



All Theses and Dissertations

2010-04-21

Contributions of Father Involvement in Family Leisure to Family Functioning

Lydia Anne Buswell

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Recreation Business Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Buswell, Lydia Anne, "Contributions of Father Involvement in Family Leisure to Family Functioning" (2010). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 2107.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/2107>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Contributions of Father Involvement in Family Leisure to Family Functioning

Lydia Buswell

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Ramon Zabriskie
Neil Lundberg
Alan Hawkins

Department of Recreation Management and Youth Leadership

Brigham Young University

August 2010

Copyright © 2010 Lydia Buswell

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Contributions of Father Involvement in Family Leisure to Family Functioning

Lydia Buswell

Department of Recreation Management and Youth Leadership

Master of Science

The purpose of this study was to examine the contribution of fathers' involvement in family leisure to aspects of family functioning. The sample consisted of 647 families of fathers and a youth from throughout the United States. The Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP) was used to measure family leisure involvement. FACES II was used to measure family functioning. Results from the father and youth perspective indicated significant relationships between father involvement in both core and balance family leisure to various aspects of family functioning. Core family leisure involvement was the only family leisure involvement variable related to family adaptability from the youth perspective. From both the father and youth perspective, core family leisure satisfaction was the single strongest predictor of all aspects of family functioning. Findings provide implications for fathers, families, scholars, professionals, and policy makers.

Keywords: father involvement, family functioning, family leisure, family leisure satisfaction

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my committee chair, Ramon, for all the time that he has put into helping me reach my goals. He has taken my project on vacations, has taken time away from conferences, and even his family to help make this thesis what it is. I would also like to thank my other committee members, Neil and Alan, for their constant support and insights. I would like to thank my fabulous cohort, Melissa, Rachel, Jessie, and Clive. You guys always encouraged me to “put my shorts on.” There is no way I would have ever made it through graduate school without our adventures, laughter, and love for each other. Your support and love has made my experience one of the best I’ve ever had. The support of my sweet, endearing husband has been never ending. He has felt all the stress of graduate school as much as I have. Your love for me has been amplified as you have supported me in this adventure. We really have had some good times these past two years. My appreciation also extends to my sweet little baby Hallie. You always slept when I needed you to, allowing me to work. My deepest gratitude extends to my Father in Heaven. He has given me strength through the Savior and has guided me as I learn about fathering and the importance a father has in the lives of their families. For the glory of the Father.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| List of Tables | v |
| Abstract | 2 |
| Contributions of Father Involvement in Family Leisure to Family Functioning..... | 3 |
| Review of Literature | 5 |
| Methods..... | 15 |
| Results..... | 19 |
| Discussion..... | 23 |
| References..... | 33 |
| Appendix A Prospectus | 45 |
| Introduction..... | 46 |
| Review of Literature | 54 |
| Methods..... | 68 |
| References..... | 73 |
| Appendix A-1a..... | 80 |
| Appendix A-1b..... | 83 |
| Appendix A-1c..... | 102 |
| Appendix A-1d..... | 104 |

List of Tables

Tables

1. Summary of Blocked Regression Equations Predicting Family Cohesion: Father Data..... 39
2. Summary of Blocked Regression Equations Predicting Family Adaptability: Father Data..... 40
3. Summary of Blocked Regression Equations Predicting Family Functioning: Father Data 41
4. Summary of Blocked Regression Equations Predicting Family Cohesion: Youth Data..... 42
5. Summary of Blocked Regression Equations Predicting Family Adaptability: Youth Data..... 43
6. Summary of Blocked Regression Equations Predicting Family Functioning: Youth Data..... 44

Contributions of Father Involvement in Family Leisure to Family Functioning

Lydia Buswell

Brigham Young University

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the contribution of fathers' involvement in family leisure to aspects of family functioning. The sample consisted of 647 families of fathers and a youth from throughout the United States. The Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP) was used to measure family leisure involvement. FACES II was used to measure family functioning. Results from the father and youth perspective indicated significant relationships between father involvement in both core and balance family leisure to various aspects of family functioning. Core family leisure involvement was the only family leisure involvement variable related to family adaptability from the youth perspective. From both the father and youth perspective, core family leisure satisfaction was the single strongest predictor of all aspects of family functioning. Findings provide implications for fathers, families, scholars, professionals, and policy makers.

Key words: father involvement, family functioning, family leisure, family leisure satisfaction

Contributions of Father Involvement in Family Leisure to Family Functioning

Over the past two decades, researchers have tried to define father involvement and discover its impact on children and families (Marks & Palkovitz, 2004). Doherty, Kouneski, and Erickson (1998) define father involvement in terms of responsible fathering conveying fathers who are responsible are those that are present at their child's birth, actively share with the mother in the continuing emotional and physical care of their child during and after pregnancy; they also share in the financial responsibility of the child from pregnancy onwards. Marsiglio (1991) describes a new father as one that is involved in seeking to establish close, intimate bonds with their children while providing nurturance and affection, engages in day-to-day caregiving tasks on his own, and is involved with daughters as much as he is sons. Marks and Palkovitz (2004) argue that it is not a new father that is emerging, but a return to post-industrial ideals of fatherhood wherein the father is involved in many aspects of their child's life, returning to roles such as "pedagogue, guidance counselor, benefactor, moral overseer, psychologist, model, progenitor, companion, caregiver, disciplinarian, and provider" (p. 115). Other ideas of fathering include engagement, accessibility and responsibility (Marsiglio, 1991) as well as "generative fathering" (Brotherson, Dollahite, & Hawkins, 2005) which all encompass similar characteristics to the new father. Among these concepts of fatherhood is the underlying trend that fathers are becoming more involved in the home with their children in an effort to provide better outcomes for their children.

Research has suggested that fathers who are involved with their children in playing and caregiving tasks such as diapering, preparing meals, dressing the child, getting up at night with infants, etc., contribute to positive outcomes for their children (Brotherson et al., 2005; Grossman, Grossman, Fremmer-Bombik, Kindler, Scheuerer-Englisch, & Zimmerman, 2002;

Pettit, Brown, Mize, & Lindsey, 1998). Some outcomes include positive cognitive development (Roggman, Boyce, Cook, Christiansen, & Jones, 2004) greater problem solving skills (Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984), healthier levels of attachment (Grossman et al.), greater peer competence (Pettit et al.), and school readiness (Fagan & Iglesias, 1999). Although there is considerable research examining the relationship between father involvement and child outcomes, limited research has extended beyond the individual to include broader family outcomes such as quality of family life, family life satisfaction, or family functioning.

