging the results

32

of this study. Do they hold up when different measures of identity are used? Most subject to criticism is the decision to set the mean as the cut-off point for both scales, an obvious limitation in that a mean cut-off depicts men's identifications to work and parenting relative to other respondents in the sample, and not in relation to their other identity (work or parenting) as would be most desirable. The idea of using ratios was considered, where instead the outcome would be how much a respondent's work and parenting identifications line up with one another. This would not, however, have allowed for an understanding of the men who identify strongly with both work and family, instead depicting men whose dual identifications are in sync with one another, high *or* low.

Initial attempts were made to conduct the analysis using a different cut-off point rather than the mean. Using the 75% percentile as the determinant for grouping proved to be particularly difficult for responses on the work scale because of the few number of men with high scores, making the top scorers on the work scale who also scored a the 75% percentile on the family scale a group too small to run the analysis with. Therefore future research should explore different ways to group respondents into identification categories in order to confirm the validity of these results.

Despite these limitations, the findings demonstrate the association between perceived positive overlap in the form or support and enrichment and identity, illuminating existing understandings of how experience work and fatherhood, thus opening a vital path to new knowledge and further research. The study makes both empirical and theoretical contributions to the understanding of paternal identity, and suggestions for bridging research and practice. This research provides further evidence

that time is associated with increased identification with both work and parenting, and brings in new findings that suggest that support and enrichment, not just expectations, are also relevant to paternal identity. Establishing these associations then begs the question— what can be done to better support the agency of fathers that hope to contribute more fully to family life and parenting?

This study highlights the importance of workplace supports, which other scholars have argued are instrumental in a time when men's experiences and choices regarding fatherhood are becoming increasingly diverse. Kathleen Gerson argues that institutional practices can aid or discourage these choices, arguing that "Such a profound transformation in men's lives will require equally fundamental changes in the organization of the workplace" (1993: 286). She suggests, for instance, eliminating the penalties associated with caregiving and providing parents with flexible work options. This latter recommendation is substantiated in Barbara Risman's (2004) research on egalitarian couples, where men's workplace flexibility was integral for establishing equal relationships at home (Risman, 2004: 440).

In this study, the findings indicate that increasing perceptions of interpersonal support at work may also help in alleviating the tension between provision and presence that some men may experience. Fathers' perceptions of how much others—coworkers and managers in particular—support their roles outside of the workplace do matter. Perhaps this warrants the implementation of manager and coworker sensitivity/awareness trainings, bonding sessions, or other strategies aimed at promoting interpersonal relationships at work. Formalizing these supports could, for some men, aid in

simultaneously fostering their work and parenting identities. These recommendations echo those of Rothbard (2001), who in her study on enrichment, suggests that "…rather than trying to limit family commitments and participation in other roles, organizations may do well to encourage such activities, as people may gain energy and sustenance from them" (681).

Support then, is also needed at the organizational level, where as Chris Weedon (1997) argues, patriarchal assumptions about gender roles produce policies and attitudes that discriminate and from the outset limit the opportunities of both men and women. How do working fathers experience, negotiate and work within these structural constraints? How do they actively make meaning of fatherhood despite current barriers to increased paternal involvement at home? Future research should explore the how and if support at the institutional level, such as flexible working arrangements and a family-supportive organizational culture, is associated with men's identifications with two competing but arguably fulfilling realms of life.

Ultimately, the contributions of this study uncover some of the complexities of paternal identity, deconstructing the dichotomous notion that identification with fatherhood is limited to practices in the home sphere. In this view, time at work negates one's commitment to family. Given that research has demonstrated that fathers are more likely to show increased work effort towards their career path, and that provision is still regarded an important component of good fatherhood by many, how can the line be drawn at what fathers do at home? For some men, work and parenting identities overlap, and commitment to one does not contradict the other. In fact, feeling supported at work,

35

for instance, can reinforce identifications with family, as does feeling that one's role at work makes one a better family member, or vice versa.

Incorporating enrichment and support into analyses of paternal identity yields a much more dynamic, complex understanding of men's attachments to both roles than solely studying experiences in one sphere or taking a hierarchical approach would allow for. Despite the current ambivalence regarding the importance of the good provider role, this study indicates that some fathers continue to express, rather than suppress, their identifications with parenting while working. As expectations around paternal involvement increase for men at home, it's important to acknowledge how fathers' choices and experiences at work can be influenced by and reinforce their identifications with parenting.

