

*Making Good on Fatherhood:
A Review of the Fatherhood Research*

January 2016



Making Good on Fatherhood

A Review of the Fatherhood Program Research

Child & Family Research Partnership

childandfamilyresearch.org • info@childandfamilyresearch.org • 512.471.3536 • Toll Free 855.471.CFRP (2377)

The University of Texas at Austin • The LBJ School of Public Affairs • P.O. Box Y, Austin, Texas 78713

Authors

Cynthia Osborne, Ph.D.

Director, Child and Family Research Partnership
Associate Professor, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin

Daniel Dillon, MPAff

Senior Research Associate, Child and Family Research Partnership
The University of Texas at Austin

Jen Winter Craver, MIPA

Research Associate, Child and Family Research Partnership
The University of Texas at Austin

Isabel Hovey

Research Assistant, Child and Family Research Partnership
The University of Texas at Austin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Background	6
Father Involvement	6
History of Fatherhood Programs	7
Federally-Funded Responsible Fatherhood Programs Are Born	8
What Do Fatherhood Programs Do?	10
Issue Areas	10
Programmatic Approaches	11
The State of Fatherhood Program Research	12
Father Involvement	13
Programs for All Fathers	13
Programs for Nonresidential Fathers	14
Programs for Residential Fathers	15
Economic Stability.....	15
Programs for All Fathers	16
Programs for Nonresidential Fathers	16
Healthy Relationships	17
Programs for All Fathers	17
Programs for Nonresidential Fathers	18
Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention	19
Ongoing Studies and evaluations	21
Measurement and Evaluation	24
Developing a Road Map for the Evaluation.....	25
Defining Expected Outcomes from Program Participation	25
Selecting Survey Items for Measuring Program Outcomes.....	26
Survey Item Considerations.....	26
Matching Expected Outcomes to Survey Items	27
Additional Survey Measures	32
Conclusion.....	33
Appendices	34

Appendix A: Fatherhood Initiatives in Texas 34
Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations 45
Appendix C: Responsible Fatherhood Program, Pre-Program Survey 67

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: Matching Curricula Outcome Goals with ACF OPRE's Outcome Domains and Recommended Survey Measures.....	29
Table 2: Fatherhood Initiatives in Texas.....	34
Table 3: Fatherhood Program Evaluations	45

Introduction

Over the past several decades, father involvement has increased dramatically.¹ A 2013 report from the Pew Research Center shows that since 1965, fathers have nearly tripled the time they spend with their children.² The general rise in paternal involvement has been accompanied by an evolving notion of fatherhood, as old conceptions of the father as “distant breadwinner” or male “role model” have given way to a more holistic rendering of the father as “equal co-parent.”³ Alongside these changes, researchers and academics have demonstrated a growing interest in studying the role that fathers play in the lives of their children. Findings from these studies have overwhelmingly shown that children with involved fathers fare better across a wide range of domains when compared to their counterparts without an active father. Yet programs designed specifically to support fathers in their role as parents are relatively new to the policy landscape.

Originally emerging as an outgrowth of welfare reform and stronger child support enforcement in the 1990s, fatherhood programs have since evolved from a narrow focus on financial stability and support to a more balanced agenda that emphasizes healthy relationships, parenting skills, and father involvement. Though fatherhood programs take a variety of approaches towards achieving these ends, they share the common goal of ensuring that fathers are positively involved in their children’s lives. Despite state and federal funding for these programs now numbering in the hundreds of millions of dollars per year, few fatherhood programs have undergone rigorous evaluation. As a result, policymakers and program administrators have a limited understanding of their effectiveness.

Recognizing this gap in knowledge, the Texas Department of Family Protective Services, Prevention and Early Intervention Division (DFPS PEI) contracted with the Child and Family Research Partnership (CFRP) at UT Austin’s LBJ School of Public Affairs to develop a comprehensive approach to supporting Texas fathers. This report takes the first step toward that goal by surveying the state of fatherhood programs, both nationally and throughout the state of Texas. It begins by tracing the history of fatherhood programs over the last several decades, paying special attention to the evolution in focus and funding of these efforts. Next, it examines the evidence base for fatherhood programs, highlighting the extent to which programs have worked to strengthen fathers’ involvement, parenting skills, relationship quality, and economic stability. Child abuse prevention programs are reviewed as well. The report then canvasses a slate of ongoing programs and evaluations currently underway, the majority of which are supported through the U.S. Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (ACF OPRE). The final section concludes with a look at the importance of program evaluation and measurement as key tools for improving the evidence base for fatherhood programs in this country.

The appendix of this report contains several additional resources, including a preliminary inventory of fatherhood initiatives within the state of Texas, and a summary table of the more rigorous evaluations conducted on fatherhood programs throughout the country. Both appendices are living documents, and will ultimately help to guide CFRP’s evaluation of several DFPS-funded fatherhood programs. In addition, this report lays the conceptual groundwork for two fatherhood summits, jointly convened by DFPS PEI and CFRP. A primary goal of the fatherhood summits is to assemble key stakeholders in the field of fatherhood for a discussion on the current and future state of fatherhood programming.

Background

The following section provides an overview of research on paternal involvement and the history of fatherhood programs. The findings on involvement underscore the crucial role that fathers play in child development and point to the vulnerability of the often tenuous bond between unmarried fathers and their children. Research shows that several factors affect the likelihood that a father will maintain a positive connection with his child, and programs that attempt to improve paternal involvement generally try to address these factors in some way. The history of these programs, beginning with federal funding of child support collection efforts, shows a steady evolution from a narrowly defined view of fatherhood to a much more holistic understanding of paternal involvement and its lasting influence on child health and wellbeing.

FATHER INVOLVEMENT

Historically, the concept of paternal involvement has been narrowly conceived, with the sole function of breadwinning defining a father's role in the family. However, the modern father is involved in nearly every aspect of parenting, from spending leisure time with his child, to nurturing and caregiving, to providing moral guidance, discipline, and support.⁴ This participation in childrearing carries significant implications for a child's welfare. Involved fatherhood has been linked to better outcomes on nearly every measure of child wellbeing, from cognitive development and educational achievement to self-esteem and pro-social behavior.⁵

A number of factors influence the nature of a father's involvement in his child's life. For example, a substantial body of research supports the notion that when parents get along, both the quantity and quality of father involvement are higher.⁶ Fathers who are romantically involved with the mother are consistently more likely to be involved with the child across a wide range of demographic, economic, and residential domains.⁷ In fact, some scholars identify the quality of parents' romantic relationship as the strongest predictor of paternal involvement.⁸

Cohabitation plays a similarly outsized role in influencing father involvement.⁹ Though many unmarried fathers are involved and living with the family shortly after the child's birth, a large number transition to non-cohabitating relationships within just a few years.¹⁰ Some nonresident fathers sustain regular involvement, but many others become gradually less involved.¹¹ Overall, fathers who live with the family are typically more involved with their children than nonresident fathers. They also tend to interact with their children in different ways, with nonresident father involvement more likely to be characterized by leisure and play than discipline or cognitive support.¹² However, research shows that even when parents do not live together and are not in a romantic relationship, their ability to cooperate and engage in positive co-parenting can have a strong influence on paternal involvement.¹³

A number of characteristics unique to the father may also affect his ability to maintain positive involvement with his child. Several studies, for example, connect a father's education, income, and employment to supportive parenting and frequency of father-child contact.¹⁴ Not all studies have

been able to derive a conclusive link between father involvement and human capital,¹⁵ but research is more decisive on the topic of antisocial behavior. Fathers with a history of incarceration, abusive behavior, or drug and alcohol problems pose a high risk to positive interaction and are less likely to maintain contact with their children over time.¹⁶

Other research points to the importance of demographic characteristics, such as race and ethnicity, in determining levels of father involvement. However, the relationship between race and father involvement continues to be entangled with economic and neighborhood factors that obscure straightforward conclusions.¹⁷

Nearly all of the risk factors associated with attenuated involvement shortly after birth – fragile relationships, low human capital, and destructive antisocial behaviors – remain salient in the years following. Over time, fathers encounter the compounding effects of these threats on their ability to be good parents.¹⁸ New barriers to involvement may also arise over time. Fathers who have children with new partners, for example, often shift their time and economic resources such that new children benefit from somewhat higher levels of involvement and support than prior children.^{19,20}

Overall, the literature on involvement suggests that unmarried fathers play an important role in the development of their children – but that role is delicate. A web of interpersonal and environmental factors exercises significant influence over a father's involvement in his child's life. Fatherhood programs face the challenge of untangling this web in order to help fathers overcome the particular barriers they face. The programs approach this challenge in a variety of ways but with one goal in common: to help fathers become the parents they want to be.

HISTORY OF FATHERHOOD PROGRAMS

The proliferation of programs targeted specifically at fathers is relatively new. Historically, social programs aimed at poverty alleviation, health, and nutrition have been geared almost exclusively towards mothers and children.²¹ Programs for fathers, by contrast, have traditionally sought to increase their financial contributions to the family, with little attention given to their broader role in the family.²² This limited view of fatherhood was typified in programs like child support, which over time has come to include services for employment, job training, and paternity establishment.²³ These supplementary services, much like child support itself, have the underlying goal of facilitating fathers' financial contributions.

In 1996, Congress passed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), otherwise known as welfare reform. This law strengthened the child support program and authorized the use of Child Support Enforcement funds to promote access and visitation programs, rather than fathers' economic contributions alone.²⁴ With this authorization, the welfare reform law became one of the first federal efforts to acknowledge the broader role that fathers play in the lives of their children.²⁵ Welfare reform also set out a number of goals congruent with the goals of many fatherhood programs. These included efforts to end welfare dependence through employment and marriage, reduce nonmarital births, and promote the formation of stable two-parent families.²⁶

Further, the 1996 welfare reform law emphasized marriage as the foundation of a successful society—especially with regard to the interests of children.²⁷ This basic belief, which was woven throughout the law and would soon find further traction within the George W. Bush administration, was not without opposition.

In fact, fatherhood programs were born into the heart of an ideological struggle about the nature of fatherhood and the American family. On one side, marriage is seen as the fundamental answer to family breakdown and father absence. Proponents of this perspective point to a long list of negative outcomes for children born to unmarried parents. Further, they argue that cohabitation is not enough; roughly 65 percent of children born to cohabiting parents will experience the separation of their parents by age 12, compared to just 24 percent of those born to married parents.²⁸ To ensure that fathers are engaged in raising their children, supporters of this perspective advocate for policies that encourage the formation of married two-parent families.²⁹

Their critics, however, contend that the beneficial outcomes observed for married couples and their children are largely due to selection rather than an independent effect of marriage; couples who choose to marry are both more likely to stay together and more likely to have the sociodemographic characteristics associated with positive outcomes than couples who do not marry.³⁰ From this perspective, promoting marriage is an insufficient policy response because it ignores the raft of social and economic factors underlying divergent family outcomes. Moreover, marriage may not be desirable in all cases, especially those involving family violence.³¹ Indeed, research shows that high conflict marriages are more detrimental to children than divorce or post-divorce conflict.³² Coercive marriage promotion policies may bring about other unintended consequences too. One possibility is that such policies could undermine relatively stable but untraditional family structures such as cohabitation, thereby delivering children into even less advantageous situations.³³ Ultimately, those who question the prudence of marriage promotion policies argue that public policy should concentrate on creating economic opportunities for poor unmarried fathers and promoting their involvement with the child, regardless of parents' marital status.³⁴

Federally-Funded Responsible Fatherhood Programs Are Born

Following the 1996 welfare reform law, some states began to devote increased resources, including Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) dollars, to pro-marriage initiatives. Though these efforts sent federal dollars to programs associated with fatherhood, the focus remained on marriage promotion, and only a handful of states chose to designate TANF dollars for this purpose.³⁵ Several years later, Responsible Fatherhood programs received their first dose of federal funding when Congress appropriated a total of \$4 million to the National Fatherhood Initiative and the Institute for Responsible Fatherhood and Family Revitalization.³⁶

In 2001, the Bush Administration began a five-year effort to reauthorize the 1996 welfare reform legislation. As part of that effort, the administration added several new provisions to the law encouraging states to adopt policies promoting marriage, and to a lesser degree, responsible fatherhood.³⁷ Though it would be several more years before the reauthorization bill would pass, the

Bush administration continued to prioritize Responsible Fatherhood programs through other avenues. One such avenue was through the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), which launched the Healthy Marriage Initiative in 2002. This initiative, intended to stem the tide of rising divorce rates and reinvigorate the institution of marriage, provided grant funding for research and demonstration projects to “help couples, who have chosen marriage for themselves, gain greater access to marriage education services, on a voluntary basis, where they can acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to form and sustain a healthy marriage.”³⁸

Despite the various efforts to spotlight fatherhood as a public policy issue, it wasn’t until 2005 that fatherhood programs received appreciable attention on the national stage. This attention came in the form of the Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) of 2005, which in addition to reauthorizing the welfare reform law, also included \$150 million in federal funding each year for five years to support both healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood programs.³⁹ During this five year period from FY2006 to FY2010, P.L. 109-171 funded grants for healthy marriage (\$100 million) at twice the level of those for responsible fatherhood (\$50 million). Beginning in FY2011, however, funding for the two grants was equalized, with \$75 million going to each grant program per year.⁴⁰

Numerous fatherhood programs have been funded through ACF in recent years. In FY2011, the Office of Family Assistance (OFA) awarded three-year grants to a total of 55 grantees serving nearly 15,000 participants. In addition, the Fatherhood Ex-Prisoner Reentry Pilot Project funded four grantees serving a total of 945 participants.⁴¹ With the FY2011 grants drawing to a close, ACF announced a new round of responsible fatherhood grants in October of 2015. These five-year grants include 39 grantees through New Pathways for Fathers and Families, and 5 grantees through Responsible Fatherhood Opportunities for Reentry and Mobility (ReFORM).⁴²

Responsible Fatherhood programs serve all types of fathers, including noncustodial parents and fathers returning to their communities from prison. The three primary goals of Responsible Fatherhood programs are to 1) improve fathers’ relationships with their spouses, significant others, and/or mothers of their children, 2) help fathers become better parents, and 3) help fathers contribute to the financial wellbeing of their children through job-training services.⁴³

In addition to the federal funding provided for Responsible Fatherhood programming, there are several other sources of federal money available for programs and services aimed at fathers. These include TANF, TANF state maintenance of effort (MOE) funding, Child Support Enforcement (CSE) funds, and the Social Services Block Grant (Title XX).⁴⁴ Of these, TANF and state MOE funds make up the largest source of potential funding for fatherhood programs. Over time, a dramatic drop in the cash welfare caseload combined with TANF’s fixed block grant funding has meant that resources previously spent on cash assistance are now available for other purposes, as long as they meet the broad goals of the TANF program. Fatherhood initiatives are one such allowable use of TANF funds.⁴⁵ In addition to federal funding, fatherhood programs also receive support from state and local governments, private foundations, and nonprofit organizations.⁴⁶

What Do Fatherhood Programs Do?

Fatherhood programs take a variety of approaches to improving paternal involvement. Most programs are educational in nature and focus on well-defined areas of parenting competency. However, some concentrate primarily on peer support or counseling, and others work with communities more broadly through awareness campaigns. The following sections provide an overview of the issue areas generally addressed by fatherhood initiatives and a review of the different approaches they take.

ISSUE AREAS

In broad terms, fatherhood programs are designed to focus on three key issue areas: healthy relationships, responsible parenting, and economic stability. These three activities are required of all fatherhood programs funded through the Administration for Children and Families' Responsible Fatherhood grants.⁴⁷ More generally, fatherhood programs tend to focus on improving efficacy in one or more domains, such as parenting skills, employment/financial stability, healthy relationships and co-parenting, violence prevention, incarceration and re-entry support, and child support or paternity establishment. Because quality of paternal involvement is as important to child wellbeing as quantity, initiatives generally attempt to address deficits in both. For noncustodial fathers, fathers who are temporarily or periodically absent, or fathers who struggle to set time aside for parenting, a programmatic focus on finding ways to increase the amount of time participants spend with their children can be especially important. But fatherhood programs also benefit participants who are already engaged in their children's lives, providing meaningful support for the development of positive parenting skills and achievement of economic self-sufficiency.

The majority of fatherhood programs focus on improving parenting skills overall by teaching fathers about child development and behavior, appropriate forms of discipline, effective communication and emotional support, activities to form and strengthen bonds, and stress and anger management. To meet the needs of the many fathers who face challenges with providing financial support and stability for their children, fatherhood programs also typically include a focus on helping participants secure stable employment and become financially self-sufficient.

Because the most significant predictor of paternal involvement is the relationship between a child's mother and father, many initiatives also focus on healthy parental relationships.⁴⁸ These relationships are important to child wellbeing whether or not parents are romantically involved, and when parents are not, the degree to which they are able to cooperate has a significant impact on paternal involvement. Many fatherhood programs offer relationship counseling, mediation services, and advice on co-parenting to help support parents, regardless of their relationship status. Some programs offer a related component focused on prevention of family violence. These lessons may cover conflict resolution, effective communication, anger and stress management, and appropriate discipline. Batterer intervention programs, while not considered fatherhood programs, provide educational classes and treatment groups that may improve both the interparental and father-child relationships.

Fatherhood initiatives also commonly assist families who have been involved with the criminal justice system. Families often find it challenging to maintain contact and cultivate relationships with incarcerated fathers, but when they succeed, it can make a significant, positive difference in children's lives. Programs that serve incarcerated or recently released fathers aim to stabilize families' fragile circumstances and to find ways for fathers to connect with their children despite the separation. Services may include relationship and parenting skills workshops, re-entry and family reunification planning, employment assistance, and financial skills education.

Finally, many programs offer to help fathers navigate the child support system. There is some overlap between this area and economic stability assistance, given that a successful child support experience requires that fathers be able to meet their obligations. Child support assistance may also include educating fathers about the system and monitoring their compliance. Information about paternity establishment and access and visitation occasionally accompany a child support component.

PROGRAMMATIC APPROACHES

Across focus areas, educational courses are the most common method of delivery for fatherhood programming. Most programs consist of a weekly class that fathers attend consistently for a certain number of weeks or months. The specific topics covered and the educational approaches vary by program. Some programs develop their own curricula, whereas others use curricula developed by an outside organization specifically for the purpose of promoting responsible fatherhood.

Alternatively, fatherhood initiatives often deliver similar educational material through standalone workshops and seminars. With this format, participants need not enroll in a long-term program and can instead attend individual workshops that better fit their schedules and interests. Workshops usually cover one subject area at a time and are presented in one or two longer sessions, as opposed to shorter sessions that span a number of weeks. This approach is convenient for fathers who are looking for information only on specific topics, such as child support or co-parenting, rather than on the full range covered in a long-term course. Frequently programs offer both workshops and a long-term course, with the workshops either supplementing the course or providing an alternate option for fathers whose schedules do not accommodate an ongoing commitment.

Other programs concentrate on providing emotional support for fathers. Peer support groups give participants an opportunity to share their experiences and struggles with one another, meet positive role models, and offer advice to peers. Support groups provide an outlet for fathers to express the frustrations and difficulties they encounter and to find productive ways to cope by talking with professionals and other fathers in similar situations.

Some programs offer counseling and mentoring services to provide a more personalized form of assistance. Counseling for individuals as well as couples can be effective in helping parents work through difficulties, such as problems with communication, which hinder father involvement. Other individualized services include case management and home visiting, which can similarly help fathers with decision-making skills and interactions with children.

Rather than providing direct services to fathers and families, some initiatives focus instead on raising community awareness of fatherhood issues, such as the connection between father involvement and child success, the importance of a father's many roles, and approaches toward bonding with children. Social awareness campaigns use public advertising space, flyers, pamphlets, and television and radio commercials to share educational material. They can also promote local fatherhood programs and inform the public about how to access further information and sign up for services.

The State of Fatherhood Program Research

Earlier in this report we traced the evolution of fatherhood programs, from a limited focus on financial support to a broader agenda targeting fathers' larger role in the family. The modern conception of fatherhood programs began to coalesce in the mid-2000s, and gained dedicated federal funding for the first time in 2005. This review of fatherhood programs is divided into the four primary foci that fatherhood programs began to target at this point: father involvement, economic stability, healthy relationships, and child abuse prevention. Many past studies target one or two of these areas, whereas current studies tend to cover three or even four. ACF funding in recent years has required programs to focus on three areas: father involvement, economic stability, and healthy relationships.