Family functioning is often examined through a family systems framework. Family systems theory describes the family as a working system that interacts as it progresses through the dynamics of family life. Because the family is a working unit, each individual affects the family as a whole, while the family also affects each individual (White & Klein, 2008). Therefore, a father's involvement with his children in the home will likely influence individual child outcomes, and according to family systems theory, such involvement is also likely to influence broader family outcomes such as family functioning. Many behavioral characteristics have been related to healthy family functioning, one of which is family leisure.

Researchers have reported a consistent relationship between family leisure and aspects of family functioning for decades (Hawks, 1991; Holman & Epperson, 1989; Orthner & Mancini, 1991). Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) reported a direct relationship between different types of family leisure and aspects of family functioning. Such findings have been consistent among different types of families such as adoptive families (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003), single-parent families (Hornberger, Zabriskie, & Freeman, 2010), and families with a child with a disability (Dodd, Zabriskie, Widmer, & Eggett, 2009) and have been examined from both a parent and child perspective. Satisfaction with family leisure also seems to be an important component of

family life. Agate, Zabriskie, Agate, and Poff (2009) found a positive relationship between satisfaction with family leisure and satisfaction with family life, and such a relationship may also exist between satisfaction with family leisure and family functioning. The specific contribution of father involvement in family leisure and the relationship to family functioning, however, has not been examined. Considering the trend of increased father involvement (new fathering) it is likely that higher levels of father involvement in family leisure is also related to family functioning.

Review of Literature

Father Involvement

Many scholars have attempted to describe father involvement as being involved in caregiving tasks as well as providing emotional and psychological support and guidance to their children (Marks & Palkovitz, 2004). Hawkins and Palkovitz (1999) argue that conceptualizations of father involvement have been dominated by a focus on the amount of time spent in caring for children and that this conceptualization lacks other important dimensions of father involvement such as the nature and experience of the activities a father is involved in with his children. Drawing upon Erikson's (1963) concept of generativity, Hawkins and Palkovitz suggest it is an ethic of care and desire to nurture the rising generation that is a central component of father involvement. Dollahite and Hawkins (1998) further this conceptualization of father involvement describing this ethic as generative fathering, or fatherwork. They pose seven types of generative work that respond to the challenges of the human condition, including the work of recreation. The work of recreation that fathers are involved in incorporates teaching children about cooperation and challenge through play. According to Dollahite and Hawkins, this work of recreation is among the most valuable in caring for the next generation. In the background of this

and other conceptualizations of father involvement is recognition that fathers are becoming more involved with their children in an effort to provide them with better outcomes.

Bianchi (2000) reported an increase in the number of hours a father spends in any activity with his child. In 1965, married fathers reported spending an average of 2.8 hours a day in any activity with his children, compared with 3.8 hours in 1998. Concurrent to the increase in father involvement, there has been an increase of attention in the popular press and research to father involvement (Eggebeen, 2002). One main area of research among fathers has been the relationship between father involvement and child outcomes (Eggebeen) with father involvement often being defined by participating in caregiving tasks and playing with their children (Marsiglio, 1991). There has been a growing number of researchers who have examined fathers' play involvement with their children and positive child outcomes in areas such as cognitive development, problem solving, attachment, peer competence, and school readiness (Grossman et al., 2002; Roggman et al., 2004; Pettit et al.).

Cognitive development. Fathers' play involvement may provide unique sources of cognitive stimulation and emotional support for infants as they explore their environments and acquire knowledge and skills (Nugent, 1991; Yogman, Kindlon, & Earls, 1995). Infant cognitive outcomes are precursors of later child outcomes, including motor outcomes which lay the building blocks for subsequent language development, higher thought processes, and language acquisition (Ejiri & Masatake, 2001). Roggman et al. (2004) found father-toddler social toy play, meaning play interactions that included conversation and meaningful responses, was positively related to children's cognitive development, language development, and emotional regulation at both 24 and 36 months, even after controlling for earlier childhood functioning. Some fathers were noted as having complex toy play interactions. These interactions extend beyond simply

playing with and talking about the toys to include returning the toys, imitating each other with the toys, or continuing the conversation after playing with toys. Roggman et al. found the more complex the toy play interactions were between a father and their two-year olds, the better the children's cognitive, language, and emotional development. In other words, there is a clear relationship between greater cognitive development and fathers' play interactions with their toddlers. There is also evidence that greater cognitive development and higher thought processes may be related to problem solving skills (Ejiri & Masatake, 2001).

Problem solving and attachment. Fathers' play with their children may also provide a context to achieve better problem solving skills (Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984). Easterbrooks and Goldberg argue that the amount of time fathers spend with their children in play and caregiving activities is more related to their performance in a socio-cognitive task (i.e. problem-solving behavior) rather than socio-emotional development (i.e., attachment). They also argue that in the father-child relationship, children who were securely attached to their fathers exhibited more positive affect and orientation in a problem-solving task. Grossman et al. (2002) also support the idea that fathers mainly provide sensitive support during explorative play of their toddlers allowing for secure attachment to take place. This secure attachment that is arguably influenced by a father's involvement (Grossman et al.) may provide insight into areas of child development such as peer competence and school readiness (Stacks & Oshio, 2009).

School readiness and peer competence. After examining father involvement in the Head Start program, Fagan and Iglesias (1999) found that children of fathers who were involved in the program showed improved academic readiness skills. Their involvement included volunteering in the classroom, coming to "Father's day" activities (i.e., participating in recreational activities during class), and playing more with their children (p. 249). Specifically,

fathers who were more involved in the Head Start program were found to be effective in increasing the applied problem skills of their children. Fathers who were more involved in self-initiated and spontaneous play with their children were also shown to have a positive impact on their children's mathematical readiness. Stacks and Oshio (2009) argue that there is a link between social skills and school readiness. Among children in the Head Start program, social skills among peers that were not properly regulated were negatively correlated to school readiness (Fagan & Iglesias).

Another essential construct related to father-child play behavior is peer competence. Pettit et al. (1998) found that both mothers' and fathers' individual hands-on involvement in their children's play with a peer predicted children's competence, but in different ways: mothers' active involvement was associated with lower levels of peer acceptance, whereas fathers' active involvement was associated with higher levels of peer acceptance. Children were more likely to learn peer competence skills from experiences in play with their father than from their mother. This suggests that father involvement in play with their children provides unique and meaningful opportunities to teach relationship skills. Although father involvement in the home, including play activities and caregiving activities with their children, appears to be related to positive individual child outcomes, limited research extends beyond father involvement and individual child outcomes to include broader family outcomes such as quality of family life, family life satisfaction, or family functioning.