Table A1. Multinomial Logistic Regression with imputed data, Odds that a Man Identifies Strongly with both Work and Fatherhood

	Average or low work and family identification	Stronger work identification	Stronger family identification
	vs. Above average work and family identification		
	Odds Ratio (95% C.I.)	Odds Ratio (95% C.I.)	Odds Ratio (95% C.I.)
Demographic variables			
Age (25-65 years)	0.98 (0.95-1.01)	0.97 (0.94-1.01)	0.95 (0.90-1.00)
Educational Attainment	1.01 (0.97-1.18)	0.99 (093-1.06)	0.84 (0.69-1.04)
Personal annual income	1.12 (0.69-1.82)	1.28 (1.01-1.55)	1.16 (0.83-1.62)
Number of Children	1.15 (0.91-1.47)	1.01 (0.78-1.31)	1.20 (0.98-1.46)
Age of youngest child	0.99 (0.96-1.03)	1.05 (1.01-1.09)	1.10 (0.97-1.04)
Time variables			
Years employed at company	1.06 (0.99-1.13)	1.00 (0.83-1.19)	0.94 (0.79-1.12)
Hours worked per week	0.47** (0.29-0.75)	0.97 (0.79-1.20)	0.60 (0.35-1.02)
Taking time off after birth of child	1.10 (0.63-1.93)	1.10 (0.63-1.93)	0.97 (0.76-1.24)
Amount of time off after birth of child	0.77*** (0.64-0.96)	0.77** (0.64-0.93)	0.94 (0.76-1.16)
Actual division of childcare	0.43 (0.21-0.81)	0.43* (0.21-0.81)	1.05 (0.86-1.29)
Hours spent with children per day	0.75*** (0.68-0.97)	0.75*** (0.71-0.80)	1.05 (0.86-1.29)
Relational variables			
Opinions about the division childcare	1.19 (0.76-1.87)	1.19 (0.76-1.87)	1.21 (0.99-1.20)
Spouse's employment status	1.84 (0.91-3.72)	1.84 (0.91-3.72)	1.22 (0.58-2.54)
Spouse's income	0.89 (0.68-1.16)	0.89 (0.68-1.16)	0.87 (0.65-1.16)
Coworker Support scale	0.95 (0.91-1.00)	0.95 (0.91-1.00)	0.93** (0.88-0.98)
Manager Support scale	0.97 (0.92-1.02)	0.97 (0.95-1.00)	0.93*** (0.92-0.95)
Spouse/partner support scale	0.94 (0.87-1.02)	0.94 (0.87-1.00)	0.99 (0.91-1.08)
Family-to-Work Enrichment scale	0.95** (0.91-0.99)	0.91** (0.86-0.96)	1.01 (0.96-1.07)
Work-to-Family Enrichment scale	0.86*** (0.82-0.89)	1.04 (1.01-1.07)	0.82*** (0.77-0.86)
N		837	

Note. Statistics are clustered to account for the four companies represented. *$p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .0$

Appendix B: Variables included in the support scales

All variables range from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree

Manager Support
- My supervisor is supportive when I have a problem.
- My supervisor is fair and doesn't show favoritism in responding to employees' personal or family needs.
- My supervisor accommodates me when I have family or personal business to take care of—for example, medical appointments, meeting with child's teacher, etc.
- I feel comfortable bringing up personal or family issues with my supervisor.
- My supervisor really cares about the effects that work demands have on my personal and family life.
- My supervisor is supportive of employees using flexible work arrangements.

Coworker Support
- I talk regularly to my coworkers about my child(ren) and family related matters.
- My coworkers are understanding when I have personal business to take care of—for example, medical appointments, meeting with child's teacher, etc.
- I feel comfortable bringing up personal or family issues with my coworkers.
- My colleagues don't respect the fact that I'm a parent (reversed=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree)
- My colleagues have made insulting jokes or comments about my status as a working parent (reversed, 1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree)
- Many of my colleagues are also parents.

Spouse Support
- My spouse/partner understands my work demands.
- My spouse/partner listens when I talk about work.
- My spouse/partner acknowledges that I have obligations as a worker.
- My spouse/partner is willing to do more at home so that I can attend to my work.
- My spouse/partner is supportive when I have on new/challenging projects at work.
- When I travel for work, my spouse/partner willingly takes on more responsibilities at home.

Appendix C: Variables included in the enrichment scales

All variables range from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree.

Work-to-Family Enrichment Scale: My Involvement in my Work: _____.

38

- Helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better family member.
- Helps me to gain knowledge and this helps me be a better family member.
- Helps me acquire skills and this helps me be a better family member.
- Puts me in a good mood and this helps me be a better family member.
- Makes me feel happy and this helps me be a better family member.
- Makes me cheerful and this helps me be a better family member.
- Helps me feel personally fulfilled and this helps me be a better family member.
- Provides me with a sense of accomplishment and this helps me be a better family member.
- Provides me with a sense of success and this helps me be a better family member.

Family-to-Work Enrichment Scale: My Involvement in my Family: _____.
- Helps me to gain knowledge and this helps me be a better worker.
- Helps me acquire skills and this helps me be a better worker.
- Helps me expand my knowledge of new things and this helps me be a better worker.
- Puts me in a good mood and this helps me be a better worker.
- Makes me feel happy and this helps me be a better worker.
- Makes me cheerful and this helps me be a better worker.
- Requires me to avoid wasting time at work and this helps me be a better worker.
- Encourages me to use my work time in a focused manner and this helps me be a better worker.
- Causes me to be more focused at work and this helps me be a better worker.