Though fatherhood programs have garnered increased funding and participation over the last decade, little research has been done on their effectiveness. The first round of fatherhood funding from the federal government in 2005 did not include a rigorous evaluation requirement. Fortunately, this changed in the most recent round of funding from the Administration of Children and Families, but this work is in its infancy. A recent review of the literature on evaluations targeting low-income fathers found a limited number of rigorous studies (i.e. those including a control or comparison group) providing services to increase and improve father involvement.⁴⁹ A number of other reviews have identified "model" or "promising" programs, all of which we draw upon for our review.

More common than rigorous evaluations are studies with a very small number of participants (i.e. 30 or under) using a pre-post design to look for changes in their participants' parenting practices. These studies also use populations that suggest that who participates may be largely a matter of accessibility. Specifically, a number of programs focus on incarcerated fathers, teenage fathers, or Head Start fathers. The common element in all these groups is their ability to be found through a single institution (respectively, prison, school, and Head Start programs). The programs in question typically include curriculum targeted toward the specific challenges faced by, say, incarcerated fathers or young fathers. However, it would be valuable to see more rigorous evaluation of programs focused on the general population of dads as recruitment and retention are two important areas that are likely more difficult with the general population, given their lack of common ties to an institution.

In this section we examine more rigorous studies of fatherhood programs, all of which are briefly described in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations. We begin our review by examining studies identified by previous reviews of the field as model or promising programs.^{50,51,52} We also searched for programs providing services in at least one of the three ACF focus areas, or child abuse and

neglect prevention. All of the studies included in this review are either randomized control trials or quasi-experimental evaluations. Randomized control trials (RCTs) are experiments that allocate participants randomly to either a treatment group (e.g., receiving the fatherhood program) or control group (e.g., not receiving the fatherhood program), and are the gold standard for research. Quasi-experimental studies are similar to RCTs in that they assign participants to a treatment or control group, but do not do so randomly; this makes it more difficult to prove causality. The studies included also aim to affect at least one of four domains (father involvement, economic stability, healthy relationships, and child abuse prevention) for either all fathers, regardless of residential status, residential fathers only, or nonresidential fathers. If no indication is provided in the study with regard to residential status, programs are assumed to serve all fathers. If the population is noncustodial parents, the program is classified as serving nonresidential fathers. Note that programs may have effects in more than one focus area. Finally, at the end of this section we discuss ongoing evaluations that provide insight into where the field is heading.

FATHER INVOLVEMENT

By far the majority of programs focus on some aspect(s) of father involvement. Programs aim to increase fathers' involvement with their children by improving parenting skills and knowledge of fathering and child development. Parenting skills include parenting attitudes, techniques, and roles. Fathering knowledge is quite similar and includes topics such as responsible fathering and father-child relationships. Of the 32 studies included in our review (see Appendix B for full details), 22 aimed to influence father involvement among their participants. Of these, 12 were for all fathers, eight targeted only nonresidential fathers, and two were only for residential fathers. Several studies have shown an impact on father involvement, and the impacts varied across fathers living with their children and living apart.

Programs for All Fathers

Programs for all fathers, regardless of residential status, used a variety of program curricula and policies. These ranged from Information and Insights about Infants to 24/7 Dad to a child support earnings disregard policy. Some of the programs specifically targeted fathers of children enrolled in Head Start or first-time fathers during the prenatal period or young fathers. Of the 12 studies showing an impact on father involvement, all but two were randomized control trials.

Broadly, programs for all fathers were able to improve outcomes on several aspects of father involvement. A number of programs increased involvement by improving the quality of the father's relationship with his child.^a For example, after a 10-week program that included both group discussion and father-child play time, fathers were more comfortable with their parental role than control fathers, as measured by the 17-question *Parenting Sense of Competence Scale*.⁵³ Another program, Young Dads, found that fathers had significant changes in their perceptions of their current

^a For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations: Bronte-Tinkew, Burkhauser, & Metz (2012); Duggan et al. (2004); Fagan & Iglesias (1999); Lewan-Bizen (2015); Mazza (2002); McBride (1990).

and future relationships with their children six months after referral into the program (which included comprehensive services tailored to the father's needs by a male social worker).⁵⁴

Participants in fatherhood programs for all dads also improved their attitudes about fatherhood or parenting,^b and increased their share of parenting.^c A recent evaluation of the 24/7 Dads program implemented in Hawaii showed that fathers in the program were more likely to read to their children, help them with homework, and encourage them to develop their talents than fathers in the control group.⁵⁵ The fathers in this 24/7 Dads program were also more likely to be happy about being a parent and to have a higher quality relationship with their first-born child, as measured on a one to five scale.⁵⁶ A parent education and play group program for fathers increased paternal responsibility (remembering, planning, and scheduling child care) for all treatment group fathers and paternal accessibility for fathers of first-born children at the end of the 10-week program.⁵⁷ Other outcomes significantly impacted by these programs include direct interaction^{58,59,60,61,62} and knowledge of child development.⁶³

When reviewing these results, sample size is an important consideration to note. Four of the studies serving all fathers showed significant, positive effects for father involvement, but had a sample size of 67 or less (that is, 34 or fewer fathers receiving treatment). Of the seven studies with sample sizes of approximately 100 or more, four had significant, positive effects on father involvement.

Programs for Nonresidential Fathers

Programs for nonresidential fathers also used a variety of curricula, but there was a large subsection focused on incarcerated fathers (five of the eight programs were for incarcerated fathers). Curricula used included Filial Therapy Training Model, Systematic Training for Effective Parenting Program, Concept Media's Curriculum, The Nurturing Program, InsideOut Dad, and Long Distance Dads. Generally, these curricula cover concepts such as child development, parenting confidence, and attitudes towards parenting and fatherhood.

Given that a number of the programs focused on nonresidential fathers were for incarcerated fathers, it is not surprising that more of these programs worked to improve knowledge and attitudes towards fatherhood and child development, rather than direct interaction with children, as compared to programs for all fathers. Programs for nonresidential fathers generally improved father involvement by increasing fathering/parenting knowledge^d and changing attitudes.^e There were fewer significant effects on direct interaction with children among these programs. For example, the

^b For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations: Fagan & Stevenson (2002); Lewan-Bizen (2015); McBride (1990).

^c For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations: Cowan et al. (2009); Duggan et al. (2004); Fagan & Iglesias (1990); Lewan-Bizen (2015); McBride (1990).

^d For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations: Block et al. (2014); Robbers (2015); Westney, Cole, & Munford (1988); Wilczak & Markstrom (1999).

For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations:

^e For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations: Harrison (1997); Landreth & Lobaugh (1998); Robbers (2005).

Responsible Fatherhood Program for Incarcerated Dads in Fairfax County, Virginia, found key differences between fathers who participated in at least four (of ten) of the 90-minute program sessions and those in the control group, including knowledge and attitudes toward fatherhood, as measured by a seven-item scale.⁶⁴ This measure included questions such as “I know a lot about the effects of fatherlessness on children” and “Father absence has a negative impact on most children’s development.”⁶⁵ An evaluation of the InsideOut Dad program for incarcerated fathers in New Jersey showed that treatment group fathers increased their scores on the InsideOut Dad Knowledge Assessment by 4.5 percent from pre to post, whereas the control group’s scores averaged more than one percentage point worse on the posttest.⁶⁶ Fathers in the treatment group were also more likely to call their children at the end of the program compared to control group fathers.

Beyond incarcerated fathers, a prenatal education intervention for young, unwed, adolescent fathers composed of four prenatal classes found that fathers increased their mean score on a questionnaire related to pregnancy and prenatal care (e.g., the importance of prenatal care, the relationship of a poor diet to prematurity, etc.) compared to control fathers.⁶⁷ Findings from this study also indicate that the fathers’ increased knowledge might lead to more supportive behaviors towards the mother and child.⁶⁸

Studies of programs for nonresidential fathers also tend to have small sample sizes. Only two studies had more than one hundred participants, two had between 80 and 90 participants, and four had 42 or fewer participants.

Programs for Residential Fathers

There were two programs open only to residential dads. One of these, the Parenting Together Project, focused not only on the fathers’ relationship with the child, but with the mother as well (including co-parenting and parental cooperation).⁶⁹ Couples, rather than individuals, were included in this study. The other required fathers to be filmed interacting with their child(ren) in the family home.⁷⁰ Both father-child relationship quality and father accessibility increased in these two programs. For example, fathers in the treatment group of the Parenting Together Project in Minnesota (which included mini-lectures, group discussion, video skill demonstrations, role playing, and new parent role models) were available, on average, 42 minutes more per day to their children than control group fathers.⁷¹ Fathers in the treatment group also increased their overall relationship quality score with their child at 6 and 12 months postpartum, as rated by observers of interactions between the father and child.⁷² In the video self-modeling program, fathers were filmed interacting with their child and then received feedback from a home visitor.⁷³ Treatment group fathers had more positive father-child interactions, were more sensitive to infant cues over time, and became more adept at fostering cognitive growth in their child than control group fathers.

ECONOMIC STABILITY

Originating with efforts to bolster child support payments, economic stability programs now include components related to paternity establishment, professional skill-building, job search assistance, access and visitation, and more. We examined eight studies that aimed to impact economic stability for fathers and their families. These programs served fathers of all different residential statuses and

all but two were randomized control trials. Curricula for economic stability programs typically included a variety of services such as employment assistance, support addressing child support orders, educational training, mentoring, or case management. Generally, the outcomes positively affected by fatherhood programs in the economic arena include better employment rates and payment of child support orders.

Programs for All Fathers

While economic stability programs for all dads increased employment rates in the treatment groups, each program had a different way of doing so.^f For example, the Center for Employment Opportunities Program in New York aimed to help fathers who were ex-offenders transition into permanent employment, reduce recidivism, and improve the father-child relationship.⁷⁴ Whereas improving the father-child relationship is a stated goal of the program, no measurement of it was taken in the study. The program did increase the likelihood of employment among program participants early in the four year study period, but these effects faded over time.⁷⁵ The study also showed differences in recidivism. Treatment group participants were significantly less likely to be re-incarcerated for a new crime (65%) than participants in the control group (70%). The sample size for this study was 977 fathers (568 in the treatment group), which is large enough to draw valid conclusions.

The Young Dads program, which provided tailored, comprehensive services to fathers (counseling, referrals for employment, housing, legal advocacy, parenting skills training, etc.), found that 97 percent of the treatment group was employed six months after referral into the program, compared to 31 percent of the control group (pre-program rates were 47% and 33%, respectively).⁷⁶ The Systemic Training for Effective Parenting for Incarcerated Fathers (STEP-UP) program also targeted young fathers. It took a less personalized approach, but offered case management services, counseling, and mentoring from successful men. This program did not show any significant effects on participants.⁷⁷ The sample size for both of these programs was small, with 60 Young Dads participants and 120 STEP-UP participants (divided into four different treatment groups), which means that more research should be done to better understand the program effects.

Programs for Nonresidential Fathers

Several of the programs and policies focused on economic stability for nonresidential fathers focused specifically on noncustodial parents. All of these were aimed at improving fathers' ability to pay child support and the collection of those funds; outcomes included improved employment rates and payment of formal child support orders.^g

In Wisconsin, the Child Support Earnings Disregard Policy enacted during the 1990s mandated that the amount of child support paid by noncustodial parents not be subtracted from TANF amounts

^f For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations: OPRE Report 2011-18 (2012); Mazza (2002).

^g For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations: Bloom et al. (2000); Knox & Redcross (2000); Schroder & Boughty (2009); Schroeder, Looney, & Schexnayder (2004).

received by custodial parents. This led to a greater percentage of treatment-group fathers paying child support, and paying greater amounts than those in the control group.⁷⁸ Parents' Fair Share also increased formal child support payments of treatment fathers, but decreased their cash amounts of informal payments.⁷⁹ The final program for nonresidential fathers aimed at improving economic stability, the Family Transition Program, showed that children in the program were more likely to receive money from their father or through a child support agency.⁸⁰

Project Bootstrap, a statewide project in Texas to improve community-based services for young fathers, including employment assistance, help with child support orders, peer support groups, and more, showed that program participants were employed for a higher percentage of time than the comparison group (65% versus 51%), but earned \$85 per month less, on average.⁸¹ Participants also made child support payments 12 percent more often and more consistently than the comparison group (35% versus 25%, measured by the proportion of times collections made in two months out of every three-month period).⁸² A second program enacted in Texas, NCP Choices, showed participants were significantly more likely to be employed and less likely to receive unemployment benefits after one year.⁸³ More recently, the Texas Child Support Division conducted a low-cost behavioral economics intervention that resulted in significant increases to the number of incarcerated noncustodial parents who apply for child support order modifications.⁸⁴

HEALTHY RELATIONSHIPS

Building on healthy marriage initiatives, fatherhood programs now recognize that parents do not have to be romantically involved for a healthy relationship to be important for their child. To that end, fatherhood programs cover topics such as co-parenting, violence prevention, conflict resolution, and self-improvement. Of the programs reviewed, 16 aimed to impact healthy relationships among their participants. These included programs that focused on healthy relationships with one's co-parent and with one's self. Both within and separate from healthy relationships, self-improvement topics such as emotional coaching and self-care have been covered in these fatherhood programs. Standard curricula used in the healthy relationships programs included Parenting: Attitude of the Heart; 24/7 Dads; Eight Short Films about Divorced Dads; Concept Media's Curriculum; The Nurturing Program; Systematic Training for Effective Parenting Program; InsideOut Dad; An Ache in their Hearts; and Facilitator's Guide to Group Triple P.

Programs for All Fathers

Programs for all fathers have shown significant improvements on a number of outcomes for participating fathers, including quality of relationship with the mother,^h reduced stress or anxiety,ⁱ and levels of support.^j For example, the couples-based Supporting Father Involvement Prevention

^h For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations: Bronte-Tinkew (2007); Fagan (2008)

ⁱ For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations: Bronte-Tinkew (2007); Cowan et al. (2009)

^j For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations: Dinkmeyer & McKay (1982); Lewan-Bizan (2015); Mazza (2002)

Intervention, which aims to increase father involvement and support positive child development, helped fathers significantly reduce their parental stress level as measured by the Parenting Stress Index.⁸⁵ This index asks parents about the difficulty of managing their child and discrepancies in their expectations of child behavior and the child's actual behavior, for example.⁸⁶ The STEP-UP program in Phoenix, Arizona provides mentoring, counseling, case management, and educational support to young fathers, with the goal of helping them achieve self-sufficiency and take responsibility for their families.⁸⁷ Fifty-three percent of mentored fathers and 42 percent of non-mentored fathers (who received other services but no mentoring) strengthened relationships with their spouse or significant other.⁸⁸

Although a number of programs produced these positive, significant outcomes, they sometimes did not have the effect they hoped for. For example, the Parents as Teachers program did not see any significant effects for fathers on parenting knowledge, attitudes, or stress, and fathers' levels of parenting satisfaction actually decreased over time in the program.⁸⁹ Nor did the Supporting Father Involvement-Fathers Only program see any difference between treatment and comparison groups on measures of parenting stress levels, authoritarian parenting beliefs, fathers' share of parenting, conflict about discipline, or relationship satisfaction.⁹⁰

As with the other focus areas, a number of the programs for all fathers were aimed at young fathers. The Minnesota Early Learning Design aimed to improve young fathers' (age 16 to 25) co-parenting by helping them share parenting responsibilities regardless of their relationship status, reducing their isolation, and providing positive role models over the course of five sessions.⁹¹ The program positively impacted fathers', but not mothers', report of communication and parenting alliance. Further, no difference was found in fathers' support between treatment and control groups. The Young Dads program, previously mentioned, shows significant, positive effects for fathers ages 16 to 18 receiving treatment, in regards to frequency of contraceptive use and availability of persons with whom a personal problem could be discussed.⁹²

Programs for Nonresidential Fathers

The six nonresidential father programs aimed to help incarcerated fathers,^{93,94,95} recently divorced fathers,^{96,97} and noncustodial fathers.⁹⁸ All but one of these studies was a randomized control trial. Whereas three programs reported no significant improvements in regards to healthy relationship aims, others aiming to affect healthy relationships among nonresidential fathers improved outcomes for fathers' attitudes towards their own self-worth^k and fathers' relationship with their co-parent.^l The Parents' Education about Children's Emotions (PEACE) Program in Ohio, for example, was designed to help divorcing parents and their children and to reduce post-divorce litigation. After completing the 2.5-hour session, parents participating in the program reported that negative behaviors from the co-parent had "decreased" and "stopped completely" because of the program.⁹⁹

^k For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations: Block et al. (2014)

^l For specific program information, please see the following references in Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations: Cookston, Braver, Griffin, Deluse, & Miles (2006); McKerny, Clark, & Stone (1999).

Another program with positive impacts on healthy relationships, Dads for Life, aimed to help recently divorced fathers improve their relationship with their child, decrease parent conflict, and promote better co-parenting behaviors.¹⁰⁰ Over ten sessions, half focused on the parent-child relationship and half on interparental conflict, participants watched *Eight Short Films about Divorced Fathers* and received content scripted for fidelity. The 127 fathers in the treatment group did not see improved co-parenting, but their former spouse was more likely to report a positive post-divorce parenting relationship. Interparental conflict also decreased over time for participants.

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT PREVENTION

Child abuse and neglect is a complex social problem with myriad conditions, stressors, behaviors, and perpetrators. The U.S. Children's Bureau reported nearly 700,000 children were identified as victims of abuse in 2013 alone;¹⁰¹ this abuse includes all forms of neglect, physical abuse, psychological maltreatment, and sexual abuse involving a child.¹⁰² The risk factors for child abuse are varied and can range from the internal (parental competency) to the external (stress or isolation) or the contextual (lack of social networks, community violence, or poverty).¹⁰³ A perpetrator of child abuse and maltreatment is someone who has knowingly harmed a child in their care; a perpetrator may be a caregiver (e.g. relatives, babysitters, and foster parents) or parent.¹⁰⁴

Child abuse programs' structure and intended outcomes are typically designed for a specific stage of child abuse. These programs may be reactive or proactive.¹⁰⁵ Historically, child protective services have tended to focus on reactive approaches aimed at the response and prevention of reoccurring child maltreatment. Reactive programs are critical to protecting victims of abuse and can potentially prevent reoccurring child abuse. Although protecting victims of abuse is essential, the new framework for child welfare places increased importance on proactive prevention preceding documented child abuse and maltreatment.¹⁰⁶ Proactive programs target families without reported or substantiated child abuse cases.¹⁰⁷ Both reactive and proactive preventions may be universal (inclusive programs focused on entire populations) or selective (programs targeting specific groups like low-income families).^{108,109}

The purpose of child abuse prevention programs has traditionally been to attempt to mitigate risk factors associated with the likelihood of child abuse, because research shows that the presence of multiple risk factors in a family increases the probability of child abuse and maltreatment at home.¹¹⁰ However, current child abuse prevention programs tend to focus on protective factors rather than risk factors.¹¹¹ The aim of this approach is to reduce child abuse in families by building protective factors through positive parenting skills, appropriate discipline, effective communication, emotional support, and stress management.

The U.S. Children's Bureau has identified the protective factors for families associated with lower incidents of child abuse, including: nurturing and attachment within families; knowledge of parenting and child development; parental emotional resilience; connection to social support; concrete support in the form of adequate food, housing, and other essential services; and social and emotional competence for children.¹¹² The focus on protective factors is intended to help parents with risk

factors for abuse and neglect learn effective parenting skills, thereby reducing the likelihood for child abuse and maltreatment at home. By strengthening these factors, prevention programs have shifted from a punitive approach to one that attempts to increase child and family wellbeing by empowering parents to effectively care for their children.