Family Functioning

Family systems theory is a widely accepted framework utilized to understand family behaviors. This framework suggests that each individual in the family affects the whole, while the whole family affects each individual member (White & Klein, 2008). Zabriskie and

McCormick (2001) summarize family systems theory by stating it “holds that families are goal directed, self-correcting, dynamic, interconnected systems that both affect and are affected by their environment and by qualities within the family system itself” (p. 281). Because family systems theory suggests that each individual affects the family as a whole, a father’s involvement in the home should also be associated with family outcomes, such as family functioning.

Olson and DeFrain (1997) have attempted to capture the dynamics of family systems in the Family Circumplex Model. Three main dimensions are embodied in the Family Circumplex Model: (a) cohesion, (b) adaptability, and (c) communication. Olson and DeFrain define cohesion as “a feeling of emotional closeness with another person” (p. 72) and adaptability as “the ability of the family to change power structure, roles and rules in the relationship” (p. 75). The third dimension, communication, allows the family to move through levels of cohesion and adaptability. The Family Circumplex Model suggests that family cohesion and family adaptability are defining characteristics of family functioning (Olson & DeFrain).

Esposito (1995) used the Family Circumplex Model to examine the quality of nonresident father interaction and family functioning. Father interaction was defined by how the father feels about the interactions he has with his child(ren). A correlation was found between the quality of the father-child interaction and cohesion, but not adaptability. These findings are also supported by Nicholls and Pike (2002) who suggest that the quality of father-child interactions among nonresident fathers predicted cohesion but not adaptability in the father-child relationship. Although these studies have examined the relationship between father involvement and family functioning, they are limited by only examining nonresident fathers as well as only defining father involvement by how fathers feel about the quality of interactions with their child. Other

behavioral characteristics that are consistently related to family functioning, such as a father's involvement with family leisure and recreational habits, have not been explicitly examined.

Family Leisure and Family Functioning

Historically, it has been argued that family leisure is beneficial to families in the areas of family satisfaction, marital interaction, and family stability (Orthner & Mancini, 1991). Multiple studies have found married couples who participate in joint leisure are more satisfied in their relationships than those who participate in individual leisure activities (Orthner, 1975, 1976; Orthner & Mancini, 1990; Palisi, 1984; Smith, Snyder, & Monsma, 1988). These early studies are limited by reports of married couples being generalized to the family as a whole.

In more recent decades, several studies have investigated the family as a whole. Shaw and Dawson (2001) found that families intentionally used family leisure as a means to enhance family functioning, calling this type of leisure purposive leisure. They reported that parents tend to set goals to improve family communication, cohesion, and create a strong sense of family through the use of family leisure. Hawks (1991) also concluded after reviewing six decades of research, that family leisure is related to cohesiveness among family members. Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) have consistently reported a direct relationship between family leisure involvement and family cohesion, adaptability, and overall family functioning using a Core and Balance family leisure framework.

The Core and Balance Model of Family Leisure Functioning is grounded in family systems theory and implies a direct relationship between family leisure and aspects of family functioning, namely cohesion and adaptability (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). It classifies family leisure into two basic types, core and balance. Core family activity patterns tend to meet the need "for familiarity and stability" by providing regular experiences in family leisure that are

predictable and promote closeness among family members as well as personal relatedness (Zabriskie & McCormick, p. 283). On the other hand, balance family activity patterns, tend to meet the need for challenge and change as they provide avenues for the family to grow, be challenged, and develop as a functioning system (Zabriskie & McCormick).

Core family leisure activities are those which are done usually inside or near the home and are performed often. These activities usually do not cost any money or very little, if necessary. Examples of core activities include shooting hoops in the driveway, playing board games, or going on family walks. Core family leisure activities are often engaged in a socializing context which provides a means for families to communicate, not only about common everyday events, but those events, feelings, or emotions that may be more difficult for family members to express (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) describe balance family leisure activities as those which are usually done away from the home, are novel experiences, not done often, and may require more resources such as time, effort, and money. Examples of these activities include family vacation, camping out, going on a hike, or attending a public swimming pool. Because balance family leisure activities are usually accompanied with novelty and unpredictability, they create an environment for challenges, new input, and experiences that involve family members needing to adapt to and negotiate with each other.

In a study among college-aged young adults, Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) found core family leisure involvement was related to greater family cohesion and balance family leisure involvement was related to family adaptability. Overall, those who reported more family leisure involvement also reported higher family functioning. Freeman and Zabriskie (2003) found among families with bi-racial adoptive children that family leisure involvement was the

strongest predictor of family functioning even when considering socio-demographic variables such as age, gender, race, family size, religion, history of divorce, and annual income. Findings have been consistent from multiple perspectives including parents, young adults, and adolescents from a variety of samples including two-parent, biological families (Zabriskie & McCormick), families with a child with a disability (Dodd et al., 2009), single-parent families (Smith, Taylor, Hill, & Zabriskie, 2004), and Hispanic families (Christenson, Zabriskie, Eggett, & Freeman, 2006) which suggest that both core and balance family leisure activities are essential, and that families who regularly participate in both types of family leisure activities report higher levels of family functioning than those who participate in low amounts of either category. The Core and Balance Model appears to offer a sound theoretical framework from which to examine fathers' leisure involvement and family functioning. These studies provide meaningful insights into family recreation and family functioning, however, the majority of responses (between 70 and 90 percent) in most of these studies, has been from a mother's perspective, and may or may not have included family leisure with the father present.

Beyond family leisure involvement or participation, the quality, or satisfaction, with family leisure involvement has also begun to be examined. Agate et al. (2009) found satisfaction with core family leisure to be the single greatest predictor of satisfaction with family life among a national sample of families. Also, Johnson, Zabriskie, and Hill (2006) reported satisfaction with marital leisure involvement as the strongest predictor of marital satisfaction in couples. No studies, however, have examined family leisure satisfaction in relationship to aspects of family functioning.

Father Involvement in Family Leisure

Family functioning in relation to family leisure and father involvement has been overlooked. One study links aspects of family leisure and nonresident fathers' involvement. Swinton, Zabriskie, Freeman, and Fields (2008) used the Core and Balance Model as a framework to examine nonresident fathers' family leisure patterns. They reported nonresident fathers participated in more core family leisure than balance. Although this study has provided some insight into family leisure patterns and father involvement, family functioning was not specifically examined. The few qualitative studies that have been conducted have found links between father involvement, leisure, and aspects of family functioning among resident fathers (Brotherson et al., 2005; Harrington, 2006).

In a qualitative analysis of interviews from 16 resident fathers, Brotherson et al. (2005) discovered avenues of achieving connectedness among fathers and children. They found fathers were able to feel connected with their children through spending meaningful time together in activities of recreation (e.g., camping, hunting and picnicking) and activities of play or learning (e.g., hide and seek, checkers, and word games). Brotherson et al. argue that "in a society that increasingly demands the time and attention of parents, these connecting moments in a father-child relationship gain greater importance and suggest the value of the 'little things' that create a sense of connection" (p. 16). Call (2002) also suggests that common, ordinary parts of fathers' relationships with their children (e.g., cuddling on the couch, talking over dinner, or sharing drinks) are crucial to experiencing a connection between a father and child. These studies provide evidence that core activities and common leisure experiences help in providing cohesiveness among fathers and children.