References

Aldous, J., Mulligan, G.M, & Bjarnason, T. (1998). Fathering over time: What makes the difference? *Journal of Marriage and Family,* 60(4): 809-820.

Barnett, R.C. & Baruch, G.K. (1987) Determinants of Fathers' Participation in Family Work. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 49(1): 29-40.

Bielby, W.T & Bielby, D.D. (1989). Family ties: Balancing commitments to work and family in dual earner households. *American Sociological Review*, 54(5), 776-789.

Burke, P.J. & Reitzes, D.C. (1981). The link between identity and role performance. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 44 (2): 83-92.

Christiansen, S.L. & Palkovitz, R. (2001). Why the "good provider" role still matters: Providing as a form of paternal involvement. *Journal of Family Issues,* 22(84): 84-106.

Day, R.D. & Lamb, M.E. (2004). Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement: Pathways, problems, and progress. In R.D. Day & & M.E. Lamb (Eds.), *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement* (ix-xiii). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Deutsch, F. M., Lussier, J.B., & Servis, L.J. (1993). Husbands at home: Predictors of paternal Participation in childcare and housework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(6): 1154-1166.

Duckworth, J. D. & Buzzanell, P.M. (2009). Constructing work-life balance and fatherhood: Men's framing of the meanings of both work and family. *Communication Studies,* 60(5): 558-573.

Eggebeen, D. & Knoester, C. (2001). Does fatherhood matter for men? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63: 381–393.

Evans, V. J. (2004). Foreword. In R.D. Day & M.E. Lamb (Eds.), *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement* (ix-xiii). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Fox, G.L. & Bruce, C. (2001). Conditional fatherhood: Identity theory and parental investment theory as alternative sources of explanation of fathering. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63: 394–403.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

40

Gerson, K. (1993). No man's-land: Men's changing commitments to family and work. BasicBooks, New York, Ny.

Glauber, R. (2008). Race and Gender in Families and at Work: The Fatherhood Wage Premium. *Gender & Society,* 22 (8): 8-30.

Gliem, J.A. & Gliem, R.R. (2003). Calculating, Interpreting, And Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient For Likert-Type Scales. Presented at the Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, October 8-10. Retrieved November 15, 2011 from http://hdl.handle.net/1805/344

Greenhaus, J. H. & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review,* 31 (1): 72–92.

Gupta, S. (2007). Autonomy, dependence, or display? The relationship between married women's earnings and housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69: 399–417.

Kaufman, G. & Uhlenberg, P. (2000). The influence of parenthood on the work effort of married men and women. *Social Forces*, 78 (3): 931-947.

LaRossa, R. (1988) Fatherhood and social change. *Family Relations*, 37:4, 451-457.

Marks, S.R. & MacDermid, S.M. (1996). Multiple Roles and the Self: A Theory of Role Balance. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 58(2), 417-432.

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

Maurer, T.W., Pleck, J.H., & Rane, T.R. (2004). Methodological considerations in measuring paternal identity. *Fathering*, 1(2): 117-129.

McBride, B.A., Brown, G. L., Bost, K.B., Shin, N., Vaughn, B., & Korth B. (2005). Paternal identity, maternal gatekeeping, and father involvement. *Family Relations*, 54, 360–372.

McCall, G.T & Simons, J.T. (1978). Identities and interactions (Rev. ed.). New York: Free Press.

Messner, Michael A. 1991. " 'Changing Men' and Feminist Politics in the United States". *Theory and Society*, 22(5): 723-737.

Parsons, T. (1982). The Hierarchy of Control. In Leon H. Mayhew (Ed.) *On Institutions*

and social evolution, selected writings (157-172). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Pleck, J. H. & Stueve, J.L. (2004). A narrative approach to paternal identity: The importance of parental identity "conjointness". In R.D. Day & M.E. Lamb (Eds.), *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement* (83-107). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

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

Risman, B. J. (2004). Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism. *Gender and Society*, 18 (4): 429-450.

Rothbard, N.P. (2001). Enriching or Depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family role. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 46(4): 655-684.

Sieber, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*, 39(4): 567-578.

Stryker, S. & Burke, P.J. (2000). The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63 (4): 284-297.

Tichenor, V., McQuillan, J., Greil, A.L., Contreras, R. & Shreffler, K.M. (2011). The important of fatherhood to U.S. married and cohabiting men. *Sociology Department, Faculty Publications*. Paper 166. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/sociologyfacpub/166

Yeung, W. J., Sandberg, J.F., Davis-Kean, P.E., & Hofferth, S. L. (2001). Children's time with fathers in intact families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63 (1): 136-154.