The majority of child abuse cases in the United States are perpetrated by parents. According to the U.S. Children's Bureau, in 2013 one or both parents were responsible for 91.4 percent of cases of maltreated children.¹¹³ Of those parents identified as perpetrators of child abuse, fathers were solely responsible for reported child maltreatment cases 20.3 percent of the time.¹¹⁴ Though fathers are more likely to be involved in moderate to severe abuse cases, the majority of child abuse and maltreatment cases (63.2%) involve only the mother or both parents.¹¹⁵ Altogether, slightly more than half (53.9%) of the perpetrators were women, 45 percent were men, and 1.1 percent were of unknown sex.¹¹⁶ One explanation for these trends may be the fact that abused children are less likely to live with a single father; consequently, the majority of child abuse prevention programs tend to have a full parent focus.

One example of a parent-focused proactive intervention is the evidence-based Healthy Families America (HFA) home visiting program. HFA aims to improve parent-child interactions and child wellbeing, thereby reducing child abuse. Though current evaluations of HFA report no effect on preventing serious forms of child abuse and neglect, studies of HFA programs in Hawaii and New York report positive outcomes for reducing corporal punishment, physiological or physical aggression, and the frequency of mild physical assault among families.^{117,118,119}

Another program, SafeCare, is a reactive home visiting program targeting families with a young child and a history of child maltreatment or risk for child maltreatment. Similar to HFA, the SafeCare model does not distinguish between mothers and fathers in the family. Multiple evaluations of the program show statistically significant positive changes for reduced child abuse recidivism.¹²⁰ For example, a 2002 study of the SafeCare program in California reported participating families were less likely to have a recurrence of child maltreatment (15%) than families in the control group (46%) three years after the intervention.¹²¹

Perhaps one of the most promising of parent-focused proactive child abuse prevention programs is Triple P Positive Parenting Practices. This program has been shown to slow rates of child abuse, reduce foster care placements, and decrease hospitalizations from child abuse injuries. A robust randomized control trial evaluating the program across 18 counties in the United States reported large effect sizes for decreases in substantiated child maltreatment, child out-of-home placements, and child maltreatment injuries.¹²²

Though most child abuse prevention programs target entire families, a few programs focus exclusively on fathers. Unfortunately, existing father-focused programs are less likely to have been rigorously evaluated for overall effectiveness compared to parent-focused programs. The Boot Camp for New Dads Program is one example of a program targeting fathers that has not yet been evaluated for impact. This program is a community-based program for fathers of all economic levels, cultures, and ages. The program facilitates engagement between experienced and new fathers to promote

involvement with their children and build confidence as a new father. The curriculum for the Boot Camp for Dads program directly addresses Shaken Baby Syndrome, but long-term outcomes are focused on general family and child wellbeing.

Emerging evidence suggests that family interventions to reduce child maltreatment are less effective when the mother experiences reoccurring domestic violence.¹²³ A promising child abuse prevention program targeting fathers and addressing this particular issue is the Caring Dads: Helping Fathers Value their Children program. This program is an intervention targeting fathers who have abused or neglected their children, exposed them to abuse of their mothers, or are determined to be high-risk for future child maltreatment. Researchers have published multiple studies citing the need for this type of program, however, a rigorous evaluation of the program has not yet been conducted.^{124,125}

Whereas programs such as the ones discussed above show promise, most child abuse prevention programs still focus on both parents. The reason for the low number of such fatherhood programs is likely twofold. First, as mentioned earlier, support for fatherhood programs is relatively new to family policy initiatives. Most existing programs targeting fathers prioritize increasing father involvement through teaching positive parenting skills, self-efficacy, and the like. Consequently, child abuse prevention is often a secondary or implicit outcome for fatherhood programs. Second, most child abuse prevention programs focus on building safe and healthy relationships and environments within entire families. The incongruity of causal factors and types of perpetrators likely influences most child abuse prevention programs to incorporate parents or families together. As a result, child abuse prevention programs have largely followed a separate trajectory of intervention strategies compared to other fatherhood programs.

ONGOING STUDIES AND EVALUATIONS

In addition to past studies, there are also several large, rigorous evaluations of fatherhood programs currently underway. Many of these are supported through the Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (ACF OPRE). The grant-funded programs at the center of these evaluations reflect the modern conception of fatherhood programming, and together are expected to provide the field with important information over the next several years.

One of the most notable ongoing studies is the Parents and Children Together (PACT) evaluation, a federal project funded by ACF OPRE and conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR).¹²⁶ The PACT project is a large-scale, multisite random-assignment evaluation of programs that were awarded a four-year grant in 2011 to help strengthen responsible fatherhood and healthy couple relationships. Like all ACF-funded fatherhood programs, each program in the PACT evaluation is legislatively mandated to offer parenting and fatherhood, economic stability, and healthy relationship services. Programs follow one of two service delivery models: a cohort approach that integrates content across core areas into one intensive daily workshop, or an open-entry menu approach that includes separate workshops for parenting, economic stability, and relationships.¹²⁷ PACT includes multiple study components aimed at understanding program design and implementation, the needs of low-income fathers, and the impacts these programs may have on the families they serve. The main study consists of an implementation and

impact evaluation assessing the program operations and effectiveness of four fatherhood programs and two healthy marriage/relationship programs. In addition, an in-depth qualitative study is using ethnographic methods to develop an understanding of the lives, motivations, and experiences of low-income fathers who voluntarily enrolled in the four fatherhood programs.^m Finally, four additional fatherhood programs are being examined to understand the role of culture in programs that serve predominantly Hispanic fathers.ⁿ

Ultimately, the PACT project is slated to produce a range of products to increase knowledge about policies, programs, and service delivery approaches to responsible fatherhood and healthy couple interventions. To date, four reports have been published as part of PACT: two reports on program implementation, one report on in-depth interviews with participants, and one report on how the four responsible fatherhood programs were designed and operated, which includes data on the first 21 months of enrollment.¹²⁸ Findings from the in-depth interviews with participants center around fathers' perceptions of their own childhoods, their personal challenges, employment and child support experiences, their relationships with their children and the mothers of their children, their views on fathering, and their participation in the fatherhood programs.¹²⁹ Findings from the first 21 months of enrollment show that the four fatherhood programs enrolled 4,713 fathers over a period lasting almost two years. On average, 80 percent of fathers attended at least one program activity in the first four months after enrollment; workshops on parenting and fatherhood were the most popular, whereas workshops on health relationships proved the least engaging.¹³⁰

Building Bridges and Bonds (B3) is an evaluation funded by ACF OPRE and conducted by MDRC.¹³¹ The evaluation runs from 2014 to 2019, with site selection, study enrollment, and data collection set to begin in 2016.¹³² Altogether, the project will include impact and process studies of six fatherhood programs, with the ultimate goal of testing parenting and employment interventions that aim to improve fathers' relationships with their children and co-parents, as well as fathers' financial circumstances. Another goal is to test engagement strategies aimed at increasing participation in fatherhood programs. At present, the B3 team is planning to test a parenting intervention in four sites that will aim to engage fathers with young children.¹³³ In addition to the parenting intervention, B3 is considering testing a cognitive behavioral intervention in two sites that serve prisoner re-entry populations. This intervention may also target improvements in employment outcomes.¹³⁴

The Fatherhood and Marriage Local Evaluation (FaMLE) and Cross-Site Project evaluation study is designed to support the research and evaluation efforts of the Administration for Children and Families' FY2015 Responsible Fatherhood and Healthy Marriage grantees. The goal of the project is to better understand which strategies federally-funded healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood programs use to design and successfully implement well-conceived programs. In addition, the project will support high-quality data collection by training and providing technical assistance on state-of-the-

^m Connections to Success in Kansas City, MO and Kansas City, KS; Fathers' Support Center St. Louis in St. Louis, MO; Goodwill-Easter Seals Minnesota in Minneapolis and St. Paul, MN; Urban Ventures in Minneapolis, MN.

ⁿ Southwest Key in San Antonio, TX; Imperial Valley Regional Occupational Program in Imperial County, CA; The Children's Institute, Inc., in Los Angeles County, CA; KidWorks, a partner of the East Los Angeles Community Union in Santa Ana, CA.

art information collection systems; update program performance measures; strengthen local evaluations of healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood programs; and conduct cross-site analysis.¹³⁵ The study is being conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR) under a contract awarded by ACF in 2013.

The Administration for Children and Families has also made investments in the study of prisoner reentry programs to better understand how Responsible Fatherhood programs can serve fathers who have been, or soon will be, released from incarceration. The Ex-Prisoner Reentry Strategies Study is an implementation study conducted by the Urban Institute to document program operations, recruitment strategies, the experiences of staff and participants, and the types of services offered to participants and their families. Currently, the study is following six grantees.¹³⁶

Another effort funded by ACF OPRE is the Home Visiting: Approaches to Father Engagement and Fathers' Experiences Study, a qualitative research project conducted by the Urban Institute. Launched in 2013, this study aims to collect information about innovative approaches currently in use by home visiting programs to actively engage and serve fathers, as well as fathers' perspectives on participating in such programs.¹³⁷ The evaluation of the federally-funded Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program in Texas is also concerned with the strategies that community programs use to successfully engage fathers in home visiting services, and the role that fathers play in retaining families in these programs.

The Fatherhood Research and Practice Network (FRPN) is a national project funded by ACF OPRE to convene work groups of fatherhood experts, both researchers and practitioners, to study and promote the rigorous evaluation of fatherhood programs. In early 2015, FRPN announced the first round of funding for four evaluation projects across the U.S. All four evaluations involve randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of fatherhood programs or services. Each project is led by a team of practitioners and researchers who collaborate to collect data from program participants and/or staff across multiple time points. Though the primary aim of each evaluation is to assess change in father-child relationships and co-parenting, several of the projects also study process-oriented outcomes such as recruitment, engagement, retention, and staff training. The specific programs and curricula being evaluated as part of the FRPN grant are *Circle of Parents*, *Developing all Dads for Manhood and Parenting (DAD MAP)*, *Dads Matter* (Home Visiting), and a fatherhood program operated through *The Ridge Project, Inc.* A second round of grant funding for program evaluation will be released in early 2016.

A number of studies and demonstration projects related to child support and employment have also been initiated in recent years. In 2014, the Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Support Enforcement (ACF OCSE) awarded grants to seven states (plus the District of Columbia) through Behavioral Interventions for Child Support Services (BICS), a national demonstration exploring the application of behavioral economics principles to child support services, especially with regard to order modification and early engagement of custodial and noncustodial parents.¹³⁸ A similar effort called the Behavioral Interventions to Advance Self-Sufficiency (BIAS) is testing behavioral economics interventions related to child support in four sites.

The Child Support Noncustodial Parent Employment Demonstration (CSPED) is a rigorous, random-assignment demonstration and evaluation project funded by ACF OCSE, and conducted by researchers at the Institute for Research on Poverty (IRP) and Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR). Launched in eight states in 2012, the project provides unemployed noncustodial parents with four services, including: integrated case management; employment-oriented services that include job placement and retention; fatherhood/parenting activities using peer support; and enhanced child support services including the review and appropriate adjustment of child support orders.¹³⁹ Findings from the project will draw on an impact evaluation, implementation evaluation, and cost-benefit evaluation.

Beyond efforts to bolster the payment of child support orders, ACF OCSE has also taken steps to increase the safe and effective establishment of parenting time orders. In September 2012, the Office of Child Support Enforcement awarded grants to five states through the Parenting Time Opportunities for Children in the Child Support Program (PTOC), a four-year demonstration project to develop, implement, and evaluate procedures for establishing parenting time orders alongside new child support orders. The pilot studies are also testing techniques for integrating the child support and child access systems. Although grantees are also required to have an independent, site-specific evaluation, they are of limited scope due to low funding levels and none involve random assignment strategies.¹⁴⁰

Measurement and Evaluation

The programs discussed in this report have all undergone evaluations of various designs. Some have employed randomized control trials (RCT), whereas others have used quasi-experimental designs. Some have surveyed fathers, some have surveyed mothers, and some have surveyed both. Though the approaches to evaluating fatherhood programs differ—a reflection of the immense variation in study populations, program goals, and program implementation—each study has to make choices about measurement and data collection during the course of the evaluation. These choices, which include selecting the appropriate survey measures and instrumentation, are essential to producing rigorous and credible results.

This section provides a primer on several of the measurement and evaluation decisions that are central to conducting a robust evaluation. In addition, this section presents a number of specific survey measures designed to capture outcomes targeted by fatherhood programs. To help guide this discussion, we use Texas as a case study, highlighting measurement considerations for two curricula currently in use by Texas fatherhood programs—24/7 Dad™ and the Nurturing Fathers Program.^o For each curriculum, we define the expected outcomes and match these outcomes with a set of potential survey questions designed to measure program effectiveness.

^o Applicants for DFPS-PEI EFFECT funding were able to choose from a list of four curricula: 24/7 Dad, Nurturing Fathers, Becoming Parents, and Supporting Father Involvement. These four program curricula were identified as promising programs by DFPS-PEI after a preliminary review of the research.

DEVELOPING A ROAD MAP FOR THE EVALUATION

The development of survey measures begins with establishing a clear road map for the evaluation, including a coherent logic model and clearly defined research questions for the study. At the outset of the evaluation, researchers are faced with two basic questions: what are the specific outcomes expected from participation in this program, and how do we measure those outcomes? In the field of Responsible Fatherhood, defining what is meant by the goal of helping fathers to become more “committed, involved, and responsible fathers” is not a straightforward task.¹⁴¹ Over the last two decades, researchers, policymakers, and practitioners have made significant efforts to identify specific outcomes for fatherhood programs and develop measures for testing those outcomes.

DEFINING EXPECTED OUTCOMES FROM PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Various attempts have been made to conceptualize the expected outcomes from modern fatherhood programs. As the field has grown, many of the expected outcomes have expanded and evolved, much as the goals of fatherhood programs have changed. Today, with the proliferation of program models and outcome goals, it has become increasingly challenging to compare outcomes across programs. In response to these challenges, the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) and the FaMLE Cross-Site team at Mathematica collaborated to identify important outcomes that programs are designed to produce.¹⁴² From these outcomes, the team generated a set of common performance measures for all responsible fatherhood programs. These standardized measures will be used with the latest round of Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood/ReFORM grantees (FY2015), who are required to collect, store, and report data in four areas: program applicant characteristics, program operations, enrollment and participation, and client outcomes. After a period for pilot testing and public comment, the performance measures were submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review.¹⁴³ The performance measures are designed to assess client outcomes through self-administered pre- and post-tests conducted at the beginning and end of each program. Performance measure outcome domains include: parenting behaviors, economic stability, relationship attitudes and behaviors, personal development, and perceptions of program.¹⁴⁴ To assess changes in these areas, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. developed a set of pre- and post-test survey questions that are included in the Appendix of this report.

Scholars have also weighed in on the effort to design appropriate measures for fatherhood programs. In a recent paper from the Fatherhood Research and Practice Network (FRPN), Fagan and Kaufman (2014) suggest that evaluators consider measuring a number of outcome domains, including: (1) quality of the co-parenting relationship, (2) family social support, (3) fathers’ risks, and (4) father involvement.¹⁴⁵ These outcome areas may help elucidate phenomena beyond those captured by standardized performance measures through an increased emphasis on contextual factors impacting fathers’ experience in the program. After identifying important outcome domains, the authors go on to offer specific survey measures for assessing these constructs, including the Parenting Alliance Measure (PAM), Family Support Scale (FSS), and others which are discussed later in this section.

Though identifying the outcome domain in which a program is expected to have impact (e.g. father involvement) is helpful, designing appropriate measures requires first having specific program goals

that can be measured. In 2009, the Administration for Children and Families, Office of Family Assistance outlined three important outcome domains for responsible fatherhood programs, each of which include a set of specific outcome goals.¹⁴⁶ For example, one of the outcome domains—effective parenting behavior—included four specific outcomes, (1) learning new parenting skills such as positive discipline techniques and cultivating a child’s independence, (2) using new parenting skills with their children, (3) increasing their understanding of child development, and (4) fathers increasing their consistency in providing formal, as well as informal and non-monetary support for their children.¹⁴⁷ Defining the expected outcomes of a program helps to provide a blueprint for the evaluation and facilitate the development of survey questions.

SELECTING SURVEY ITEMS FOR MEASURING PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Once the expected outcomes of a program have been clearly articulated, researchers can begin to develop specific survey measures to properly assess each outcome. Selecting robust survey measures involves a number of considerations. Strong survey items show internal consistency and reliability with similar measures in the study, and maintain validity across time and samples. Below are a number of measurement considerations adapted from a 2015 report entitled *Considerations for Collecting Outcomes Data from Parents in Complex Families*, produced by Child Trends for the Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.¹⁴⁸ An additional consideration has been added, and several have been expanded to include the reflections of other researchers.

Survey Item Considerations

Who is the program intended to impact? Fathers? Fathers’ partners? Fathers’ children? In many cases, complex families may need additional specification. Is the program intended to improve a father’s relationship with his current or past partner, resident or nonresident children, biological or non-biological children? These can be challenging issues for evaluators because some fathers may have more than one child, and children may be living in different households with different mothers. Evaluators can ask about each individual child, or focus on one target child—often the youngest—when assessing father involvement.¹⁴⁹ The Fatherhood Research and Practice Network recommends asking fathers about more than one of their children because relationships with older children may be very different than relationships with the youngest.¹⁵⁰

Who should answer the questions? Depending on who the program is intended to impact, the sample population may change. If co-parenting or relationship outcomes are part of the evaluation, for example, it might make sense to survey both partners for a more complete understanding of relationship dynamics.

Who should the questions be about? Questions can focus on the respondent’s own behavior and attitudes, or the behavior and attitudes of the respondent’s partner or former partner. Choosing the focus of the survey questions is dependent upon the goal of the evaluation, and where program effects are expected.

How should the data be collected? Given the potentially sensitive nature of some survey questions, it is important to administer the survey in a way that encourages honest responses while protecting participant privacy. Respondents are often more likely to answer the questions truthfully if they complete the survey on their own, rather than with an interviewer.

What are the findings from previous research in this field? Designing appropriate survey questions also requires a familiarity with prior research in the field. For example, studies on father involvement are clear that the quality of father-child interaction matters more for child wellbeing than the mere quantity of father-child interaction.¹⁵¹ Father involvement is also closely tied to the quality of fathers' relationship with the mother, making effective co-parenting central to fathers' ongoing engagement with their children.¹⁵² Awareness of these contextual factors aids in the development of well-specified survey questions.

Matching Expected Outcomes to Survey Items

In this section, we attempt to close the circle by linking the various concepts discussed above into a practical blueprint for arriving at well-tailored survey measures. As an example, we draw on two curricula in use by Texas fatherhood programs—24/7 Dad™ and the Nurturing Fathers Program. Each curricula includes a set of expected outcomes or program goals. For example, the stated goals of the 24/7 Dad™ curriculum include increasing pro-fathering knowledge, skills, and attitudes; increasing fathers' frequency of healthy interaction with children; increasing healthy interaction with the mother of fathers' children; decreasing the social, emotional, and physical ills of children.¹⁵³ The Nurturing Fathers Program also includes a list of expected outcomes the program hopes to achieve. Some of the outcome goals listed by the programs are more specific than others; the more clearly defined the outcome goal, the better targeted the survey measure can be.

In Table 1, we first match the expected outcome of each program to an overarching outcome domain, such as parenting or partner communication. The outcome domains are drawn from the Administration for Children and Families' Healthy Marriage/Relationship Education: Models and Measures project, a collaborative effort with Child Trends to identify outcome areas and survey measures related to healthy marriage and relationship education programs. Altogether, the ACF report includes 20 outcome domains, though only six are shown in Table 1 because the majority of outcome domains do not correspond with expected outcomes from the 24/7 Dad™ and the Nurturing Fathers Program curricula. Each outcome domain in Table 1 also includes an expected length of time for change to be measurable. Short-term outcomes are those that can be seen during and immediately following the intervention; intermediate outcomes are behavior changes that are measured at 6-12 months, and; long-term outcomes are those that measure an ultimate change in the participant's status or condition, usually seen 2-3 years after the intervention.