In a qualitative study among Australian fathers, Harrington (2006) found that sports were a common way fathers interacted and bonded with their children. Fathers sought to instill positive memories of family life that would hopefully be passed on through generations supporting the idea of Shaw and Dawson (2001) which described families using leisure centered around a purpose, mainly the opportunity to teach children to have healthy habits and values, to communicate better, and to have healthier family functioning.

Among these qualitative studies (Brotherson et al., 2005; Harrington, 2006), fathers expressed that their leisure interactions with their children have led to greater cohesion, which is an aspect of family functioning. The specific contribution of fathers' leisure involvement with their children and the relationship to family functioning, however, has not been examined on a broad scale. Although there has been a strong focus of past research on father involvement in family work to various child outcomes and a limited focus on fathers' play interactions related to child outcomes (Grossman et al., 2002; Pettit et al., 1998; Roggman et al., 2004), scholars have not examined father involvement in family leisure and its relationship to family outcomes. Considering the trend of increased father involvement (Bianchi, 2000), it is likely that a father's involvement with their children in leisure is related to broader family outcomes such as family functioning. The Core and Balance Model would also suggest that fathers who are involved in more family leisure with their children are likely to report higher levels of family functioning than those who participate in less. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the contribution of father involvement in family leisure to aspects of family functioning. Specifically, it was hypothesized that father involvement in core and balance family leisure would be related to family cohesion, adaptability, and overall family functioning. Furthermore, satisfaction with family leisure involvement with the father present would also be related to

family cohesion, adaptability, and overall family functioning from both a father and child perspective.

Methods

Sample

Data were collected through an online survey sampling company whose subjects are drawn from a multi-source internet panel of people willing to participate in online research. The research instrument was completed by a national sample of families ($n = 647$) residing in U.S. households containing at least one child (11-15 years old).

Each responding family was required to submit two completed responses: one from a father and one from a child between the ages of 11 and 15. The majority of respondents (69.2%) lived in urban/suburban areas (population $> 50,000$). The households were located in the following census regions: Northeast (23.8%), Midwest (24.6%), South (34.5%), and West (17.2%). The average family size was 3.80 people with a reported range from 2 to 8 family members. Annual income ranged from less than \$10,000 to over \$150,000 with a median income of \$60,000 to \$69,999.

Slightly more than half of the youth respondents were male (62.6%) with a mean age of 13.13 ($SD = 1.404$) and ranged from 11 to 15. The ethnic majority of youth was white (69.6%) with minority represented by Black (12.2%), Hispanic (11.4%), Asian (3.2%), Native American (1.2%), Pacific Islander (0.5%), and other (1.9%).

Ages of the fathers ranged from 29 to 71 with a mean age of 44.19 ($SD = 8.552$). Approximately 80% of the fathers were married, 7.3% were single/never married, 2.5% were separated, 13.8% were divorced, 1.5% were widowed, and 7.9% were unmarried and living with a partner. A history of divorce was reported by 28.6% of the fathers. Nearly 45% of the fathers

completed at least a four-year college degree (B.S., B.A.). Fathers were predominately white (69.7%) with minority represented by Black (13.0%), Hispanic (11.9%), Asian (2.9%), Native American (1.1%), Pacific Islander (0.3%), and other (1.1%). Nearly 25% of fathers had been unemployed within the past year. Months of unemployment ranged from one to 12 with an average of 7.56 (SD = 4.415).

When compared with census data for the U.S., White ethnicity of this sample was reflective of census data (75.0%), compared with 69.7% in the current sample. The current sample also was quite reflective of minorities: Hispanic (15.4%) and Black (12.4%) in the U.S. census data (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). In terms of census regions the current sample was quite similar to census data (Northeast 19.1%, Midwest 22.9%, South 35.6%, and West 22.5%) with slightly more respondents from the Northeast and slightly less from the West. The current sample reflected a slightly higher annual income compared to the real median income for all households in 2007 being \$50,233 (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2008). Furthermore, marital status was 80% in the sample compared to 60% in the census data (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009). Overall the current sample was generally reflective of the U.S. population census information.

Instrumentation

Two scales were selected for use in this study. The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales (FACES II) provided a measure of the family's perceptions of their family cohesion, family adaptability, and an overall measure of family functioning (Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Larsen, Muxen, & Wilson, 1992). The Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP) measured core, balance, and overall family leisure involvement as well as satisfaction with family leisure

involvement (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). Relevant demographic questions were also included.

FACES II. The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales (FACES II) includes 30 items used to measure an individual's perceptions of family adaptability, family cohesion, and family functioning based on Olson's Family Circumplex Model (Olson & DeFrain, 1997). There are 16 questions that measure family cohesion. The other 14 questions measure family adaptability. Answers are rated on a Likert scale from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). Scores for family adaptability and family cohesion were calculated based on a scoring formula that accounts for reverse coded questions. After obtaining total family adaptability and family cohesion scores, corresponding values of 1 through 8 were assigned based on the linear scoring interpretation of Olson et al. (1992). These two scores were then averaged together to obtain the family type score which is used as an indicator of overall family functioning. Acceptable psychometric properties have been reported for FACES II including internal consistency with a score of 0.90, and reliability with Cronbach alpha levels as 0.78 and 0.79 for adaptability and 0.86 and 0.88 for cohesion (Olson et al.).

FLAP. The Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP) measures family leisure involvement based on the Core and Balance Model of Family Leisure Functioning (Zabriskie, 2000). The questionnaire includes 16 questions with eight items measuring core family leisure involvement and eight items measuring balance family leisure involvement. In each question, the respondent is asked if he or she participates in activities of that specific category with other family members, and if so, how often and for how long. The Family Leisure Satisfaction Scale (FLSS) is embedded into the FLAP and measures satisfaction with current involvement in each of the

family leisure activities and are indicated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied).

An index score was calculated for each item by multiplying frequency and duration. The core family leisure index score was calculated by summing the index scores of items 1 through 8. The balance family leisure index score was calculated by summing the index scores of items 9 through 16 (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). Family leisure satisfaction scores were calculated by summing items 1 through 8, providing a score indicating satisfaction with core family leisure, and summing items 9 through 16, providing a score indicating satisfaction with balance family leisure. The FLAP has demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties among construct validity, content validity, inter-rater reliability, and test-retest reliability for core ($r = 0.74$), balance ($r = 0.78$), and total family leisure involvement ($r = 0.78$) (Zabriskie, 2001) and the FLSS has demonstrated internal consistency from both a parent and youth perspective with a Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$ (Agate et al., 2009).