Within each of the outcome domains, the Child Trends ACF report includes an extensive catalogue of survey measures that are designed to capture change related to that outcome. The survey measures included in the ACF inventory have been thoroughly vetted, and provide a useful starting place for

the development of questions related to fatherhood program evaluations. Table 1 presents a sample evaluation question for each program outcome goal. For example, one goal of the 24/7 Dad™ program is to increase fathers' frequency of healthy interaction with children. This goal corresponds with the "parenting" outcome domain. Within the parenting domain, the table provides a potential survey item for assessing change. For example, to assess the frequency of fathers' healthy interaction with children, participants might be asked "About how often in the past month have you: Spent time with [CHILD] doing one of (his/her) favorite activities, like shopping, playing a sport, going to a movie, watching TV, or playing videogames?"

Table 1: Matching Curricula Outcome Goals with ACF OPRE's Outcome Domains and Recommended Survey Measures

Outcome Domain ¹	Outcome Goal ^{2,3}	Curriculum	Sample Survey Measure ¹
Parenting (Short-term and intermediate outcomes)	Increase pro-fathering (and decrease anti-fathering) knowledge, skills, and attitudes	24/7 Dad™	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since attending the program, I feel more confident that I have the skills necessary to be an effective parent .
	Increase fathers' frequency of healthy interaction with children	24/7 Dad™	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About how often in the past month have you: Spent time with [CHILD] doing one of (his/her) favorite activities, like shopping, playing a sport, going to a movie, watching TV, or playing videogames?
	Increase parental attitudes and behaviors/develop attitudes and skills for male nurturance	Nurturing Fathers Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I share an affectionate, warm relationship with my child(ren).
	Fathers will learn positive discipline tools through a uniquely father-friendly method for successful child behavior management.	Nurturing Fathers Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over the past month, how often did you... Talk to [CHILD] about what he/she did wrong? • Over the past month, how often have you.... Yelled, shouted, screamed at, or threatened [CHILD] because you were mad at (him/her)?
	Decrease social, emotional, and physical ills of children	24/7 Dad™	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If upset, my child(ren) will seek comfort from me.
	Fathers will learn effective family communication techniques to strengthen the father-child and father-mother relationships.	Nurturing Fathers Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How often do you and your child talk about things that really matter? • My child(ren) openly share their feelings and experiences with me.
Co-parenting Relationship with Current Partner (Intermediate and long-term outcomes)	Increase healthy interaction with the mother of fathers' children	24/7 Dad™	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each of these items, do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the statement: When I'm having a rough day with the child(ren), I can turn to [PARTNER] for support and advice.
	Fathers will learn effective family communication techniques to strengthen the father-child and father-mother relationships.	Nurturing Fathers Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the past month, how often did the following things happen in your relationship? Would you say often, sometimes, hardly ever, or never? Arguments took place in front of the children.
	Fathers will learn how to achieve cooperation and teamwork in family life.	Nurturing Fathers Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following statements are about [PARTNER]'s and your involvement in the care of your biological children with [PARTNER]. For each statement, please answer if the statement is true often, sometimes, hardly ever, or

Outcome Domain ¹	Outcome Goal ^{2,3}	Curriculum	Sample Survey Measure ¹
			<p>never. I feel good about [PARTNER]’s judgment about what is right for our child(ren).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each of these items, do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the statement: We work together to set good rules for our child.
Co-parenting Relationship with Previous Partner or Other Co-parents (Intermediate and long-term outcomes)	Increase healthy interaction with the mother of fathers’ children	24/7 Dad™	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding your relationship with [PREVIOUS PARTNER or OTHER CO-PARENT], tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements: I am trying to improve our relationship for the good of our children. Please tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement: We could raise my child(ren) just as well without [PREVIOUS PARTNER OR OTHER CO-PARENT].
	Fathers will learn effective family communication techniques to strengthen the father-child and father-mother relationships.	Nurturing Fathers Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each of these items, do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the statement. Thinking about each child you are raising with your previous partner or other co-parents, would you say your child is confused about.... Whose rules to follow.
	Fathers will learn how to achieve cooperation and teamwork in family life.	Nurturing Fathers Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each item below, please indicate how often your previous partner does this with the child you have together. Makes decisions about our child without discussing them with me.
Partner Communication (Short-term outcomes)	Increase healthy interaction with the mother of fathers’ children	24/7 Dad™	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please think about your interactions with your partner. In a typical month, how frequently do YOU: Talk about the day’s events with your partner. In the past month, how often did the following things happen in your relationship? Would you say often, sometimes, hardly ever, or never? [PARTNER] and I stayed mad at one another after an argument.
	Fathers will learn effective family communication techniques to strengthen the father-child and father-mother relationships.	Nurturing Fathers Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the past month, how often did the following things happen in your relationship? Would you say often, sometimes, hardly ever, or never? [PARTNER] seemed to view my words or actions more negatively than I meant them to be.

Outcome Domain ¹	Outcome Goal ^{2,3}	Curriculum	Sample Survey Measure ¹
	Fathers will learn how to achieve cooperation and teamwork in family life.	Nurturing Fathers Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the past month, how often did the following things happen in your relationship? Would you say often, sometimes, hardly ever, or never? Arguments took place in front of the children.
Family Processes (Short-term and intermediate outcomes)	Decrease social, emotional, and physical ills of children	24/7 Dad™	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much do you agree with the following statements? Would you say you strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree that: Overall, there are more happy feelings, than unhappy feelings in my family.
	Fathers will learn the secrets for creating safe, loving, stable, and nurtured families.	Nurturing Fathers Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each statement below, please mark how much each statement describes your home environment. At home we can talk to each other without being interrupted. For each statement below, please mark how much each statement describes your home environment. No matter what our family plans, it usually doesn't seem to work out.
	Fathers will learn how to achieve cooperation and teamwork in family life.	Nurturing Fathers Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How satisfied are you with: How you divide household chores.
Couple Conflict Management/ Conflict (Intermediate and long-term outcomes)	Fathers will learn how to stop fighting and arguing by using proven-effective strategies for conflict resolution and problem solving.	Nurturing Fathers Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How often do you and [PARTNER] argue about the following items? Would you say often, sometimes, hardly ever, never? Sample Items: Relationships with previous partners, children from previous relationships, your relationship, not earning enough money, how to spend money, discipline of kids, household chores. How often do the following things happen in your relationship? Would you say often, sometimes, hardly ever, or never? We are pretty good listeners, even when we have different positions on things.

Source: ¹Scott, M.E., Moore, K.A., Benedetti, A.M., Fish, H., Rosinsky, K. (2015). *Healthy marriage and relationship education: Recommended outcome measures for parents in complex families*. OPRE Report #2015-66a. Prepared by Child Trends. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. ²National Fatherhood Initiative. 24/7 Dad™ Logic Model. Retrieved from <http://capacitybuilding.fatherhood.org/document.doc?id=35> ³The Nurturing Father's Program. Retrieved from <http://nurturingfathers.com/>

Additional Survey Measures

The Fatherhood Research and Practice Network (FRPN) has assembled its own set of recommended survey measures, some of which align with the ACF OPRE measures in Table 1, but most of which are unique. One of the recommended measures reviewed by FRPN is the Parenting Alliance Measure (PAM), formally developed by Abidin and Konold (1999).¹⁵⁴ The PAM, a measure of co-parenting created for use with unmarried parents, assesses partners' capacity to "acknowledge, respect, and value the parenting roles and tasks for the other partner."¹⁵⁵ Altogether, the PAM includes 20 questions such as "My child's other parent makes my job of being a parent easier" and "When there is a problem with our child, we work out a good solution together"—each of which are rated on a 5-point Likert scale.¹⁵⁶ The measure was developed with a diverse community sample and has been used in a number of studies with nonresident, never-married fathers. Various studies have also shown that the PAM possesses high internal consistency reliability and adequate predictive validity.¹⁵⁷ The Fatherhood Research and Practice Network (FRPN) is currently in the process of developing alternate measures of co-parenting for use in fatherhood programs that will help to capture other aspects of the parents' relationship not assessed in the PAM.

The Family Support Scale (FSS) is a well-vetted measure for assessing family social support. The original measure includes 18 individual items, though researchers have added and adapted survey items over time. Specific questions attempt to assess the helpfulness of specific individuals or groups of individuals (such as parents, partners, relatives, coworkers, friends, teachers, or doctors) in raising the family.¹⁵⁸ A modified version of the FSS has been tested for reliability and validity, and has shown strong internal consistency.¹⁵⁹

The Child-Parent Relationship Scale (CPRS) is a self-reported measure that assesses parents' perception of closeness and conflict in the parent-child relationship. The scale includes 15 Likert scale items, such as "I share an affectionate, warm relationship with my child," and "My child and I always seem to be struggling with each other."¹⁶⁰ The scale features multiple benefits, including questions formulated at a basic reading level and appropriateness for use with children of different ages (3-12); unfortunately, the measure is also likely to include some degree of rater bias resulting from self-reporting.¹⁶¹ Nevertheless, the measure has been shown to have adequate predictive validity and construct validity, as well as stability across developmental periods, in various studies.¹⁶²

Quantity of father involvement has most often been measured using self-reported survey data from the mother or father. Some studies have used time diaries, also self-reported, to assess the quantity of father involvement. One of the more common conceptualizations of father involvement explores the overarching measure through three sub-constructs: accessibility, engagement, and responsibility. To measure accessibility, fathers are asked how often they see or visit with the child. To measure engagement, fathers are asked how many hours per week they engage in certain activities with the child. To measure responsibility, fathers are asked how often they help with basic childrearing tasks such as feeding the child or taking the child to the doctor. Various iterations of these measures have

been used in a number of studies, including the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCW), but there remain some concerns about their applicability to nonresident fathers.¹⁶³

Conclusion

Fatherhood programs have come a long way since their inception several decades ago. An array of programs now serve many thousands of fathers annually, and federal efforts to support these programs have proliferated greatly in recent years. Despite the rapid growth in fatherhood programming, limited research has been done on the effectiveness of these initiatives. Some have shown promise in small-scale studies, and others have registered impacts under more rigorous evaluation designs. Still, further research is needed to determine the best way to support fathers in their various roles as parents, partners, co-parents, and workers.

This report reviewed the evidence base for fatherhood programs, with a specific focus on which outcomes changed, and for whom. In subsequent reports, we will turn our attention to the programmatic elements common to successful programs in an effort to identify the specific curricula and delivery models that make a fatherhood program effective. CFRP will also continue to gather information on various fatherhood efforts underway in Texas, including those funded by DFPS, in order to develop a comprehensive plan for supporting fathers and families in the state.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Fatherhood Initiatives in Texas

Within the state of Texas, more than two dozen programs exist to promote father involvement and provide fathers with the tools for healthy, effective parenting. The vast majority of these initiatives serve just one city or county, with only a handful operating in multiple counties or statewide. The programs are generally operated by non-profits and other local organizations with funding from the state, federal grants, or private foundations. Programs vary in the services they offer, the way in which they bring services to fathers, the primary goals and emphasis of the program, and the characteristics of the fathers served.

This table is a preliminary inventory of initiatives in Texas that aim to increase and improve fathers’ involvement with their children. The table identifies the organization – the nonprofit or government entity – that operates the program and the county or city in which the services are available. Each program’s primary funding source is specified, and the table is color-coded to indicate programs that are funded by the same source. The services offered are described in the *Program Features* column. *Program Focus* identifies the primary objective(s) of the program, based on the following categories: parenting skills, co-parenting, healthy relationships, financial stability, employment, child abuse prevention, anger/stress management, incarceration/re-entry support, child support, paternity establishment, and training and support. Finally, if there are any eligibility requirements to participate in the program, they are defined in the last column.

Fatherhood Initiatives’ Primary Funding Source Color Key
Federally Funded
State Funded
Mixed Funding (Non-profit/Private/Government)

Table 2: Fatherhood Initiatives in Texas

Program Name	Organization	Location	Funding Source	Program Features	Program Focus	Eligibility
Alliance for North Texas Healthy and Effective Marriages, dba Anthem Strong Families	Alliance for North Texas Healthy and Effective Marriages (ANTHEM)	Dallas	New Pathways for Fathers and Families Grant - ACF (2015)	Aimed at to improving the educational environment to increase father involvement. Provide training, technical assistance, and event facilitation for schools and community organizations, including Head Start. Tools include the Strong Start and Blue Prints for Dad curricula for service providers.	Father Engagement Training and Support, Curriculum Development	Schools, organizations, or programs with an interest in improving father engagement

Program Name	Organization	Location	Funding Source	Program Features	Program Focus	Eligibility
Motivation, Education, and Training, Inc.	Motivation, Education, and Training, Inc.	New Caney	New Pathways for Fathers and Families Grant – ACF (2015)	Provides employment, vocational training, emergency support, housing services *New grantee, information on fatherhood program not available online	Employment/ Financial Stability, Job Readiness	Migrant and seasonal farmworkers, low-income families
Services to Fathers, Parent-Child Education Program	AVANCE – San Antonio	Delivered in Houston and Rio Grande Valley	New Pathways for Fathers and Families Grant – ACF (2015) Foundation grants	Provides educational courses for fathers, case management, and support services such as meals and transportation; uses the Five Protective Factors framework to promote father involvement and AVANCE Inc. Services to Fathers Curriculum; parents learn about anger and stress management, domestic violence prevention, and positive expression of emotions	Parenting Skills, Violence Prevention/ Anger Management	Must have a child 0-3 years old and have income within the federal poverty guidelines
Horizon Eagle	Horizon Outreach	Houston, Spring	New Pathways for Fathers and Families Grant – ACF (2011, 2015)	Provides curriculum-based instruction on effective parenting and relationship skills, resources for economic stability; emphasis on veterans suffering from PTSD	Parenting, Healthy Relationships, Employment/ Financial Stability	All fathers, veteran fathers with history of PTSD
Fathers and Children Together (FACT)	Workforce Solutions for Tarrant County	Fort Worth, Tarrant County	Responsible Fatherhood Grant – ACF (2011)	Provides personal Mentor-Navigator to help with child support/visitation, employment, parenting skills, strengthening relationships, education, finances, and anger management	Employment/ Financial Stability	Low-income mothers and fathers
The Fatherhood Works Program	Goodwill Industries of Central Texas	Austin	Responsible Fatherhood Grant - ACF (2011)	Offers a comprehensive approach to promoting responsible fatherhood	Unknown	Unknown
Responsible Fatherhood	Southwest Key Programs, Inc.	San Antonio	Responsible Fatherhood Grant – ACF (2011)	Engages fathers in relationship-building/long-term bonding with their children through weekly classes and quarterly workshops; offer case management, aftercare, and economic stability services; uses Raising Children with Pride, Active Relationships, and Healing the Wounded Spirit curricula	Parenting Skills, Healthy Relationships, Financial Stability	Anyone who identifies as being in a fatherhood role

Program Name	Organization	Location	Funding Source	Program Features	Program Focus	Eligibility
Fathers Empowerment Project	LifeWorks Youth & Family Alliance	Travis County	Responsible Fatherhood Grant – ACF (2011)	Offers counseling, parenting education, case management, and employment assistance to help fathers learn how to care for a new child, create a productive relationship with child's mother, and continue education/enter the workforce	Employment/ Financial Stability, Co-parenting	Anyone who identifies as being in a fatherhood role, lives in Travis County, has income within the federal poverty guidelines
Dads Make a Difference; Building Strong and Healthy Families Initiative	Healthy Families of San Angelo	San Angelo	Responsible Fatherhood Grant, Healthy Marriage Grant – ACF (2011)	Encourages fathers to emotionally connect with and financially support their children. To promote relationships between fathers and their children, the program conducts home visits, father and parent group meetings, father and child play activities, family outings, and other recreational activities	Parenting Skills, Healthy Relationships, Employment/ Financial Stability	
Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service	Texas A&M	College Station	Health Marriage and Relationship Education Grant – ACF (2015)	Provides educational programs, activities, and resources for agricultural-based programs and organizations across Texas	Training and Support	Schools, organizations, or programs offering agricultural-based services
Strengthening Relationships/ Strengthening Families (SR/SF)	Texas State University	San Marcos	Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education Grant – ACF (2011, 2015)	Provides high school youth training on value of marriage, relationship skills and budgeting; and job readiness and financial literacy/management skills; incorporates case management, referrals, and home visits as needed	Healthy Relationships, Employment/ Financial Stability, Job Readiness	High school students
Empowering Families Project (EPF)	The Parenting Center	Fort Worth, Tarrant County	Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education Grant – ACF (2011, 2015)	Provides community education, marriage programs and counseling services focused on parenting skills, financial management, conflict resolution, and job, career advancement, and marriage skills training	Parenting skills, Healthy Relationships, Job Readiness, Employment/ Financial Stability	Low-income parents and families, those on or at-risk of going on TANF, and refugees

Program Name	Organization	Location	Funding Source	Program Features	Program Focus	Eligibility
Healthy Marriage Community Empowerment Program	AVANCE – Houston, Inc.	Houston	Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education – ACF (2011, 2015) United Way	Provides classes on parenting skills, improving relationships between couples, and strengthening families; job and career advancement skills training; services include advocacy and referrals; Program uses the following curricula: Parejas Unidas, Active Relationships, Father Factor and AVANCE, Inc.’s Parent Education Curriculum.	Parenting Skills, Healthy Relationships / Co-Parenting	Families and married couples
Alliance for North Texas Healthy and Effective Marriages, dba Anthem Strong Families	Alliance for North Texas Healthy and Effective Marriages (ANTHEM)	Dallas	Healthy Marriage Grant – ACF (2011)	Provide training on marriage education, marriage skills, and relationship skills programs; may include parenting skills, financial management, conflict resolution and job and career advancement	Healthy Relationships, Parenting Skills, Employment/ Financial Stability, Job Readiness	Married couples, high school students
Houston Marriage Project	Family Service Center at Houston and Harris County	Houston, Harris County	Healthy Marriage Grant – ACF (2011)	Provides marriage campaigns; marriage and relationship skills programs; job and career advancement; mentoring programs. Uses the following curricula: Active Marriage and Best Practices, Active Choices, Hold Me Tight and Prepare/Enrich.	Healthy Relationships, Employment/ Financial Stability, Job Readiness	Low-income couples
Healthy Opportunities for Marriage Enrichment	El Paso Center for Children, Inc.	El Paso	Healthy Marriage Grant – ACF (2011)	Provides families with marriage education and marriage/relationship skills that may include parenting skills, financial management, conflict resolution, and job and career advancement, uses the PREP: Within Our Reach curriculum	Parenting Skills, Employment/ Financial Stability, Job Readiness	Low-income Hispanic married couples with children
Steps to Success	Healthy Families San Angelo	San Angelo	Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP) Grant – ACF (2012)	Integrated dads program into full family approach. Intensive, long-term home visiting that engages moms and dads from prenatal stage to child’s 2nd birthday. Male and female home visitors focus on bonding and attachment, healthy birth spacing through contraceptive use, family self-sufficiency through education and employment, and healthy relationship skills. Uses Healthy Babies...Healthy Families, Maps for Dads, and Steps to Success curricula.	Parenting Skills, Healthy Relationships, Employment/ Financial Stability	Mothers must be under 21 years old at intake

Program Name	Organization	Location	Funding Source	Program Features	Program Focus	Eligibility
Urban Fathers Asset Building (UFAB) project	Attorney General of Texas (OAG), Child Support Division (CSD) – Family Initiatives	Houston	Building Assets for Fathers and Families (BAFF) Grant – ACF-OCSE (2011)	Encourages financial literacy and asset building to help fathers become more economically self-sufficient Provides financial stability services, information about child support, and matched savings accounts	Child Support, Financial Stability	
Dad’s Club	North Texas Fatherhood Initiative (subsidiary of Texas Healthy Marriage and Relationship Initiative)	Dallas	Compassion Capital Fund Grant – ACF (2009)	Provides support group for fathers to connect and share information; dads promote positive involvement and interaction by participating in monthly “Lunch Dads” activity	Parenting Skills	All fathers
Success for Life	Family Care Connection	Dallas County	Grant to Enhance Culturally Specific Services for Victims of Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence and Stalking Program – U.S. Department of Justice (2013)	Aimed at teen/young adult parents; provides case management, parent education, mentoring, and marriage/relationship skills training through group meetings, home visits, and high school class presentations; emphasizes role of fathers	Parenting Skills – Teen Focused, Healthy Relationships	Teen/young adult parents
Fatherhood EFFECT I	Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS), Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) (BCFS Health and Human Services; Child Crisis Center of El Paso)	Cameron and Taylor County; El Paso	DFPS-PEI and CBCAP federal funds	Offers parenting education course, uses the 24/7 Dad curriculum, teaches characteristics of a good father; topics include conflict resolution, communication, child behavior problems, handling complicated emotions, aggression, alcohol, and violence; participants receive childcare, transportation, and food/diapers/clothing	Parenting/ Co-parenting Skills, Violence Prevention/ Anger Management	Have children under age 17, no open or substantiated DFPS case, live in Cameron or Taylor County; Must have no substantiated CPS case, have at least one risk factor from a designated list