The directions of this scale were modified from its original form to ask fathers specifically about their participation in family leisure. Furthermore, on the youth survey, the directions were modified to ask about family leisure involvement in which the father was involved or included.

Demographics. Socio-demographic questions were included to identify the underlying characteristics of the sample. These items included age of the father and youth, ethnicity of the father and youth, gender of father and youth, marital status, history of divorce, state of residence, population of place of residence, highest level of education, annual family income, employment status, and family size.

Analysis

The statistical package SPSS was used to analyze the data. Data were reviewed for missing responses and examined for outliers to be sure all responses fit within the sample parameters. Data were compiled into two data sets: response of fathers, and response of youth. Underlying characteristics of the research variables were examined with descriptive statistics. Pearson Product Moment zero-order correlations between variables in each of the two data sets were examined for multicollinearity as well as to identify possible controlling factors to be included in subsequent multiple regression equations. A blocked entry method of multiple regression was then conducted for both the father and youth data sets. Socio-demographic variables that were significantly correlated with the dependent variable were included in the first block as controlling factors in the multiple regression models to facilitate examination of the unique contribution of fathers' involvement in family leisure to family functioning. The second block included the fathers' family leisure involvement variables (core family leisure participation and balance family leisure participation). The third block included core and balance family leisure satisfaction variables. Multiple regression analyses were performed on each of the three dependent variables (family cohesion, family adaptability, and family functioning) for both the father and youth perspective. Standardized regression coefficients are presented in the models.

Results

Scores fell within established norms for each scale. Multicollinearity, as indicated by $r > .90$ (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996) was not found between any of the independent variables in either the father or youth data set. In the father data set, zero-order correlations were reported between family adaptability and the independent variables of income ($r = .25, p < .01$), history of divorce ($r = .13, p < .01$), unemployment within the past year ($r = .10, p < .01$), and highest level

of education ($r = .21, p < .01$). Therefore, these variables were included in the regression equations for the father perspective. In the youth data set, zero-order correlations were reported between family adaptability and the independent variables of family size ($r = -.08, p < .05$), income ($r = .26, p < .01$), history of divorce ($r = .14, p < .01$), unemployment within the past year ($r = .12, p < .01$), and highest level of education ($r = .18, p < .01$). Therefore, these variables were included in the regression equations for the youth perspective.

Subsequently, multivariate analysis was performed using the block-entry method of multiple regression to examine the relationship between father involvement in family leisure and family functioning. For both the father and youth data set, a multiple regression model was created for each of the dependent variables (cohesion, adaptability, and total family functioning), resulting in a total of six regression models.

In the first model for the father data (see Table 1), the first block containing only socio-demographic variables was not significant in explaining variance in family cohesion ($R^2 = .009, p = .224$). After adding fathers' reports of their own involvement in core and balance family leisure into the second block there was a significant statistical change in the variance explained by the model ($\Delta R^2 = .090, p < .001$). The socio-demographic variables remained insignificant but fathers' reports of their own core family leisure involvement ($\beta = .181, p < .001$) as well as balance family leisure involvement ($\beta = .158, p = .001$) were significant predictors of family cohesion. Upon adding core and balance family leisure satisfaction into the third block there was again a significant change in the variance explained by the model ($\Delta R^2 = .123, p < .001$). Balance family leisure involvement ($\beta = .139, p = .002$) and core family leisure satisfaction ($\beta = .359, p < .001$) were significant predictors of family cohesion from the father perspective, but core family leisure involvement was no longer significant.

In the second model for the father data (see Table 2), the first block containing only socio-demographic variables explained a significant amount of variance in family adaptability ($R^2 = .075$, $p < .001$). The highest level of education ($\beta = .092$, $p = .049$), estimated annual income ($\beta = .180$, $p < .001$), and history of divorce ($\beta = .084$, $p = .031$) were significant predictors. After adding core and balance family leisure involvement into the second block there was a significant statistical change in the variance explained by the model ($\Delta R^2 = .092$, $p < .001$). The previous variables remained significant with the exception of highest level of education ($\beta = .082$, $p = .063$). Both core family leisure involvement ($\beta = .208$, $p < .001$) and balance family leisure involvement ($\beta = .131$, $p = .004$) were significant predictors of family adaptability. After adding core and balance family leisure satisfaction into the third block there was a significant change in the model ($\Delta R^2 = .199$, $p < .001$). The previous socio-demographic variables remained significant predictors as well as balance family leisure involvement. Both core family leisure satisfaction ($\beta = .376$, $p < .001$) and balance family leisure satisfaction ($\beta = .143$, $p = .007$) were significant predictors of family adaptability from the father perspective.

In the final model for the father data (see Table 3), the first block, again, containing only socio-demographic variables explained a significant amount of variance in total family functioning ($R^2 = .032$, $p < .001$). The estimated annual income was a significant predictor ($\beta = .160$, $p = .001$). After adding core and balance family leisure involvement into the second block there was a significant change in the model ($\Delta R^2 = .113$, $p < .001$). Annual income remained a significant predictor ($\beta = .117$, $p = .013$). Both core family leisure involvement ($\beta = .218$, $p < .001$) and balance family leisure involvement ($\beta = .161$, $p < .001$) were significant predictors of total family functioning with core family leisure involvement explaining slightly more variance than balance family leisure involvement. Upon adding core and balance family leisure

satisfaction into the third block of the model there was a significant statistical change ($R^2 = .333$, $p < .001$). Balance family leisure involvement ($\beta = .136$, $p = .002$) remained a significant predictor, while annual income and core family leisure involvement did not. Core family leisure satisfaction was also a significant predictor of total family functioning ($\beta = .422$, $p < .001$) from the father perspective.

In the first model for the youth data (see Table 4), the first block containing only socio-demographic variables was not significant in explaining variance in youths' reports of family cohesion ($R^2 = .013$, $p = .143$), although the estimated annual income was a significant predictor ($\beta = .139$, $p = .006$). After adding youths' reports of father involvement in core and balance family leisure into the second block there was a significant statistical change in the variance explained by the model ($\Delta R^2 = .090$, $p < .001$). Core family leisure involvement was once again a significant predictor of family cohesion ($\beta = .197$, $p < .001$), as well as balance family leisure involvement ($\beta = .134$, $p = .009$), while annual income was no longer significant ($\beta = .092$, $p = .057$). Upon adding core and balance family leisure satisfaction into the third block of the model, there was a statistical significant change ($\Delta R^2 = .131$, $p < .001$). Both core and balance family leisure involvement became insignificant predictors while core family leisure satisfaction ($\beta = .354$, $p < .001$) became a significant predictor of family cohesion.