Program Name	Organization	Location	Funding Source	Program Features	Program Focus	Eligibility
Fatherhood EFFECT II	Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS), Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) (NewDay Services)	Tarrant and Denton Counties	DFPS-PEI and CBCAP federal funds	Offers cohort-based parenting and healthy relationships course using Nurturing Fathers curriculum (13 weeks, 2.5 hour classes/week). Ancillary services include a mentor navigator component to connect with other systems of support.	Parenting Skills, Healthy Relationships	Must have no substantiated CPS case, have at least one risk factor from a designated list
Project Help through Intervention and Prevention (HIP)	Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS), Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI)	Multiple program sites statewide	DFPS-PEI	Provides voluntary services to families to increase protective factors and prevent child abuse; extensive family assessment, home visiting programs that include parent education and basic needs support	Child Abuse Prevention, Parenting Skills	Parents whose parental rights were previously terminated/who have had a child die due to child abuse and neglect, who currently have newborn
Healthy Outcomes through Prevention and Early Support (Project HOPES)	Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS), Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) (contractors operate the program in 8 counties)	Cameron, Ector, El Paso, Gregg, Hidalgo, Potter, Travis, and Webb Counties	DFPS-PEI	Offers group sessions, case management, counseling, parent education, and home visitation to promote supportive family environments, healthy relationships, and positive communication. Contracts with community-based organizations to provide child abuse and neglect prevention services. Each site uses curriculum that best fits their community; 24/7 Dad, Triple P, Breaking the Cycle, Fathering After Violence, and Nurturing Fathers are all being used.	Violence Prevention, Healthy Relationships, Parenting Skills	Must have child age 0-5, no open/substantiated CPS case, reside in the county where the contract was awarded, and have two risk factors from a designated list
Texas Families: Together and Safe (TFTS)	Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS), Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) (BCFS non-profit network)	Bexar, Cameron, Hidalgo, Kerr, and Nueces Counties	DFPS-PEI	Parenting education program that teaches families how to resolve conflict/improve communication, improve children's behavioral problems, deal with strong emotions, aggression, alcohol, and violence, and validate parents' strengths	Parenting/ Co-Parenting Skills, Violence Prevention/Anger Management	Families with children 3-17yrs, no open CPS case, no prior case of abuse or neglect, in counties served

Program Name	Organization	Location	Funding Source	Program Features	Program Focus	Eligibility
Families First	Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS), Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) (Catholic Charities Fort Worth)	Fort Worth/Tarrant County	DFPS-PEI and TFTS grant	Provides assessment, parenting education, and support services using Triple P curriculum	Parenting Skills	Parents with children 18 months-12 years, no substantiated open or past CPS case, must live in Tarrant County, and must enroll in classes voluntarily
CPS Fatherhood Initiative	Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS), Child Protective Services (CPS)	Texas	DFPS-CPS	CPS Fatherhood Initiative aims to more effectively engage fathers in the child welfare system and increase permanency for children in foster care. Works with other agencies and stakeholders, conducts trainings and presentations on father engagement, participates in fatherhood related workgroups.	Parenting Skills, Violence Prevention, Father Engagement	
Texas Home Visiting	Texas Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC)	Bexar, Collin, Dallas, Ector, Gregg, Harris, Hays, Hidalgo/Wilacy/Cameron, Montgomery, Nueces, Potter, Smith/Cherokee, Starr, Tarrant, and Wichita Counties	HHSC and MIECHV federal funds	Offers three different home visiting programs (Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters, Nurse-Family Partnership, Parents as Teachers) to parents of children five and under in 15 counties throughout Texas. The programs aim to help “good people be great parents,” as well as working in communities to strengthen support for all families.	Parenting Skills	Varies by home visiting program

Program Name	Organization	Location	Funding Source	Program Features	Program Focus	Eligibility
Noncustodial Parent Choices	Texas Office of the Attorney General (OAG), Child Support Division (CSD) – Family Initiatives & Texas Workforce Commission	Multiple program sites statewide	OAG-CSD	Provides enhanced child support case compliance monitoring and employment services for un/underemployed, NCPs who owe child support; services include personal career counselor, job leads, job search guidance, career planning, GED or ESL classes, and work clothing and transportation assistance; typically lasts 6 months	Child Support, Employment/ Financial Stability	Must be court ordered into the program
Parenting and Paternity Awareness (p.a.p.a.)	Texas Office of the Attorney General (OAG), Child Support Division (CSD) – Family Initiatives	Multiple program sites statewide	OAG-CSD	Public school curriculum (14 sessions) on rights, responsibilities, and realities of parenting; focuses on father involvement, paternity establishment, financial/emotional challenges of single parenting, healthy relationship skills	Parenting Skills – Teen Focused, Paternity Establishment , Violence Prevention	Public school students
Services for Incarcerated Parents and Parents Returning to the Community	Texas Office of the Attorney General (OAG), Child Support Division (CSD) – Family Initiatives	Multiple program sites statewide	OAG-CSD	Creates and delivers resources about paternity and child support to incarcerated and formerly incarcerated parents (handbook and DVD); encourages incarcerated parents to remain emotionally and financially engaged with children; parents can request review of their child support obligation	Child Support, Paternity Establishment	Incarcerated and formerly incarcerated parents
Paternity Establishment	Texas Office of the Attorney General (OAG), Child Support Division (CSD)	Texas	OAG-CSD and federal funds	Supports voluntary paternity establishment and early engagement of fathers to reduce the need for formal, adversarial child support services. Provides paternity establishment training and resources for Texas HHSC’s Home Visiting program, the Texas WIC program, and local community and faith-based parent education programs.	Paternity Establishment	Nonmarital births

Program Name	Organization	Location	Funding Source	Program Features	Program Focus	Eligibility
Child Support	Texas Office of the Attorney General (OAG), Child Support Division (CSD)	Texas	OAG-CSD and federal funds	Provides services for parents who wish to obtain or provide support for their children, including: locating the absent parent, establishing paternity, establishing and enforcing child support orders, establishing and enforcing medical support orders, reviewing and adjusting child support payments, collecting and distributing child support payments. Services are required by federal law.	Child Support, Paternity Establishment	
Shared Parenting Programs	Texas Office of the Attorney General (OAG), Child Support Division (CSD) – Family Initiatives	Multiple providers statewide	OAG-CSD	Provide visitation services for noncustodial parents, shared parenting education, and information regarding child custody, conservatorship, and possession order issues. These programs include the multiple community-based organizations and county domestic relations offices.	Access and Visitation	
Access and Visitation Hotline and Website	Legal Aid of Northwest Texas	Texas	OAG-CSD	Telephone hotline to provide easy, statewide access to basic legal information, education, and resources for parents and other interested parties who do not have access to an attorney. Attorneys provide basic legal information and education about establishing paternity, the child support process and a parent’s legal authority to see his or her child; they do not offer legal advice	Child Support, Paternity Establishment	
WIC Peer Dad (PD) Program	Texas Department of State Health Services (DSHS), The Office of Title V and Family Health (OTVFH)	Dallas, Cameron County, San Antonio, College Station, Tyler, and Hidalgo County.	DSHS-OTVFH	Teaches fathers and mothers about: Breastfeeding, Shaken Baby (e.g. Periods of Purple Crying), Baby Behavior training, Being a dad –caring for a mom. Makes referrals to social services for financial security (e.g. employment, utilities, etc.) Reaches out to fathers and grandfathers of women who don’t breastfeed.	Parenting Skills	

Program Name	Organization	Location	Funding Source	Program Features	Program Focus	Eligibility
Live Like a Dad Media Campaign	Texas Department of State Health Services (DSHS), The Office of Title V and Family Health (OTVFH)	Texas	DSHS-OTVFH	www.liveliheadad.com/ increases awareness on the importance of fatherhood involvement, and provides father-centered educational information and resources to help fathers navigate and support their partners through the stages of pregnancy, labor and delivery, and parenting including infant health and development. Includes email subscription service.	Parenting Skills, Healthy Relationships	
Someday Starts Now Public Awareness Campaign	Texas Department of State Health Services (DSHS), The Office of Title V and Family Health (OTVFH)	Texas	DSHS-OTVFH	Public awareness campaign of DSHS's infant mortality reduction initiative, Healthy Texas Babies—provides accessible, reliable, and supportive information on leading a healthy lifestyle from preconception to parenting and beyond for men and women of childbearing age. Tools for men include a Life Planning Tool, a Birth Plan (to encourage involvement and partner support during pregnancy), a booklet for new fathers called Maps for New Dads, and references to national resources on fatherhood.	Parenting Skills, Health Relationships	
Family Place, My Father's House, Family Pathways	Buckner Children and Family Services, Family Transition Programs	Amarillo, Conroe, Dallas, Houston, Lubbock, Lufkin, Midland	Texas Fund Grant – Texas State Affordable Housing Corporation	Single parent focus; parents and children are offered safe place to live, counseling services, and lessons in parenting skills, money management, and conflict resolution; provide spiritual mentorship	Parenting Skills	Must be >18 years old, enrolled in educational/vocational program

Program Name	Organization	Location	Funding Source	Program Features	Program Focus	Eligibility
Compadre Y Compadre	The Children's Shelter	San Antonio and Bexar County area	United Way, local foundations/donations	2 week "Daddy Boot Camp" – learn child development, infant safety precautions, hands-on childcare training; 15 week parenting class (Nurturing Fathers and Abriendo Puertas/Opening Doors curricula) – non-violent discipline, appropriate boundaries, stress management, self-awareness, overcoming barriers; offer case management, assessments/screenings, aftercare mentoring, school readiness	Parenting Skills, Violence Prevention/Anger & Stress Management	Any male caregiver with a child under 18
iParent SA Parenting Support	The Children's Shelter	San Antonio/Bexar County	United Way of San Antonio and Bexar County, DFPS, Metro Health 1115 Waiver	Provides short- and long-term services including in-home and group-based parent training, child school readiness, developmental assessments, family enrichment activities, case management, 24/7 crisis intervention, and emergency day/overnight respite	Parenting Skills	Parents/guardians with children under 18 in San Antonio or Bexar County
Parent Education	Family Service Association of San Antonio	San Antonio	United Way, corporate/foundation grants	Parenting classes to teach effective nurturing and disciplining; in-home parenting sessions; speakers bureau to spread word on child abuse prevention throughout the community	Parenting Skills	All parents
Parenting 101, Positive Parenting, Parenting Help, and Helping Children Cope with Divorce	DePelchin Children's Center	Multiple program sites statewide	United Way	Courses that cover child development, communication, positive discipline, stress management, causes of child misbehavior, and positive parenting strategies; divorce class offers guidance on navigating the process to minimize negative impact on children; offer 8 week, 6 week, and 2 day classes; use Parenting 101 and Triple P curricula	Parenting/Co-Parenting	All parents
Safe Harbour Supervised Visitation Center	Project Unity	Brazos Valley	OAG, City of Bryan Community Development Block Grant, Dansby Foundation, United Way of Brazos Valley	Center for children's supervised visits with noncustodial parent; provides parenting education, assists in developing shared parenting plans, and facilitates fathering support groups	Parenting/Co-Parenting	Families that have some type of supervised visitation requirement

Appendix B: Fatherhood Program Evaluations

Though fatherhood programs have garnered increased funding and participation over the last decade, little research has been done on their effectiveness. To date, a modest number of rigorous evaluations have been completed, with some showing effects on father involvement, economic stability, and healthy relationships. Table 3 below summarizes key information from each of the evaluations discussed in this report’s “State of Fatherhood Research” section. It presents the base reference for the evaluation, the program name, population served, basic curriculum information, findings in four key areas, the number of participants in the evaluation, and the type of research design.

Table 3: Fatherhood Program Evaluations

Reference	Program/Policy Name	All Dads/Non-Residential/Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
Block et al. (2014)	InsideOut Dad	Non-residential	This program aimed to reduce recidivism and strengthen father-child relationships for incarcerated fathers. <i>InsideOut Dad Curriculum</i> , based on the <i>Long Distance Dads Program</i> , was used with an added reentry component.	Analysis of the program found statistically significant overall positive changes for fathering confidence, parenting knowledge, parenting behavior across program sites. Fathers in the treatment group were statistically more likely to call their children.		Statistically significant improvements to fathers' attitudes related to spirituality, self-worth, and fathering while in prison were found for fathers in the treatment group.		411 (307 treatment; 104 control)	Quasi-experimental
Bloom et al. (2000)	Family Transition Program	Non-residential	The FTP model included 4 features: a limit on case assistance; financial work incentives (e.g. years of transitional child care after leaving	The FTP treatment group received increased care and support from noncustodial biological fathers by 5 percentage points. Children in	Children in the FTP treatment group were also more likely to receive money from their father directly or through a child support agency.			1,108 (554 treatment; 554 control)	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
			welfare-to-work); enhanced services and requirements (e.g. intensive case management and participation in employment related activities); and parental responsibility mandates (e.g. parents ensured children attended school regularly).	the FTP group were cared for more by their fathers.					

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non-Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
Bronte-Tinkew (2007)	An Ache in their Hearts	All Dads	An Ache in their Hearts curriculum provided written information on infant death, relationship counseling, psychosocial support, and support in the grieving process.			Fathers in the treatment group had significantly reduced psychiatric disturbances and reduced levels of anxiety 15 month post loss. Fathers were significantly more likely to seek support as a coping strategy and significantly less likely to use avoidance coping strategies. High-risk parents participating in the program were more likely to maintain relationship quality compared to the comparison group. Significant benefits at 15 months post loss suggest long-term efficacy of the intervention.		144 (84 treatment; 60 control) (Of n=144, 65 participants were fathers)	Quasi-experimental
Bronte-Tinkew et al (2007)	Triple P-Positive Parenting Program	Residential	Curriculum titled <i>Facilitator's Guide to Group Triple P</i> . This program targeted families with children with			Both treatments had statistically significant positive effects on intended outcomes, but the enhanced		37 (21 standard group; 23 enhanced group)	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
			high levels of behavior problems. The goal was to reduce child behavior problems and reduce marital stress, and increase marital satisfaction.			treatment was not significantly different from standard. Fathers reported improvements to child behavior, conflict over parenting, and relationship satisfaction and communication.			
Bronte-Tinkew, Burkhauser, & Metz (2012)	Preparing for the Drug Free Years	All Dads	Program designed to teach parents effective methods to prevent substance abuse for their children. Curriculum is based on research on causes of adolescent problem behaviors, risk factors, and protective factors. Sessions include strengthening family relationships, setting clear expectations on drugs, and substance abuse prevention.	Fathers receiving treatment were significantly more likely to communicate rules pertaining to substance use and be more involved with their children compared to the control group. They were also significantly more likely to exhibit proactive communication with their child and improvement to relationship quality or bonding with their child.				175	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
Campis, Lyman, & Prentice- Dunn (1986)	Long Distance Dads	Non- residential	Long Distance Dads curriculum. This is a parenting program to promote responsible fatherhood and empower fathers.	Minimal to no effect. Fathers receiving treatments self-reported increased number of letters sent to children and total contact with children. These findings were not corroborated by reports from caregivers.				89 (42 treatment; 47 control)	Quasi-experimental
Cancian, Meyer & Caspar (2008)	Child Support Earnings Disregard Policy	Non- residential	This policy mandated that the amount of child support paid by noncustodial parents was not subtracted from TANF amounts received by custodial parents.	There were no differences in paternity establishment between treatment and control groups.	A greater percentage of treatment fathers paid child support in years two and three. They also paid greater amounts of child support than those in the control group.			13,616	RCT
Cookston, Braver, Griffin, Deluse, & Miles (2006)	Dads for Life	Non- residential	This program targeted recently divorced fathers to improve the father-child relationship. It was designed to increase parenting skills, decrease parental conflict, and promote better			No effect found in father's reports of co-parenting. However, ex-spouse of fathers reported statistically significant improvement in parenting		214 (127 treatment; 87 control)	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
			co-parenting skills. It incorporated the films <i>Eight Short Films about Divorced Dad</i> .			relationship over time with fathers receiving treatment. Interparental conflict decreased over time for fathers receiving treatment.			
Cowan et al. (2009)	Supporting Father Involvement (Couples-based)	All Dads	This program was designed to increase fathers' involvement with their families and support positive child development. SFI curriculum was based on family risk model. Couples participating in the program were assigned to SFI couple group, SFI fathers-only group, or low-dosage comparison group.	Comparing the couples-only and comparison groups, the study observed that mothers in the SFI fathers group reported increases to fathers' share of parenting, but also reported increases to conflict about child discipline. However, there was no significant difference for fathers in the same treatment regarding share of parenting or conflicts about discipline. No change was observed in fathers' psychological involvement in parenting or child		Comparing the couples-only and comparison groups, the study reported fathers in the SFI fathers group experienced greater average decline in parental stress compared to comparison group. No changes were observed for fathers in attitudes about authoritarian parenting		289, 193 couples (95 treatment; 98 comparison).	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non-Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
				outcomes (e.g. aggression, hyperactivity, anxiety or depression).					
Cowan et al. (2009)	Supporting Father Involvement (Fathers-only)	All Dads	This program was designed to increase fathers' involvement with their families and support positive child development. SFI curriculum was based on family risk model. Couples participating in the program were assigned to SFI couple group, SFI fathers-only group, or low-dosage comparison group.	Comparing the fathers-only and comparison groups, no significant difference was observed in changes to psychological involvement in parenting or child outcomes (e.g. aggression, hyperactivity, anxiety or depression).		Comparing the fathers-only and comparison groups, there was no change in parenting stress levels, authoritarian parenting beliefs, father's share of parenting, conflict about discipline, or relationship satisfaction		289, 194 couples (96 treatment; 98 comparison).	RCT
Dinkmeyer & McKay (1982)	Systematic Training for Effective Parenting for Incarcerated Fathers (STEP-UP)	All Dads	This program was designed to help young low-income fathers achieve self-sufficiency and effectively support their families. Participants received case management services, counseling, and		No statistically significant effects reported. Study reported higher percentage of fathers receiving mentoring services found and retained jobs during the project period and earned slightly higher average hourly incomes	A higher percentage of mentored fathers reported strengthened family relationships compared to non-mentored fathers.		120 (assigned to 4 different treatment groups)	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
			mentoring from successful men.		compared to groups without mentors.				
Doherty, Erickson, & LaRossa (2006)	Parenting Together Project	Residential	The Parenting Together Curriculum was designed to improve fathers' knowledge, skills, and commitment to fatherhood role; increase mother support and expectations; and promote better co-parenting and parental cooperation.	There were statistically significant difference for fathers receiving treatment for quality of father-child relationship pertaining to warmth/emotional support, intrusiveness, positive affect, and dyadic synchrony. Overall the father-child relationship quality was significantly higher for fathers in treatment group. Fathers in treatment were, on average, available to their children for 40 more minutes				132 (65 couples in treatment; 67 control)	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
				than those fathers in the control group.					
Duggan et al. (2004)	Hawaii's Healthy State Program	All Dads	The Healthy State Program is a child abuse prevention program. Home visitors work with at-risk families to reduce abusive and neglectful parenting behaviors, improve family functioning, and promote health and development of children.	For families in the treatment group, as reported by mothers, there was no significant effect on fathers' accessibility, engagement, or sharing of responsibility. In families with a nonviolent fathers at baseline, mothers reported they were more likely to be satisfied with father accessibility.				684 (373 treatment; 270 control)	RCT
Fagan & Iglesias (1999)	Head Start Based Father Involvement Program	All Dads	This program entailed: volunteering in Head Start; weekly Father's day programs in classroom; father sensitivity training for staff; support groups for fathers; father-child recreation activities.	The treatment group showed significant effects for direct interaction, accessibility, and support of learning in univariate analyses. No significant effects were found for child rearing behaviors.				96 (55 treatment; 41 control)	Quasi-experimental

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
Fagan & Stevenson (2002)	Men as Teachers	All Dads	Program designed for African American fathers with children enrolled in the Head Start program with curriculum based on empowerment theory, emphasizing fathers' strengths while developing parenting skills. Included the video series <i>Parenting: Attitude of the Heart</i> .	The study observed positive effects of the program on attitudes about teaching. No significant difference was found in fathers' parenting satisfaction between treatment and control groups.		No significant difference were found between treatment and control groups in racial oppression socialization.		38 (19 treatment, 19 control)	RCT
Fagan (2008)	Minnesota Early Learning Design	All Dads	The program was designed to improve co-parenting of youth fathers. Program components included helping fathers share parenting responsibilities, reducing fathers' isolation, and providing positive role models for fathers.	No difference was found between groups in parenting confidence.		The program had a positive impact on fathers' reports of communications, but no effect on mothers' reports of communication and fathers' involvement. It also had a positive impact on fathers' reports on parenting alliance, but no effect on mothers' report of parenting alliance. No difference was		165 fathers (post-test sample: 44 treatment, 46 control)	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
						found in fathers' support.			
Harrison (1997)	Parental Training for Incarcerated Fathers	Non-residential	This program was designed to improve incarcerated fathers' attitudes about child-rearing and self-esteem. Program used multiple curricula including <i>Concept Media's Curriculum</i> , <i>The Nurturing Program</i> , and <i>Systematic Training for Effective Parenting Program</i> .	Fathers receiving treatment experienced statistically significant improvement to attitudes about child rearing compared to control group. Separately, the children of fathers in the program were administered a Self-Perception Profile for Children or Adolescents, but there were no significant changes in child and adolescent perception over time for fathers		No significant difference was found between treatment and control groups for parental self-esteem.		30 (15 treatment; 15 control)	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
				receiving treatment.					
Knox & Redcross (2000)	Parents' Fair Share	Non- residential	The program was designed to help low-income noncustodial fathers find stable employment, increase earnings and child support payments, and become more involved parents by providing parents with employment training, peer support, voluntary mediation between parents, and enhanced child support enforcement (e.g. lowering child support enforcement).		No statistically significant difference was found between treatment and control in employment or earnings. Fathers in the treatment group were statistically more likely to increase formal child support payments, but decreased cash amounts of informal payments.	No effect was found in the likelihood of mothers to report father had improved as a parent or parenting discussions about the child, style of conflict between parents, or mothers taking out restraining order against non-custodial fathers.		5,611 (2,819 treatment; 2,792 control)	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
Landreth & Lobaugh (1998)	Filial Support Training	Non-residential	This program aimed to encourage work and independence in families receiving public assistance and reduce welfare dependency by increasing families' levels of work and income.	Treatment group fathers scored higher than control fathers on all measures of acceptance of their children (Porter Parental Acceptance Scale). Treatment fathers scored lower than control fathers on the Parenting Stress Index total score, parent domain subscale, and filial problems checklist.				32 (16 treatment; 16 control)	RCT
Lewan-Bizan (2015)	24/7 Dads Hawaii Evaluation	All Dads	This program used the <i>24/7 Dads</i> curriculum to train fathers in self-awareness, caring for self, fathering skills, parenting skills, and relationship skills.	Fathers in the intervention group were statistically more likely than fathers in the control group to be involved in father involvement tasks expected of contemporary fathers (e.g. helping children with homework, reading to children, and positive encouragement of children). Fathers in		Fathers in the intervention group were statistically more likely to improve levels of support for mother of the child at than fathers in the control group.		48	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
				the program also reported statistically significant improvements in happiness about being a parent compared to the control group.					
Magill-Evans et al. (2007)	Video Self-Modeling Effects of Parenting Education on First-Time Fathers' Skills	Residential	The program was designed to improve fathers parenting skills including response to infant behavioral cues, promote their infants' development, and increase competence as a father. Program used the <i>Keys to Caregiving</i> video series.	Fathers receiving treatment exhibited more positive father-child interactions compared to fathers in the control group. Fathers in the treatment group were statistically more sensitive to infant cues over time and fostering cognitive growth.				183 (89 treatment; 94 control)	RCT
Mazza (2002)	Young Dads	All Dads	The program was designed to improve confidence and responsible parenting for young fathers. Fathers received individually targeted comprehensive services including	There were statistically significant positive effects for fathers receiving treatment in perceptions of the quality of current and future relationship with children.	There were statistically significant positive effects for fathers receiving treatment in employment rates, vocational plans.	There were statistically significant positive effects for fathers receiving treatment in frequency in contraceptive use and availability of persons with whom a personal problem could be discussed.		60 (30 treatment; 30 control)	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
			counseling; mentoring; referrals for employment, education, healthcare, housing, legal advocacy; and parenting skills training.						
McBride (1990)	Effect of Parenting Education on First- Time Fathers	All Dads	This study aimed to show that fatherhood involvement programs increased father interaction and parental responsibility. Fathers receiving treatment participated in weekly parent education discussion groups and father-child play groups. The discussion groups followed didactic parent educational programs like Parent Effectiveness Training, Adlerian, and Behavioral Approaches	Fathers receiving treatment scored significantly higher than the control group on measures of comfort with their parenting role, parental responsibility, interaction and accessibility to the child.				30 (15 treatment; 15 control)	Quasi-experimental

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
McKerny, Clark, & Stone (1999)	PEACE Program	Non- residential	The curriculum aimed to prevent issues for families post-divorce based on social learning theory and parenting skills training. Parents were required to attend 2.5 hour session after filing for divorce before a decree is granted.			Parents receiving treatment and in the subsample reported significantly better relationships with their children ($p \leq .10$). Parents in the subsample also reported they were significantly more satisfied with their custody agreement ($p \leq .001$). On average, parents found the program helpful and reported that the other parents' negative behaviors had "decreased" and "stopped completely after receiving treatment.		236 (136 treatment; 100 control)	RCT
OPRE Report 2011-18	Center for Employment Opportunities Program	All Dads	The program aimed to assist ex-offenders with transition into permanent employment, reduce recidivism, and improve father-child relationships.		The program increased the likelihood of employment among program participants early in the four year study period, but these effects faded over time. Treatment			977 (568 treatment; 409 control)	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
			Participants received pre-employment classes, paid transitional employment, job coaching and placement, and post placement support for one year.		group participants were significantly less likely to be reincarcerated for a new crime than participants in the control group.				
Owen & Mulvihill (1994)	PAT	X	Parents as Teachers is a home-based program in which a home visitors educates and supports parents on positive ways to guide their child's development and prepare them for school. The program also aims to reduce parent stress and provide parents with external social support.			Fathers in the PAT program reported higher levels of perceived social support compared to the control group. Fathers' levels of parenting satisfaction decreased over time in the program. Fathers reported higher levels of parenting confidence. The study reported no significant effects of parent knowledge about child development, parenting attitudes, or parenting stress.		128 (59 treatment; 69 control)	Quasi-experimental (longitudinal)

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
Pfannenstiel & Honig (1991)	Information and Insights About Infants	All Dads	This program was designed to support first-time, low-income fathers with prenatal support using the Information and Insights about Infants (III) intervention program and the "Where are the Fathers?" booklet.	Fathers receiving treatment scored significantly higher than the control group on measures of father-infant interaction (e.g. AFIS scale measuring behavioral empathy, infant mood, vocalizations, distress, visual gaze, posture, and interaction attempts) at hospital discharge. However, no significant differences were found on measures of father-infant interaction between treatment and control groups one month after discharge. A second follow-up found fathers in treatment scored higher on measures of knowledge (e.g. Epstein's Knowledge of				67 (34 treatment; 33 control)	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
				Infant Scale) about child development compared to the control group.					
Robbers (2005)	Responsible Fatherhood for Incarcerated Dads	Non-residential	This program was designed to improve family relationships, knowledge and attitude toward fatherhood, and awareness of justice system for incarcerated fathers.	The study observed positive outcomes on knowledge and attitudes about fatherhood for fathers in treatment group. No statistically significant effects were observed for frequency of contact with children.		No statistically significant effects were observed for quality of relationship between father and mother of child or knowledge of justice system.		87 (56 treatment; 31 control)	Quasi-experimental
Schroeder & Doughty (2009)	Non-Custodial Parenting Choices	Non-residential	Program targeted noncustodial parents who were under- or unemployed, owed child support, and whose children received public assistance. The program aimed to improve compliance of child support orders through helping		Parents in the treatment group were significantly more likely to be employed and less likely to receive unemployment insurance benefits the first year after entry.			3,749 (1,875 treatment; 1,874 comparison)	Quasi-experimental

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
			parents find a job, educational training, and assisting with transportation or equipment costs.						
Schroeder, Looney, & Schexnayder (2004)	Project Bootstrap	Non-residential	Part of Texas Fragile Families Initiative, this program was designed to improve community based services for young fathers. The program components included employment assistance, case management, help with child support orders, peer support groups, and cash incentives.		The study observed that fathers in treatment were more likely to be employment compared to control, but had lower average earnings. Additionally, the study found positive effects for the treatment group of consistently paying child support and participation in workforce development and training programs. Custodial mothers associated with fathers receiving treatment spent less time on TANF compared to mothers associated with control group. No effect was			118 (59 treatment; 59 control)	Quasi-experimental

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
					found in average amount of child support payments and receipt of public assistance.				
Westney, Cole, & Munford (1988)	A Prenatal Education Intervention	Non-residential	This program was designed to educate prospective adolescent fathers on pregnancy and prenatal care and increase father's supportive behaviors for mother and infant. Curriculum structured as four prenatal classes.	Fathers receiving treatment significantly increased knowledge of pregnancy, prenatal care, and infant development and care. Study reports that significant positive relationship between support and knowledge scores from pre to post tests indicate that increased knowledge may lead to more supportive behaviors for mother and infant.				28 (15 treatment; 13 control)	RCT
Wilczak & Markstrom (1999)	Systematic Training for Effective	Non-residential	The curriculum for the program was based on the <i>Systematic Training</i>	Fathers in the program scored significantly higher at post-test relative				42 (21 treatment; 21 control)	RCT

Reference	Program/ Policy Name	All Dads/Non- Residential/ Residential	Curriculum or Focus	Results: Father Involvement	Results: Economic Stability	Results: Healthy Relationships	Results: Child Abuse Prevention	N	Research Design
	Parenting for Incarcerat ed Fathers		<i>for Effective Parenting (STEP) Program</i> and modified for incarcerated fathers. The program aimed to increase knowledge of parenting and child development, parent satisfaction, and parenting confidence levels.	to pre-test on father's knowledge about new parenting skills and parent satisfaction.					

Appendix C: Responsible Fatherhood Program, Pre-Program Survey

Below is the pre-test survey developed by Mathematica Policy Research for use by the FY2015 Responsible Fatherhood grantees. The survey includes questions designed to assess participant change in the areas of parenting, relationships, economic stability, and wellbeing.

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research

OMB Control No.: XXXX-XXXX
Expiration Date: XX/XX/XXXX

Respondent ID #: _____
Date: _____

**RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD PROGRAM
PRE-PROGRAM SURVEY**

For Community-Based Fathers

PRIVACY

Thank you for your help with this important study. This survey includes questions about your parenting, relationships, economic stability, wellbeing, and program experiences. Your name will not be on the survey and your responses will remain private to the extent permitted by law. We want you to know that:

1. Your participation in this survey is voluntary.
2. We hope that you will answer all the questions, but you may skip any questions you do not wish to answer.
3. The answers you give will be kept private to the extent permitted by law.

THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1995

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 25 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and reviewing the collection of information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The information requested in this survey will be used to document how programs receiving HMRF grant funding operate and describe participant outcomes. The data gathered will allow ACF to better monitor grantee progress and performance.

SECTION A. PARENTING AND CO-PARENTING

We would like get a sense of who you are as a parent. We realize that children are different and may require different parenting.

Questions in this section are about your child—or if you have more than one, your two youngest children—under the age of 21.

A1a. Do you have any children who are under 21 years old? Please only include your biological or legally adopted children.

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Yes, I have one child who is younger than age 21
- 2 Yes, I have more than one child who is younger than age 21 → **GO TO A1d**
- 3 No, I have no children
- 4 No, all my children are 21 years or older → **GO TO B1**

A1b. What is your child's first name or initials?

_____ [CHILD 1]

A1c. How old is your child? [CHILD 1]

_____ YEARS → **GO TO A1f**

A1d. What is your youngest child's first name or initials? [CHILD 1]

A1e. How old is your youngest child? [CHILD 1]

_____ YEARS

A1f. Does [CHILD 1] live with you all or most of the time?

- 1 Yes, he or she lives with me all or most of the time → **GO TO A3**
- 0 No, he or she does not live with me all or most of the time

A2a. When was the last time you saw [CHILD1]?
MARK ONE ONLY

1 In the past week }
 2 In the past month } → GO TO A2b

3 In the past six months }
 4 In the past year }
 5 1-2 years ago } → GO TO A2d
 6 More than 2 years ago }
 7 Never }

A2b. In the past month, how often did you see [CHILD1]?
MARK ONE ONLY

1 Every day or almost every day
 2 One to three times a week
 3 One to three times in the past month
 4 I did not see this child in the past month → GO TO A2d

A2c. In the past month when you saw [CHILD1], how many hours per day did you usually spend with [CHILD1]?

 |_|_| HOURS

A2d. In the past month, how often have you reached out to [CHILD1] even if [CHILD1] did not respond? This includes calling on the phone; sending email, letters, or cards; texting; or using Facebook or FaceTime.
MARK ONE ONLY

1 Every day or almost every day
 2 One to three times a week
 3 One to three times in the past month
 4 Never in the past month

A2e. In the past month, did you buy things for [CHILD1] that he or she needed like diapers, clothes, school supplies, medicine, or other things he or she needed?

1 Yes
 0 No

A2f. Do you have an agreement with the mother of [CHILD1] about spending time with [CHILD1]?

- 1 Yes, we have a legal document
- 2 Yes, we have a written agreement that is not court-ordered
- 3 Yes, we have a verbal understanding
- 4 No, we have no parenting agreement → GO TO A6

A2g. How often does [CHILD1]'s mother follow the agreement?

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Always
- 2 Often
- 3 Sometimes
- 4 Never

A2h. How often do you follow the agreement?

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Always
- 2 Often
- 3 Sometimes
- 4 Never

A3. Please tell us how often you've felt or acted this way in the past month with [CHILD1].

MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

	NEVER	HARDLY EVER	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
a. I am happy being with [CHILD1].....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. [CHILD1] and I are very close to each other	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. I try to comfort [CHILD1] when s/he is upset....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. I spend time with [CHILD1] doing what s/he likes to do	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>

A4. Over the past month, how often did you...

MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

	NEVER	1 – 3 TIMES A MONTH	1 – 3 TIMES A WEEK	EVERY DAY OR ALMOST EVERY DAY
a. ...hit, spank, grab, or use physical punishment with [CHILD 1]?.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. ...yell, shout, or scream at [CHILD 1] because you were mad at him/her?.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. ...talk to [CHILD 1] about what he/she did wrong?.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>

A5. In the past month, how often have you...

MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

	NEVER	1 – 3 TIMES A MONTH	1 – 3 TIMES A WEEK	EVERY DAY OR ALMOST EVERY DAY
a. Had a meal together with [CHILD1]?.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Taken [CHILD1] places he/she needed to go, such as to school or to the doctor?.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Helped [CHILD1] with his/her bedtime routine or homework?.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. Talked with [CHILD1] about things he/she is especially interested in?.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>

A6. In the past month, how often have you felt overwhelmed by your parenting responsibilities?

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Never
- 2 Hardly ever
- 3 Sometimes
- 4 Often

[If A1a = 2, continue to A7a; else, GO TO B1.]

Now think about your next youngest biological or legally adopted child, [CHILD2].

A7a. What is your next youngest child's first name or initials?

_____ [CHILD2]

A7b. How old is your next youngest child?

_____ YEARS

A8. Does [CHILD2] live with you all or most of the time?

¹ Yes, he or she lives with me all or most of the time → GO TO A10

⁰ No, he or she does not live with me all or most of the time → GO TO A9a

A9a. When was the last time you saw [CHILD2]?

MARK ONE ONLY

- ¹ In the past week
 - ² In the past month
 - ³ In the past six months
 - ⁴ In the past year
 - ⁵ 1-2 years ago
 - ⁶ More than 2 years ago
 - ⁷ Never
- GO TO A9d

A9b. In the past month, how often did you see [CHILD2]?

- ¹ Every day or almost every day
- ² One to three times a week
- ³ One to three times in the past month
- ⁴ I did not see this child in the past month → GO TO A9d

A9c. In the past month when you saw [CHILD2], how many hours per day did you usually spend with [CHILD2]?

____ HOURS

A9d. In the past month, how often have you reached out to [CHILD2] even if [CHILD2] did not respond? This includes calling on the phone; sending email, letters, or cards; texting; or using Facebook or FaceTime.

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Every day or almost every day
- 2 One to three times a week
- 3 One to three times in the past month
- 4 Never in the past month

A9e. In the past month, did you buy things for [CHILD2] that he or she needed like diapers, clothes, school supplies, medicine, or other things he or she needed?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

A9f. Do you have an agreement with the mother of [CHILD2] about spending time with [CHILD2]?

- 1 Yes, we have a legal document
- 2 Yes, we have a written agreement that is not court-ordered
- 3 Yes, we have a verbal understanding
- 4 No, we have no parenting agreement → GO TO A 13

A9g. How often does [CHILD2]'s mother follow the agreement?

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Always
- 2 Often
- 3 Sometimes
- 4 Never

A9h. How often do you follow the agreement?

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Always
- 2 Often
- 3 Sometimes
- 4 Never

A10. Please tell us how often you've felt or acted this way in the past month with [CHILD2].

MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

	NEVER	HARDLY EVER	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
a. I am happy being with [CHILD2].....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. [CHILD2] and I are very close to each other	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. I try to comfort [CHILD2] when s/he is upset.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. I spend time with [CHILD2] doing what s/he likes to do	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>

A11. Over the past month, how often did you...

MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

	NEVER	A FEW TIMES A MONTH	A FEW TIMES A WEEK	EVERY DAY OR ALMOST EVERYDAY
a. ... hit, spank, grab, or use physical punishment with [CHILD2]?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. ... yell, shout, or scream at [CHILD2] because you are mad at him/her?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. ... talk to [CHILD2] about what he/she did wrong?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>

A12. In the past month, how often have you...

MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

	NEVER	1 - 3 TIMES A MONTH	1 - 3 TIMES A WEEK	EVERY DAY OR ALMOST EVERY DAY
a. Had a meal together with [CHILD2]?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Taken [CHILD2] places he/she needed to go, such as to school or to the doctor?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Helped [CHILD2] with his/her bedtime routine or homework?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. Talked with [CHILD2] about things he/she is especially interested in?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>

A13. In the past month, how often have you felt overwhelmed by your parenting responsibilities?

MARK ONE ONLY

¹ Never

² Hardly ever

³ Sometimes

⁴ Often

SECTION B. ECONOMIC STABILITY

B1. Currently, do you...

MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

	YES	NO
a. Have a checking account?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a savings account?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Use a budget to plan your spending?.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>

B2. How often do you find it difficult to pay your bills?

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Never
- 2 Once in a while
- 3 Somewhat often
- 4 Very often

B3. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the statements below?

MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NOT APPLICABLE
a. I would like to learn new job skills	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	
b. I have good job skills.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	
c. I know where to find job openings.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	
d. I know how to apply for a job	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	
e. I feel confident in my ability to conduct an effective job search for a job I want .	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	
f. I feel confident in my interviewing skills	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	
g. I would like to get a job.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	na <input type="checkbox"/>
h. I would like to get a better job	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	na <input type="checkbox"/>
i. I am usually on time for work	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	na <input type="checkbox"/>
j. If I'm not going to go to work, I let my supervisor know ahead of time	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	na <input type="checkbox"/>

B4. Do you have an updated resume that you can give to employers?