In the second model for the youth data (see Table 5), the first block, again containing only socio-demographic variables explained a significant amount of the variance in family adaptability ($R^2 = .089$, $p < .001$). The estimated annual income ($\beta = .221$, $p < .001$), history of divorce ($\beta = .120$, $p = .002$), and number of family size ($\beta = -.099$, $p = .010$) were all significant predictors. After adding core and balance family leisure involvement into the second block, there was a significant change in the variance explained by the model ($\Delta R^2 = .068$, $p < .001$). The

previous socio-demographic variables remained significant and core family leisure involvement was a significant predictor of family adaptability ($\beta = .229, p < .001$) while balance family leisure involvement was not ($\beta = .048, p = .331$). Upon adding core and balance family leisure satisfaction into the third block of the model there was a significant change ($\Delta R^2 = .159, p < .001$). Core family leisure involvement ($\beta = .093, p = .049$) and core family leisure satisfaction ($\beta = .398, p < .001$) were significant predictors of family adaptability from the youth perspective.

In the final model for the youth data (see Table 6), the first block containing only socio-demographic variables explained a significant portion of the variance in total family functioning ($R^2 = .038, p < .001$). The estimated annual income was a significant predictor ($\beta = .197, p < .001$). After adding core and balance family leisure into the second block there was a significant change in the model ($\Delta R^2 = .104, p < .001$). Annual income remained a significant predictor while both core ($\beta = .241, p < .001$) and balance family leisure involvement ($\beta = .110, p = .029$) were once again significant predictors of total family functioning. After adding core and balance family leisure satisfaction into the third block there was a significant change in the model ($\Delta R^2 = .178, p < .001$). Core family leisure involvement ($\beta = .093, p = .049$) remained a significant predictor while balance family leisure involvement did not. Core family leisure satisfaction ($\beta = .450, p < .001$) also became a significant predictor of total family functioning from the youth perspective.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the contribution of fathers' involvement in family leisure to aspects of family functioning. Results from the father and youth perspective indicated significant relationships between father involvement in both core and balance family leisure to various aspects of family functioning (cohesion, adaptability, and total family

functioning). Father involvement in core family leisure activities proved to be strongly related to all aspects of family functioning. Of particular interest was the finding that father involvement in core family leisure is the strongest predictor of family adaptability from the youth perspective. Examining satisfaction with family leisure participation also provided interesting insights into the relationship between father involvement in family leisure involvement and aspects of family functioning. Satisfaction with father involvement in core family leisure was the single strongest significant predictor of all aspects of family functioning from both the father and youth perspective. Moreover, this is the first family leisure study to examine a father's involvement in family leisure and its relation to family functioning from both a father and youth perspective. Although study limitations must be considered, findings have specific and meaningful implications for fathers, families, practitioners, scholars, and policy makers.

Comparison of Mean Scores

Previous studies which have examined family leisure involvement and family functioning have provided meaningful insights into family recreation and family functioning, however, the majority of responses (between 70 and 90 percent) in most of these studies, has been from a mother's perspective, and may or may not have included family leisure with the father present (Dodd et al., 2009; Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). The current study is unique in that it examined a father's involvement in family leisure from the father's perspective. Findings from the present study indicate fathers being involved in nearly the same amount of core family leisure activities as previous studies, but being involved in less balance leisure activities from both the father and youth perspective. Zabriskie and McCormick reported a mean score of 42.95 (SD = 13.22) for core family leisure involvement and 60.15 (SD = 24.80) for balance family leisure involvement from the parent perspective which was 77% female. The

present study reported a mean of 41.30 (SD = 16.08) for core family leisure involvement and 44.76 (SD = 29.17) for balance family leisure involvement from the father perspective which also specifically includes leisure with the father present. Fathers are involved in nearly the same amount of core family leisure as mothers' perception of general family involvement. Such findings provide further support to the trend of increased father involvement in the home (Bianchi, 2000) as well as recent research which suggests that for fathers, family and home-based leisure activities are the main context for leisure as well as the main site for familial attachment and affiliation (Larson, Gillman, & Richards, 1997).

Relationship Between Family Leisure Involvement and Family Functioning

Researchers have consistently found a relationship between family leisure involvement and family functioning (Dodd et al., 2009; Hornberger et al., 2010; Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003). While recent qualitative studies have emerged finding links between father involvement, leisure, and aspects of family functioning (Brotherson et al., 2005; Harrington, 2006), the current study is among the first to examine that relationship with a large sample of families allowing quantitative methods to obtain more specific information pertaining to various aspects of both father involvement in family leisure involvement and family functioning. Therefore, this study both supports and adds additional insight to the present body of knowledge concerning father involvement and the benefit of family leisure for them.

Findings indicated a positive multivariate relationship between core and balance family leisure involvement and family cohesion from both a father ($p < .01$) and youth ($p < .01$) perspective. Core family leisure activities are usually common, low-cost, home-based, spontaneous, and require little planning. Even after taking into account other family characteristics such as highest level of education, annual income, unemployment, and history of

divorce, father involvement in core family leisure was the strongest predictor of family cohesion from both the father and youth perspective. In other words, fathers who regularly participated in activities such as board games, home meals, gardening, reading books, etc., with his family reported higher levels of family cohesion. This finding is in line with previous qualitative research (Brotherson et al., 2005) which suggests that shared activities of play between a father and his child lead to a sense of companionship and enjoyment. This study extends beyond connection with only children to include a sense of cohesion, or connectedness, among the complete family unit.

In the 1970s terms such as ‘Disneyland dad’ became commonly used to describe the leisure patterns of fathers, particularly nonresident fathers. This term characterized fathers as only participating in those activities which are expensive and extraordinary, or in other words, balance family leisure activities. Employing the core and balance framework, Swinton et al. (2008) examined nonresident fathers’ leisure patterns and found that this was not true among her sample and reported higher levels of core family leisure involvement. Findings from this study add further support by indicating that participation in core family leisure activities explained more variance with respect to family functioning than participation in balance family leisure among intact families. Although participation in balance family leisure activities is important and needed, it was fathers’ involvement in the everyday family leisure activities that held more weight than the large, extravagant, out of the ordinary types of activities when examining family functioning.

Contrary to what is predicted by the Core and Balance Model, findings indicated father involvement in core family leisure activities as the strongest predictor of family adaptability (before adding the third block with the family leisure satisfaction variables) from the father

perspective and the only family leisure involvement variable to predict family adaptability from the youth perspective. This finding suggests that a father's participation in core family leisure activities also provides children necessary experiences to learn flexibility in various family situations, especially according to the view of the child. Perhaps children view their father's participation in the everyday play time as not only a time to bond with their father, but a time where they learn various skills that allow them to be more adaptable. The generative fathering perspective (Dollahite & Hawkins, 1998) proposes fathering as generative work, meaning "caring for and contributing to the next generation" (Dollahite & Hawkins, p. 110) through meeting the various needs of their children. Dollahite and Hawkins propose the work of recreation as a means by which fathers help children to cooperate and challenge their skills and coping abilities. Current findings clearly provide empirical support to this reasoning.

Furthermore, Harrington (2006) found that fathers used the context of sport to show an interest in and bond with their children as well as to inculcate values and lifelong social skills in line with Shaw and Dawson's (2001) purposive leisure. Current findings also suggest that children view the everyday leisure activities with their fathers as a time to learn various social skills and coping abilities that may help them adapt and be flexible in various family situations just as much as fathers in previous studies view leisure time as a time to teach such skills.

Findings also indicated father involvement in both core and balance family leisure activities predicted total family functioning from both the father and youth perspective with core activities being a slightly stronger predictor than balance activities. This finding is consistent with previous research examining family leisure involvement and has been found among a variety of family structures including families with adoptive children of color (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003), Hispanic families (Christenson et al., 2006), and single-parent families (Smith

et al., 2004). This is the first study, however, to look specifically at father involvement in family leisure and to evaluate it from a father and youth perspective. It is also the first to examine father involvement in family leisure and its relation to a family variable such as family cohesion, family adaptability, and family functioning, and it does so using a large, nationally reflective sample. Furthermore, this study also extended beyond simply measuring the level of family leisure participation to examine the quality of the experiences, or the satisfaction with family leisure and its relationship to aspects of family functioning.

Relationship Between Satisfaction With Family Leisure Involvement and Family Functioning

Whereas past research has primarily focused on participation in various aspects of family leisure, additional insights from our findings include evaluating the quality, or satisfaction with family leisure involvement. Findings from both the father and youth perspective indicated core family leisure satisfaction as the single greatest contributor ($p < .001$) to all aspects of family functioning (cohesion, adaptability, and total family functioning) even after controlling for socio-demographic variables such as annual income, family size, history of divorce, level of education, and unemployment. Satisfaction with balance family leisure activities were only significantly related to family adaptability from the father perspective. These findings emphasize that it is not simply the amount of involvement fathers spend in leisure activities with their children and family that is related to greater family functioning, but rather leisure provides a context through which quality, meaningful, and satisfying interactions may take place, which in turn predicts greater family functioning. This is particularly true concerning core family leisure activities. In today's busy society, fathers often have commitments in multiple places while also placing weight on the amount of time spent in family leisure when it appears that the satisfaction of

father involvement in everyday leisure activities is more important than level of involvement when considering various aspects of family functioning.

Such findings related to core family leisure satisfaction are consistent with previous work (Agate et al., 2009). While examining satisfaction with family life, Agate et al. found core family leisure satisfaction to be the single strongest predictor from both a parent and youth perspective. The consistency and strength of the contribution of core family leisure satisfaction to the various aspects of family functioning not only confirms the importance of core family leisure, but also adds strength to its significance, particularly from the youth perspective. Data suggest that when children are satisfied with the father being present in core family leisure activities, youth tend to report their family functioning higher than when they are not satisfied. Rather than the expensive family vacation, being satisfied with activities such as eating dinner together, reading books, or playing board games with the father present was the single strongest predictor of all aspects of family functioning, (cohesion, adaptability, and total family functioning) particularly from the youth perspective.

Practical Implications

Findings from this study have several valuable implications for fathers, professionals who work with and study fathers and families, and policy makers. This is the first study to identify specifically father involvement in family leisure as well as satisfaction with family leisure being related to family functioning. Professionals who work with families often overlook the role of father involvement in family leisure. These findings, however, clearly indicate that father involvement in family leisure is an indispensable component of family life and must be considered. They not only provide empirical evidence, but they do so with a large, relatively representative sample and from a father and youth perspective, and do so even after for

controlling for demographic variables such as highest level of education, income, unemployment, history of divorce and family size. Furthermore, they give relatively clear direction as to the kinds of family leisure activities in which fathers should be involved.

It is important to identify core family leisure involvement and core family leisure satisfaction as essential elements of family life in which fathers should be involved. In other words, it is the common, ordinary parts of a fathers' relationship with his children in family leisure (Call, 2002) that contribute most to family functioning. Professionals who work with families and particularly fathers would do well to use this information to help develop programs that promote fathers being involved in quality, everyday, home-based leisure activities with their families. Fathers may want to consider participating in activities such as family meals, board games, reading together, or other common activities that can be done together at home with little or no resources. Professionals could also consider teaching fathers the importance of their involvement in the everyday leisure activities, provide ideas of activities fathers could be involved in, and facilitate regular participation in such home-based activities.

Policymakers may also benefit from the findings of this study. Laws and policies shape the borders of fatherhood, fathering, and father identities. "Policy frameworks shape the kinds of choices men make as fathers and foster certain kinds of identities and interests. Public discourse creates hegemonic ideologies around fatherhood, which can be enabling or constraining for fathers" (Hobson, 2002, p. 14). By informing policymakers about leisure and fatherhood, and shaping policy to encourage and support fatherhood, perhaps fathers will feel more enabled to fill their role in the home. Findings of this study may assist policymakers in helping fathers make and find time to spend in the home with their families. Employers may provide more flexible

work schedules to permit fathers the time at home to be with their families allowing them the time and opportunities to strengthen the family unit.

Future Research

Although several implications exist from this study, it must be recognized that there are limitations as well. This study used correlational techniques to determine relationships, and therefore causal inferences cannot be determined or assumed without further research. In order to determine directionality of the relationships between father involvement in family leisure to family functioning, longitudinal studies with experimental designs must be employed. Although this study was delivered to a large nationally reflective group and met national averages for ethnicity and marital status, it was not a true random sample and therefore the results cannot simply be generalized to all families. A large, randomized, national sample is recommended for use in future studies examining father involvement in family leisure to allow generalization to a broader population. Future research may also benefit by collecting data from all family members so as to gain a complete view of a fathers' involvement in family leisure. Future research would also do well to examine other dependent variables, such as satisfaction with family life or family communication, and their relationship to father involvement in family leisure. Possible societal factors that may have contributed to the importance of father involvement in core family leisure and activities and satisfaction of those activities should also be explored.