- 1 Yes
- 0 No

B5. Below are some general statements about knowledge of child support. For each statement, please indicate whether you believe it is true or false.

Please complete this question even if you do not have a child support order.

MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

	TRUE	FALSE	IDON'T KNOW
a. Fathers can get help with their child support by calling the child support agency.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	d <input type="checkbox"/>
b. A father has the right to ask for a change in the amount of his child support order.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	d <input type="checkbox"/>
c. The law requires a father to pay child support even if the mother of his child has a new partner.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	d <input type="checkbox"/>
d. The law requires a father to pay child support even if the child's mother prevents him from seeing his child.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	d <input type="checkbox"/>

B6. Do you have a legal arrangement or child support order that requires you to provide financial support for ANY of your children that do not live with you all or most of the time?

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Yes
 - 2 No
 - 3 I don't know
- } → GO TO C1

B7. Do you know how to request a change in your child support order if your income changes?

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Yes
- 0 No
- d I don't know

SECTION C. RELATIONSHIPS/MARRIAGE				
C1. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?				
MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW				
	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
a. It is better for children if their parents are married.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Living together is just the same as being married.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
C2. Are you currently in a relationship (whether you are married or not married)?				
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes				
0 <input type="checkbox"/> No → GO TO D1				
C3. Which of the following statements best describes your relationship with your current partner?				
MARK ONE ONLY				
1 <input type="checkbox"/> We are married				
2 <input type="checkbox"/> We are romantically involved on a steady basis				
3 <input type="checkbox"/> We are involved in an on-again and off-again relationship				
C4. In the past month, how often have the following happened?				
MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW				
	NEVER	HARDLY EVER	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
a. My partner/spouse was rude or mean to me when we disagreed.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. My partner/spouse seemed to view my words or actions more negatively than I meant them to be.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Our arguments became very heated.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. Small issues suddenly became big arguments. ...	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
e. My partner/spouse or I stayed mad at one another after an argument.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>

C5. In the past month, how often have the following happened?

MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

	NEVER	HARDLY EVER	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
a. My partner/spouse blamed me for his/her problems.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. My partner/spouse yelled or screamed at me.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>

C6. How satisfied are you with the way you and your partner/spouse handle conflict?

MARK ONE ONLY

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Somewhat satisfied
- 3 Not at all satisfied

SECTION D. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

D1. This question is about feelings you may have experienced recently. During the PAST 30 DAYS, how often have you felt...

MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

	NONE OF THE TIME	A LITTLE OF THE TIME	SOME OF THE TIME	MOST OF THE TIME	ALL OF THE TIME
a. Nervous?.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Hopeless?.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Restless or fidgety?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. So depressed that nothing could cheer you up?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
e. That everything was an effort?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
f. Worthless?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

D2. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

MARK ONE BOX IN EACH ROW

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
a. I have little control over the things that happen to me.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. I have hope when I think about my future.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. I wouldn't know where to go for help if I had money troubles.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. I have others who will listen when I need to talk about my problems.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
e. When I am lonely, there are several people I can talk to.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
f. I have people I can count on if I am feeling down.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
g. If there is a crisis, I have others I can talk to.....	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>

D3. Is there someone you could you turn to, such as a friend or family member, if you suddenly needed to borrow money?

MARK ONE ONLY

Yes

No

I don't know

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

ENDNOTES

-
- ¹ 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.; Lamb, Michael E. et al. “A Biosocial Perspective on Paternal Behavior and Involvement.” *Parenting Across the Life Span : Biosocial Dimensions*. Ed. Jane B. Lancaster et al. New York: Aldine De Gruyter, 1987. 111-135. Print.
- ² Parker, Kim and Wendy Wang. *Modern Parenthood: Roles of Moms and Dads Converge as They Balance Work and Family*. Pew Research Center. March 14, 2013.
- ³ 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.
- ⁴ Marsiglio, W., Amato, P., Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Scholarship on Fatherhood in the 1990s and beyond. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62 (4), 1173-1191.; Palkovitz, R. (2002). Involved Fathering and Child Development: Advancing Our Understanding of Good Fathering. In C. S. Tamis-LeMonda & N. J. Cabrera (Eds.), *Handbook of Father Involvement* (pp. 33-64). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- ⁵ Rosenberg, Jeffrey, and Wilcox, W. Bradford. United States Department of Health and Human Services. Administration for Children and Families. Child Welfare Information Gateway. *The Importance of Fathers in the Healthy Development of Children*. Office on Child Abuse and Neglect, U.S. Children's Bureau, 2006. Retrieved from <https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/usermanuals/fatherhood/chaptertwo.cfm>; Bronte-Tinkew, Jacinta et al. *Involvement Among Resident Fathers and Links to Infant Cognitive Outcomes*. *Journal of Family Issues*. Volume 29 Number 9. September, 2008. 1211-1244.; Cabrera, N. J., Shannon, J. D., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. (2007). Fathers' Influence on Their Children's Cognitive and Emotional Development: From Toddlers to Pre-K. *Applied Developmental Science*, 11(4), 208-213.; Black, M. M., Dubowitz, H., & Starr, R. H., Jr. (1999). African American Fathers in Low Income, Urban Families: Development, Behavior, and Home Environment of Their Three-Year-Old Children. *Child Development*, 70 (4), 967-978.; Carlson, Marcia J. and Katherine Magnuson. (2011) Low-Income Fathers' Influence on Children. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 635:95. 95-116.; Carlson, Marcia J., Sara S. McLanahan, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. (2007, September) Fathers' Involvement and Young Children's Behavior in Fragile Families. *Extended Abstract*.; Carlson, Marcia J., Sara S. McLanahan. (2009, May 11) Fathers in Fragile Families. *Center for Research on Child Wellbeing. Working Paper WP09-14-FF*.; Harris, Kathleen Mullan, Frank F. Furstenberg, and Jeremy K. Marmer. (1998). Paternal involvement with adolescents in intact families: The influence of fathers over the life course. *Demography*. 35 (2), 201-216.; Carlson, M. J. (2006), Family Structure, Father Involvement, and Adolescent Behavioral Outcomes. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68: 137–154.
- ⁶ 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; Gee, C. B., McNeerney, C. M., Reither, M. J., & Leaman, S. C. (2007). *Adolescent and young adult mothers' relationship quality during the transition to parenthood: Associations with father involvement in fragile families*. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36(2), 213-224; Ryan, R. M., Kalil, A. & Ziol-Guest, K. M.

(2008). *Longitudinal patterns of non-residential fathers' involvement: The role of resources and relations*. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(4), 962-977.

⁷ Carlson, Marcia J., Sara S. McLanahan. (2009, May 11) *Fathers in Fragile Families*. Center for Research on Child Wellbeing. Working Paper WP09-14-FF.; 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; Gee, C. B., McNerney, C. M., Reither, M. J., & Leaman, S. C. (2007). *Adolescent and young adult mothers' relationship quality during the transition to parenthood: Associations with father involvement in fragile families*. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36(2), 213-224; Ryan, R. M., Kalil, A. & Ziol-Guest, K. M. (2008). *Longitudinal patterns of non-residential fathers' involvement: The role of resources and relations*. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(4), 962-977; Fagan, J., & Palkovitz, R. (2007). *Unmarried, Nonresident Fathers' Involvement with Their Infants: A Risk and Resilience Perspective*. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21 (3), 479-489.; Gavin LE, Black MM, Minor S, Abel Y, PapasMA, BentleyME (2002) *Young, disadvantaged fathers' involvement with their infants: An ecological perspective*. *J Adolesc Health* 31:266–276.

⁸ Gavin, L. E., Black, M. M., Minor, S., Abel, Y., Papas, M. A., & Bentley, M. E. (2002). *Young, disadvantaged fathers' involvement with their infants: An ecological perspective*. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 31, 266 –276.

⁹ Carlson, M. J., & McLanahan, S. S. (2004). *Early Father Involvement in Fragile Families*. In R. D. Day & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Conceptualizing and Measuring Father Involvement* (pp. 241-271). Mahwah, N J: Lawrence Erlbaum; Fagan, J., & Palkovitz, R. (2007). *Unmarried, Nonresident Fathers' Involvement with Their Infants: A Risk and Resilience Perspective*. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21 (3), 479-489.

¹⁰ Carlson, Marcia J., Sara S. McLanahan. (2009, May 11) *Fathers in Fragile Families*. Center for Research on Child Wellbeing. Working Paper WP09-14-FF.

¹¹ Amato, Paul and Sandra Rezac. (1994, June). *Contact with Nonresident Parents, Interparental Conflict, and Children's Behavior*. *Journal of Family Issues*, 15(2), 191-207.; Seltzer, Judith A. (1991, Feb.) *Relationships between Fathers and Children Who Live Apart: The Father's Role after Separation*. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 53(1), 79-101.

¹² Marsiglio, W., Amato, P., Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). *Scholarship on Fatherhood in the 1990s and beyond*. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62 (4), 1173-1191.; Furstenberg, F. F., & Cherlin, A. (1991). *Divided Families: What Happens to Children When Parents Part*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

¹³ Carlson, M. J., McLanahan, S. S., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2008). *COPARENTING AND NONRESIDENT FATHERS' INVOLVEMENT WITH YOUNG CHILDREN AFTER A NONMARITAL BIRTH*. *Demography*,45(2), 461-488.; Sobolewski JM, King V. "The Importance of the Coparental Relationship for Nonresident Fathers' Ties to Children" *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2005;67:1196–212; Coley, R. L., & Hernandez, D. C. (2006). *Predictors of Paternal Involvement for Resident and Nonresident Low-Income Fathers*. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(6), 1041-1056.; 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.

¹⁴ Cabrera, N. J., Shannon, J. D., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. (2007). *Fathers' Influence on Their Children's Cognitive and Emotional Development: From Toddlers to Pre-K*. *Applied Developmental Science*, 11(4), 208-213; Coley, R., & Chase-Lansdale, P. (1999). *Stability and Change in Paternal Involvement Among Urban African American Fathers*. *Journal Of Family Psychology*, 13(3), 416-435.; Castillo, Jason T., Greg W. Welch, and Christian M. Sarver. *The Relationship Between Disadvantaged Fathers' Employment Stability, Workplace Flexibility, and Involvement With Their Infant Children*. *Journal of Social Service Research*, Vol. 39, Iss. 3, 2013.

¹⁵ Cabrera, N. J., Fagan, J., & Farrie, D. (2008). *Explaining the Long Reach of Fathers' Prenatal Involvement on Later Paternal Engagement*. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(5), 1094-1107.; Carlson, M. J., & McLanahan, S. S. (2004). *Early Father Involvement in Fragile Families*. In R. D. Day & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Conceptualizing and Measuring Father Involvement* (pp. 241-271). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.; Ryan, R. M., Kalil, A. & Ziol-Guest, K. M. (2008). *Longitudinal patterns of non-residential fathers' involvement: The role of resources and relations*. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(4), 962-977.

¹⁶ Waller, Maureen R. and Raymond Swisher. (August 2006). *Fathers' Risk Factors in Fragile Families: Implications for "Healthy" Relationships and Father Involvement*. *Social Problems*, 53 (3), 392-420.; Fagan, J., & Palkovitz, R. (2007). *Unmarried, Nonresident Fathers' Involvement with Their Infants: A Risk and Resilience Perspective*. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21 (3), 479-489.

¹⁷ Hofferth, Sandra L. (2003, March). *Race/Ethnic Differences in Father Involvement in Two-Parent Families: Culture, Context, or Economy?* *Journal of Family Issues*. 24: 185-216.

- ¹⁸ Gee, C. B., Mc Nerney, C. M., Reither, M. J., & Leaman, S. C. (2007). *Adolescent and young adult mothers' relationship quality during the transition to parenthood: Associations with father involvement in fragile families*. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36(2), 213-224.
- ¹⁹ Harknett, K. and Knab, J. (2007), More Kin, Less Support: Multipartnered Fertility and Perceived Support Among Mothers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69: 237–253.
- ²⁰ Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (1999). New Families and Nonresident Father-Child Visitation. *Social Forces*, 78(1), 87-116.; Stewart, S. D. (2003). Nonresident Parenting and Adolescent Adjustment: The Quality of Nonresident Father-Child Interaction. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(2), 217-244.
- ²¹ Haskins, R., & Sawhill, I. (2009). *Creating an opportunity society*. Brookings Institution Press, 191.; Solomon-Fears, Carmen. (2015). *Fatherhood Initiatives: Connecting Fathers to Their Children*. (CRS Report No. RL31025). Retrieved from Congressional Research Service. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL31025.pdf>; Osborne, C., Workgroup, R. F., Austin, J., Dion, M. R., Dyer, J., Fagan, J., ... & Scott, M. E. *Framing the Future of Responsible Fatherhood*. Evaluation Research for the Fatherhood Research and Practice Network. Responsible Fatherhood Workgroup.
- ²² Ibid.
- ²³ The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2010). *Responsible Fatherhood Investments, 1994-2009. Influence, Impact, & Leverage*. Baltimore, MD: JustPartners, Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-ResponsibleFatherhoodInvestments-2010.pdf>
- ²⁴ Solomon-Fears, Carmen. (2015). *Fatherhood Initiatives: Connecting Fathers to Their Children*. (CRS Report No. RL31025). Retrieved from Congressional Research Service. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL31025.pdf>
- ²⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁶ Ibid.
- ²⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁹ The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2002). *Making Fathers Count. Assessing the Progress of Responsible Fatherhood Efforts*. Baltimore, MD: Social Policy Action Network. Retrieved from: <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-makingfatherscount-2002.pdf>
- ³⁰ Tori DeAngelis. (2004). *Marriage promotion: a simplistic 'fix'?* American Psychological Association. *The Monitor on Psychology*. Vol 35, No. 8. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/monitor/sep04/marriage.aspx>
- ³¹ Ibid.
- ³² Ibid.
- ³³ Solomon-Fears, Carmen. (2015). *Fatherhood Initiatives: Connecting Fathers to Their Children*. (CRS Report No. RL31025). Retrieved from Congressional Research Service. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL31025.pdf>
- ³⁴ The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2002). *Making Fathers Count. Assessing the Progress of Responsible Fatherhood Efforts*. Baltimore, MD: Social Policy Action Network. Retrieved from: <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-makingfatherscount-2002.pdf>
- ³⁵ National Healthy Marriage Resource Center. Administration for Children and Families, Healthy Marriage Initiative, 2002-2009. *An Introductory Guide*. Retrieved from <http://www.healthymarriageinfo.org/docs/acfhinitiativeguide.pdf>
- ³⁶ Solomon-Fears, Carmen. (2015). *Fatherhood Initiatives: Connecting Fathers to Their Children*. (CRS Report No. RL31025). Retrieved from Congressional Research Service. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL31025.pdf>
- ³⁷ National Healthy Marriage Resource Center. Administration for Children and Families, Healthy Marriage Initiative, 2002-2009. *An Introductory Guide*. Retrieved from <http://www.healthymarriageinfo.org/docs/acfhinitiativeguide.pdf>
- ³⁸ National Healthy Marriage Resource Center. Administration for Children and Families, Healthy Marriage Initiative, 2002-2009. *An Introductory Guide*. Retrieved from <http://www.healthymarriageinfo.org/docs/acfhinitiativeguide.pdf>
- ³⁹ National Healthy Marriage Resource Center. Administration for Children and Families, Healthy Marriage Initiative, 2002-2009. *An Introductory Guide*. Retrieved from <http://www.healthymarriageinfo.org/docs/acfhinitiativeguide.pdf>
- ⁴⁰ Solomon-Fears, Carmen. (2015). *Fatherhood Initiatives: Connecting Fathers to Their Children*. (CRS Report No. RL31025). Retrieved from Congressional Research Service. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL31025.pdf>
- ⁴¹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Administration for Children and Families. Office of Family Assistance. (2015). *About Healthy Marriage & Responsible Fatherhood*. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/programs/healthy-marriage/about>

- ⁴² Solomon-Fears, Carmen. (2015). *Fatherhood Initiatives: Connecting Fathers to Their Children*. (CRS Report No. RL31025). Retrieved from Congressional Research Service. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL31025.pdf>
- ⁴³ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Administration for Children and Families. Office of Family Assistance. (2015). *Responsible Fatherhood*. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/programs/healthy-marriage/responsible-fatherhood>
- ⁴⁴ Solomon-Fears, Carmen. (2015). *Fatherhood Initiatives: Connecting Fathers to Their Children*. (CRS Report No. RL31025). Retrieved from Congressional Research Service. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL31025.pdf>
- ⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶ Solomon-Fears, Carmen. (2015). *Fatherhood Initiatives: Connecting Fathers to Their Children*. (CRS Report No. RL31025). Retrieved from Congressional Research Service. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL31025.pdf>
- ⁴⁷ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Administration for Children and Families. Office of Family Assistance. (2015). *Responsible Fatherhood*. Retrieved from <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/programs/healthy-marriage/responsible-fatherhood>
- ⁴⁸ Osborne, C., Workgroup, R. F., Austin, J., Dion, M. R., Dyer, J., Fagan, J., ... & Scott, M. E. *Framing the Future of Responsible Fatherhood. Evaluation Research for the Fatherhood Research and Practice Network. Responsible Fatherhood Workgroup.*
- ⁴⁹ Osborne, C., Workgroup, R. F., Austin, J., Dion, M. R., Dyer, J., Fagan, J., ... & Scott, M. E. *Framing the Future of Responsible Fatherhood. Evaluation Research for the Fatherhood Research and Practice Network. Responsible Fatherhood Workgroup.*
- ⁵⁰ Ibid.
- ⁵¹ Bronte-Tinkew, J., Carrano, J., Allen, T., Bowie, L., Mbawa, K., & Matthews, G. (2007). *Elements of Promising Practice for Fatherhood Programs: Evidence-Based Research Findings on Programs for Fathers*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Child and Families, Office of Family Assistance. Retrieved from <https://library.fatherhood.gov/cwig/ws/library/docs/FATHERHD/Blob/62423.pdf?w=NATIVE%28%27Ti+ph+is+%27%27Elements+of+Promising+Practice+for+Fatherhood+Programs+%3A+Evidence-Based+Research+Findings+on+Programs+for+Fathers%27%27%29&upp=0&rpp=25&order=native%28%27year%27Descend%27%29&r=1&m=1>
- ⁵² Bronte-Tinkew, J., Burkhauser, M., & Metz A.J.R. (2012). *Elements of Promising Practices in Fatherhood Programs: Evidence-Based Research Findings on Interventions for Fathers*. *Fathering*, 10(1), 6-30. doi: 10.3149/ft.1001.6
- ⁵³ McBride, Brent A. (1990). The effects of a parent education/play group program on father involvement in child rearing. *Family Relations*, 39, (3), 250-256. Available at <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0197-6664%28199007%2939%3A3%3C250%3ATEOAPE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-W>.
- ⁵⁴ Mazza, C. (2002). Young dads: The effects of a parenting program on urban African American adolescent fathers. *Adolescence*, 37(148), 681-693.
- ⁵⁵ Lewin-Bizan, S. (2015). *24/7 Dad Program in Hawaii: Sample, Design, and Preliminary Results*. Center on the Family, University of Hawaii. Retrieved from <http://cdn2.hubspot.net/hubfs/135704/247-Dad-Evaluation-Lewin-Bizan-06102015.pdf>
- ⁵⁶ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷ McBride, Brent A. (1990). The effects of a parent education/play group program on father involvement in child rearing. *Family Relations*, 39, (3), 250-256.
- ⁵⁸ Fagan, J., and A. Iglesias. (1999). *Father Involvement Program Effects on Fathers, Father Figures, and their Head Start Children: A Quasi-Experimental Study*. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 14(2), 243-269.
- ⁵⁹ Pfannenstiel, A. E., and A.S. Honig. (1991). *Prenatal Intervention and Support for Low-Income Fathers*. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 12(2), 103-115.
- ⁶⁰ Lewin-Bizan, S. (2015). *24/7 Dad Program in Hawaii: Sample, Design, and Preliminary Results*. Center on the Family, University of Hawaii. Retrieved from <http://cdn2.hubspot.net/hubfs/135704/247-Dad-Evaluation-Lewin-Bizan-06102015.pdf>
- ⁶¹ Catalano, R.F., Hill, K.G., Haggerty, K.P., Fleming, C.B., & Hawkins, J.D. (2010). *Social Development Interventions Have Extensive, Long-lasting Effects*. (Chapter Five). *Social Work Practice Research for the 21st Century*. A.E. Fortune, P. McCallion and K. Briar-Lawson. New York, Columbia University Press.

- ⁶² McBride, Brent A. (1990). The effects of a parent education/play group program on father involvement in child rearing. *Family Relations*, 39(3), 250-256.
- ⁶³ Pfannenstiel, A. E., and A.S. Honig. (1991). Prenatal Intervention and Support for Low-Income Fathers. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 12(2), 103-115.
- ⁶⁴ Robbers, M. L. P. (2005). Focus on Family and Fatherhood: Lessons from Fairfax County's Responsible Fatherhood Program for Incarcerated Dads." *Justice Policy Journal*, 2(1), 1-27.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶⁶ Block, S., Brown, C.A., Barretti, L., Walker, E. Yudt, M., & Fretz R. (2014). A mixed-method assessment of a parenting program for incarcerated fathers. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 65, 50-67.
- ⁶⁷ Westney, O.E., Cole, O.J., & Munford, T.L. (1988). The effects of prenatal education intervention on unwed prospective adolescent fathers. *Journal of Adolescent Health Care*, 9(3), 214-218.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid.
- ⁶⁹ Doherty, W.J., Erickson, M.F., LaRossa, R. (2006). An intervention to increase father involvement and skills with infants during the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Psychology*, 20(3), 438-447.
- ⁷⁰ Magill-Evans, J., Harrison, M.J., Benzies, K., Gierl, M. & Kimak, C. (2007). Effects of Parenting Education on First-Time Father's Skills in Interactions with Their Infants. *Fathering*, 5(1), 42-57.
- ⁷¹ Doherty, W.J., Erickson, M.F., LaRossa, R. (2006). An intervention to increase father involvement and skills with infants during the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Psychology*, 20(3), 438-447.
- ⁷² Ibid.
- ⁷³ Magill-Evans, J., Harrison, M.J., Benzies, K., Gierl, M. & Kimak, C. (2007). Effects of Parenting Education on First-Time Father's Skills in Interactions with Their Infants. *Fathering*, 5(1), 42-57.
- ⁷⁴ OPRE Report 2011-18 (2012). More Than a Job: Final Results from the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) Transitional Job Program. Retrieved from: http://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/full_451.pdf
- ⁷⁵ OPRE Report 2011-18 (2012). More Than a Job: Final Results from the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) Transitional Job Program. Retrieved from: http://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/full_451.pdf
- ⁷⁶ Mazza, C. (2002). Young dads: The effects of a parenting program on urban African American adolescent fathers. *Adolescence*, 37(148), 681-693.
- ⁷⁷ Wilczak, G.L., & Markstrom, C.A. (1999). The Effects of Parent Education on Parental Locus of Control and Satisfaction of Incarcerated Fathers. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 43(1), 90-102. DOI: 10.1177/0306624X99431009
- ⁷⁸ Cancian, M., D.R. Meyer, and E. Caspar. (2008). Welfare and Child Support: Complements, Not Substitutes. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 27(2), 354-375.
- ⁷⁹ Knox, V., and C. Redcross. (2000). Parenting and Providing: The Impact of Parents' Fair Share on Paternal Involvement. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC).
- ⁸⁰ Bloom, D., Kemple, J.J., Morris, P., Scrivener, S., Verma, N., Hendra, R., Adams-Ciardullo, D., Seith, D., & Walter, J. (2000). The family transition program: Final report on Florida's initial time-limited welfare program. Retrieved from <http://www.mdrc.org/publications/20/overview.html>
- ⁸¹ Schroeder, D., S. Looney, and D. Schexnayder. (2004). Impacts of Workforce Services for Young Low-Income Fathers: Findings from the Texas Bootstrap Project. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, University of Texas at Austin.
- ⁸² Ibid.
- ⁸³ Schroeder, D. and N. Doughty. (2009). Texas Non-Custodial Parent Choices: Program Impact Analysis. Austin, TX: Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin.
- ⁸⁴ Administration for Children and Families. Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. (June 2015). Fatherhood: Ongoing Research and Program Evaluation Efforts. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/resource/fatherhood-ongoing-research-and-program-evaluation-efforts>
- ⁸⁵ Cowan, P. A., C. P. Cowan, M. K. Pruett, K. Pruett, and J. J. Wong. (2009) Promoting Fathers' Engagement with Children: Preventive Interventions for Low-Income Families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(3), 663-679.
- ⁸⁶ Ibid.

- ⁸⁷ Bronte-Tinkew, J., Burkhauser, M., & Metz, A. (2009). Elements of Promising Practice in Teen Fatherhood Programs: Evidence-Based and Evidence-Informed Research Findings on What Works. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Child and Families, Office of Family Assistance. Retrieved from <https://library.fatherhood.gov/cwig/ws/library/docs/FATHERHD/Blob/64588.pdf?w=NATIVE%28%27Ti+ph+is+%27%27Elements+of+Promising+Practice+in+Teen+Fatherhood+Programs+%3A+Evidence-Based+and+Evidence-Informed+Research+Findings+on+What+Works%27%27%27%29&upp=0&rpp=25&order=native%28%27year%2FDescend%27%29&r=1&m=1>
- ⁸⁸ Ibid.
- ⁸⁹ Ibid.
- ⁹⁰ Cowan, P. A., C. P. Cowan, M. K. Pruett, K. Pruett, and J. J. Wong. (2009). Promoting Fathers' Engagement with Children: Preventive Interventions for Low-Income Families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, (71)3, 663-679.
- ⁹¹ Fagan, J. (2008) Randomized Study of a Prebirth Coparenting Intervention with Adolescent and Young Fathers. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 57(3), 309-323.
- ⁹² Mazza, C. (2002). Young dads: The effects of a parenting program on urban African American adolescent fathers. *Adolescence*, 37(148), 681-693.
- ⁹³ Robbers, M. L. P. (2005). Focus on Family and Fatherhood: Lessons from Fairfax County's Responsible Fatherhood Program for Incarcerated Dads." *Justice Policy Journal*, 2(1), 1-27.
- ⁹⁴ Harrison, K. (1997). Parental training for incarcerated fathers: Effects on attitudes, self-esteem, and children's self-perceptions. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 137(5), 588-593.
- ⁹⁵ Block, S., Brown, C.A., Barretti, L., Walker, E. Yudit, M., & Fretz R. (2014). A mixed-method assessment of a parenting program for incarcerated fathers. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 65, 50-67.
- ⁹⁶ McKenry, Patrick C., Kathleen A. Clark, and Glenn Stone. (1999). Evaluation of a Parent Education Program for Divorcing Parents. *Family Relations* 48 (2). National Council on Family Relations: 129–37. doi:10.2307/585076.
- ⁹⁷ Cookston, J.T., Braver, S.L., Griffin, W.A., Deluse, S.R., & Miles, J.C. (2006). Effects of the dads for life intervention on interparental conflict and coparenting in the two years after divorce. *Family Process*, 46(1), 123-137.
- ⁹⁸ Knox, V., and C. Redcross. (2000). *Parenting and Providing: The Impact of Parents' Fair Share on Paternal Involvement*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC).
- ⁹⁹ McKenry, P.C., Clark, K.A., & Stone, G. (1999). Evaluation of a Parent Education Program for Divorcing Parents. *Family Relations*, 48(2), 129-137.
- ¹⁰⁰ Cookston, J.T., Braver, S.L., Griffin, W.A., Deluse, S.R., & Miles, J.C. (2006). Effects of the dads for life intervention on interparental conflict and coparenting in the two years after divorce. *Family Process*, 46(1), 123-137.
- ¹⁰¹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau. (2015). *Child maltreatment 2013*. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/research-data-technology/statistics-research/child-maltreatment>
- ¹⁰² U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau. (2015). *Child maltreatment 2013*. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/research-data-technology/statistics-research/child-maltreatment>
- ¹⁰³ Dumka, L. E., Roosa, M. W., Michaels, M. L., & Suh, K. W. (1995). *Using research and theory to develop prevention programs for high risk families*. *Family relations*, 78-86.
- ¹⁰⁴ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau. (2013). *Child maltreatment 2012*. Available from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/research-data-technology/statistics-research/child-maltreatment>.
- ¹⁰⁵ MacLeod, J., & Nelson, G. (2000). Programs for the promotion of family wellness and the prevention of child maltreatment: A meta-analytic review. *Child abuse & neglect*, 24(9), 1127-1149.
- ¹⁰⁶ Stagner, M. W., & Lansing, J. (2009). *Progress toward a prevention perspective*. *The Future of Children*, 19(2), 19-38.
- ¹⁰⁷ Prilleltensky, I., Nelson, G. B., & Peirson, L. (2001). *Promoting family wellness and preventing child maltreatment: Fundamentals for thinking and action*. University of Toronto Press.
- ¹⁰⁸ Geeraert, L., Van den Noortgate, W., Grietens, H., & Onghena, P. (2004). The effects of early prevention programs for families with young children at risk for physical child abuse and neglect: A meta-analysis. *Child Maltreatment*, 9(3), 277-291.

- ¹⁰⁹ MacLeod, J., & Nelson, G. (2000). Programs for the promotion of family wellness and the prevention of child maltreatment: A meta-analytic review. *Child abuse & neglect*, 24(9), 1127-1149
- ¹¹⁰ Brown, J., Cohen, P., Johnson, J. G., & Salzinger, S. (1998). A longitudinal analysis of risk factors for child maltreatment: Findings of a 17-year prospective study of officially recorded and self-reported child abuse and neglect. *Child abuse & neglect*, 22(11), 1065-1078.
- ¹¹¹ Stagner, M. W., & Lansing, J. (2009). *Progress toward a prevention perspective. The Future of Children*, 19(2), 19-38.
- ¹¹² Child Welfare Information Gateway, *Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect Factsheet* (Washington: Children's Bureau/ACYF 2008).
- ¹¹³ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau. (2015). Child maltreatment 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/research-data-technology/statistics-research/child-maltreatment>
- ¹¹⁴ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau. (2015). Child maltreatment 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/research-data-technology/statistics-research/child-maltreatment>
- ¹¹⁵ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau. (2015). Child maltreatment 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/research-data-technology/statistics-research/child-maltreatment>
- ¹¹⁶ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁷ Duggan, A., McFarlane, E., Fuddy, L., Burrell, L., Higman, S. M., Windham, A., et al. (2004). Randomized trial of a statewide home visiting program: Impact in preventing child abuse and neglect. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28(6), 597-622.
- ¹¹⁸ DuMont, K., Mitchell-Herzfeld, S., Greene, R., Lee, E., Lowenfels, A., Rodriguez, M., et al. (2008). Healthy Families New York (HFNY) randomized trial: Effects on early child abuse and neglect. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 32(3), 295-315
- ¹¹⁹ DuMont, K., Kirkland, K., Mitchell-Herzfeld, S., Ehrhard-Dietzel, S., Rodriguez, M. L., Lee, E., Layne, C., & Greene, R. (2010). "A randomized trial of Healthy Families New York (HFNY): Does home visiting prevent child maltreatment?" Rensselaer, NY: New York State Office of Children & Family Services and Albany, NY: The University of Albany, State University of New York, 2010.
- ¹²⁰ Chaffin, M., Hecht, D., Bard, D., Silovsky, J. F., & Beasley, W. H. (2012). A statewide trial of the SafeCare home-based services model with parents in Child Protective Services. *Pediatrics*, 129(3), 509-515.
- ¹²¹ Gershater-Molko, R. M., Lutzker, J. R., & Wesch, D. (2002). Using recidivism data to evaluate project safecare: Teaching bonding, safety, and health care skills to parents. *Child Maltreatment*, 7(3), 277-285.
- ¹²² Prinz, R.J., Sanders, M.R., Shapiro, C.J., Whitaker, D.J., & Lutzker, J.R. (2009). Population-based prevention of child maltreatment: The U.S. Triple P system population trial. *Prevention Science*, 10(1), 1-12.
- ¹²³ Eckenrode, J., Ganzel, B., Henderson Jr, C. R., Smith, E., Olds, D. L., Powers, J., ... & Sidora, K. (2000). Preventing child abuse and neglect with a program of nurse home visitation: The limiting effects of domestic violence. *Jama*, 284(11), 1385-1391.
- ¹²⁴ Scott, K. L., & Crooks, C. V. (2007). Preliminary evaluation of an intervention program for maltreating fathers. *Brief treatment and crisis intervention*, 7(3), 224.
- ¹²⁵ Scott, K. L., & Crooks, C. V. (2004). Effecting change in maltreating fathers: Critical principles for intervention planning. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 11(1), 95-111.
- ¹²⁶ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Administration for Children and Families. Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. (2015). Parents and Children Together (PACT) Evaluation, 2011-2016. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/parents-and-children-together-pact-evaluation>
- ¹²⁷ Zaveri, H., Baumgartener S., Dion, R., & Clary, L. (2015). *Parents and Children Together: Design and Implementation of Responsible Fatherhood Programs*. OPRE Report 2015-76. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/pact_initial_rf_implementation_report_9_11_15_508b.pdf
- ¹²⁸ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Administration for Children and Families. Parents and Children Together Study Overview, Quarterly Update October 2015. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/pact_newsletter_october2015_b508.pdf
- ¹²⁹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Administration for Children and Families. Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. (June 2015). In Their Own Voices: The Hopes and Struggles of Responsible Fatherhood Program

Participants in the Parents and Children Together Evaluation. OPRE Report #2015-67. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/pact_qualitative_report_6_17_2015_b508_3.pdf

¹³⁰ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Administration for Children and Families. Parents and Children Together Study Overview, Quarterly Update October 2015. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/pact_newsletter_october2015_b508.pdf

¹³¹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Administration for Children and Families. Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. (2015). Building Bridges and Bonds (B3), 2014-2019. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/building-bridges-and-bonds>

¹³² Administration for Children and Families. Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. (June 2015). Fatherhood: Ongoing Research and Program Evaluation Efforts. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/resource/fatherhood-ongoing-research-and-program-evaluation-efforts>

¹³³ MDRC. (2016, January 11). Update on B3 Research Design and Questions for you about Interventions. Memorandum. New York, NY: B3 Research Design Team.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Chamberlain, S. (in publication). Fatherhood and Marriage Local Evaluation (FaMLE) and Cross-Site Project, 2013- 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/fatherhood-and-marriage-localevaluation-famle-and-cross-site-project>.; Administration for Children and Families. Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. (June 2015). Fatherhood: Ongoing Research and Program Evaluation Efforts. Retrieved from

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/resource/fatherhood-ongoing-research-and-program-evaluation-efforts>

¹³⁶ Administration for Children and Families. Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. (June 2015). Fatherhood: Ongoing Research and Program Evaluation Efforts. Retrieved from

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/resource/fatherhood-ongoing-research-and-program-evaluation-efforts>

¹³⁷ Campbell, N. (in publication). Home Visiting: Approaches to Father Engagement and Fathers' Experiences, 2013- 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/research/project/home-visiting-approaches-tofather-engagement-and-fathers-experiences>

¹³⁸ Administration for Children and Families. Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. (June 2015). Fatherhood: Ongoing Research and Program Evaluation Efforts. Retrieved from

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/resource/fatherhood-ongoing-research-and-program-evaluation-efforts>

¹³⁹ Administration for Children and Families. Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. (June 2015). Fatherhood: Ongoing Research and Program Evaluation Efforts. Retrieved from

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/resource/fatherhood-ongoing-research-and-program-evaluation-efforts>

¹⁴⁰ Osborne, C., Workgroup, R. F., Austin, J., Dion, M. R., Dyer, J., Fagan, J., ... & Scott, M. E. Framing the Future of Responsible Fatherhood. Evaluation Research for the Fatherhood Research and Practice Network. Responsible Fatherhood Workgroup.

¹⁴¹ Fagan, J. and Kaufman, R. (2014). Reflections on theory and measures for fatherhood programs: Father involvement and co-parenting outcomes. Working Paper. Fatherhood Research and Practice Network. Prepared under Administration for Children and Families (Office of Policy, Research, and Evaluation) Grant #90PR0006.

¹⁴² Mathematica Policy Research (May 2015). Performance Measures: Tracking Program Progress. A FaMLE Cross-Site Project Webinar. Sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. Retrieved from http://www.famlecross-site.info/pdfs/FaMLEPerformanceMeasuresWebinar05262015_Webinar2.pdf

¹⁴³ Fatherhood and Marriage Local Evaluation & Cross-Site Project. FAQs on Performance Measures/nFORM, Local Evaluations, and Federally-led Evaluations. Retrieved from <http://www.famlecross-site.info/pdfs/DataEvaluationFAQ.pdf>

¹⁴⁴ Mathematica Policy Research (May 2015). Performance Measures: Tracking Program Progress. A FaMLE Cross-Site Project Webinar. Sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. Retrieved from http://www.famlecross-site.info/pdfs/FaMLEPerformanceMeasuresWebinar05262015_Webinar2.pdf

¹⁴⁵ Fagan, J. and Kaufman, R. (2014). Reflections on theory and measures for fatherhood programs: Father involvement and co-parenting outcomes. Working Paper. Fatherhood Research and Practice Network. Prepared under Administration for Children and Families (Office of Policy, Research, and Evaluation) Grant #90PR0006.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Rosinsky, K. and Scott, M.E. (2015). Healthy marriage and relationship education: Considerations for Collecting Outcomes Data from Parents in Complex Families. Prepared by Child Trends. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/hmre_considerations_for_collecting_outcomes_data_from_parents_in.pdf

¹⁴⁹ Fagan, J. and Kaufman, R. (2014). Reflections on theory and measures for fatherhood programs: Father involvement and co-parenting outcomes. Working Paper. Fatherhood Research and Practice Network. Prepared under Administration for Children and Families (Office of Policy, Research, and Evaluation) Grant #90PR0006.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ National Fatherhood Initiative. 24/7 Dad™ Logic Model. Retrieved from <http://capacitybuilding.fatherhood.org/document.doc?id=35>

¹⁵⁴ Abidin, R. R., & Konold, T. R. (1999). PAM: parenting alliance measure: professional manual. Psychological Assessment Resources.

¹⁵⁵ Fagan, J. and Kaufman, R. (2014). Reflections on theory and measures for fatherhood programs: Father involvement and co-parenting outcomes. Working Paper. Fatherhood Research and Practice Network. Prepared under Administration for Children and Families (Office of Policy, Research, and Evaluation) Grant #90PR0006.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ Ibid.



CHILD & FAMILY RESEARCH PARTNERSHIP

Strengthening Families & Enhancing Public Policy Through Rigorous Research

The Child and Family Research Partnership is an independent, nonpartisan research center under the direction of Dr. Cynthia Osborne at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at The University of Texas at Austin. CFRP specializes in rigorous research on policy issues related to young children, teens, and their parents. CFRP seeks to understand how current demographic trends affect parents and their children, what factors contribute to both positive and negative child outcomes, and what policy and programmatic changes can be implemented to improve child and family wellbeing.

Research Areas

Family Structure and Wellbeing

Family Instability • Marriage & Cohabitation • Child Support
Economic Security • Family Violence

Father Involvement

Responsible Fatherhood • Paternity Establishment
Father Participation in Social Programs

Early Childhood

Home Visiting Programs • Systems-Level Change
Program Retention • Public Pre-Kindergarten

Child Welfare

Child Welfare Workforce • Permanency • Effectiveness of Mediation • Family Safety

Adolescent Health and Wellbeing

Teen Pregnancy • Teen Fathers • Healthy Relationships • Youth Homelessness

Join Our Email List

<http://eepurl.com/xEN3v>

childandfamilyresearch.org   bit.ly/cfrplinkedin

facebook.com/CFRPIbj   [@CFRPIbj](https://twitter.com/CFRPIbj)