Father involvement in core family leisure involvement seems to greatly affect all aspects of family functioning. Contrary to what is predicted by the Core and Balance model and particularly interesting to this study was the importance adolescents placed on father involvement in core family leisure and its positive relation to family adaptability. Scholars should attempt to gain a more in-depth understanding of this relationship. Qualitative methods

may be beneficial in determining the characteristics of father involvement in core family leisure, particularly from a youth perspective. It may also be beneficial to examine specific core leisure activities in which fathers participate to determine if variations exist between these relationships.

References

- Agate, J., Zabriskie, R., Agate, S., & Poff, R. (2009). Family leisure satisfaction and satisfaction with family. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(2), 205-223.
- Bianchi (2000). Employment and time with children: Dramatic change or surprising continuity? *Demography*, 37(4), 401-414.
- Brotherson, S. E., Dollahite, D. C., & Hawkins, A. J. (2005). Generative fathering and the dynamics of connection between fathers and their children. *Fathering*, 3(1), 1-28.
- Call, J. (2002). Finding the extraordinary in the ordinary. *Marriages and Families*, 7, 7-18.
- Christenson, O., Zabriskie, R., Eggett, D., & Freeman, P. (2006). Family acculturation, family leisure involvement, and family functioning among Mexican-Americans. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 38(4), 475-495.
- DeNavas-Walt, C., Proctor, B. D., & Smith, J. C. (2008). Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States:2007. *Current Population Reports*, (p. 60-235). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Dodd, D., Zabriskie, R., Widmer, M., & Eggett, D. (2009). Contributions of family leisure to family functioning among families that include children with developmental disabilities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(2), 261-286.
- Doherty, W. J., Kouneski, E. F., & Erickson, M. F. (1998). Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual framework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60(2), 277-292.
- Dollahite, D. C., & Hawkins, A. J. (1998). A conceptual ethic of generative fathering. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 7(1), 109-132.
- Easterbrooks, M. A., & Goldberg, W. A. (1984). Toddler development in the family: Impact of father involvement and parenting characteristics. *Child Development*, 55(3), 740-752.

- Eggebeen, D. J. (2002). The changing course of fatherhood: Men's experiences with children in demographic perspective. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23(4), 486-506.
- Ejiri, K., & Masatake, N. (2001). Co-occurrence of preverbal vocal behavior and motor action in early infancy. *Developmental Science*, 4(1), 40-48.
- Erikson, E. (1963). *Childhood and Society*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Esposito, S. A. (1995). Cohesion and adaptability in the non-custodial father-child relationship: The effects of interaction quality. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 23(1), 21-38.
- Fagan, J., & Iglesias, A. (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.
- Freeman, P. A., & Zabriskie, R. B. (2003). Leisure and family functioning in adoptive families: Implications for therapeutic recreation. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 37(1), 73-93.
- Grossman, K., Grossman, K. E., Fremmer-Bombik, E., Kindler, H., Scheuerer-Englisch, H., & Zimmerman, P. (2002). The uniqueness of the child-father attachment relationship: Fathers' sensitive and challenging play as a pivotal variable in a 16-year longitudinal study. *Social Development*, 11(3), 307-331.
- Harrington, M. (2006). Sport and leisure as contexts for fathering in Australian families. *Leisure Studies*, 25(2), 165-183.
- Hawkins, A. J., & Palkovitz, R. (1999). Beyond ticks and clicks: The need for more diverse and broader conceptualizations and measures of father involvement. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 8(1), 11-32.
- Hawks, S. R. (1991). Recreation in the family. In S. J. Bahr (Ed.), *Family research: A sixty year review, 1930-1990*, Vol. 1 (pp. 387-433). New York: Lexington books.

- Hobson, B. (2002). *Making men into fathers: Men, masculinities and the social politics of fatherhood*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Holman, T. B., & Epperson, A. (1984). Family leisure: A review of the literature with research recommendations. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 16(4), 277-294.
- Hornberger, L., Zabriskie, R. & Freeman, P. (2010) Contributions of family leisure to family functioning among single-parent families. *Leisure Sciences*, 32(2), 143-161.
- Johnson, H., Zabriskie, R. & Hill, B. (2006). The contribution of couple leisure involvement, leisure time, and leisure satisfaction to marital satisfaction. *Marriage and Family Review*, 40(1), 69-91.
- Lamb, M. E. (1987). Introduction: The emergent American father. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father's role: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 3-25). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Larson, R. W., Gillman, A., & Richards, M. (1997). Divergent experiences of family leisure: Fathers, mothers, and young adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29(1), 78-97.
- Marks, L., & Palkovitz, R. (2004). American Fatherhood Types: The good, the bad, and the uninterested. *Fathering*, 2(2), 113-129.
- Marsiglio, W. (1991). Paternal engagement activities with minor children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 53(4), 973-986.
- Nicholls, W. J. & Pike, L. T. (2002). Contact fathers' experience of family life. *Journal of Family Studies*, 8(1), 74-88.
- Nugent, J. K. (1991). Cultural and psychological influences on the father's role in infant development. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 53(2), 475-485.

- Olson, D. H., & DeFrain, J. (1997). Understanding family relationships. In D. H. Olson & J. DeFrain (Ed.), *Marriage and the family: Diversity and strengths* (pp. 65-97). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Olson, D. H., McCubbin, H. I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M., & Wilson, M. (1992). *Family inventories: 2nd revision*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Orthner, D. K. (1975). Leisure activity patterns and marital satisfaction over the marital career. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50(1), 60-77.
- Orthner, D. K. (1976). Patterns of leisure and marital interaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 37(7), 91-102.
- Orthner, D. K., & Mancini, J. A. (1990). Leisure impacts on family interaction and cohesion. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 22(1), 125-137.
- Orthner, D. K., & Mancini, J. A. (1991). Benefits of leisure for family bonding. In B. L. Driver, P. J. Brown, & G. L. Peterson (Eds.), *Benefits of leisure* (pp. 215-247). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Palisi, B. J. (1984). Marriage companionship and marriage well-being: A comparison of metropolitan areas in three countries. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 15, 43-56.
- Pettit, G. S., Brown, E. G., Mize, J., & Lindsey, E. (1998). Mothers' and fathers' socializing behaviors in three contexts: Links with children's peer competence. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 44(2), 173-188.
- Roggman, L. A., Boyce, L. K., Cook, G. A., Christiansen, K., & Jones, D. (2004). Playing with daddy: Social toy play, early head start, and developmental outcomes. *Fathering*, 2(1), 83-108.

- Shaw, S. M. & Dawson, D. (2001). Purposive leisure: Examining parental discourses on family activities. *Leisure Sciences*, 23(4), 217-231.
- Smith, G. T., Snyder, T. J., & Monsma, B. R. (1988). Predicting relationship satisfaction from couples' use of leisure time. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 16(1), 3-13.
- Smith, K. M., Taylor, S., Hill, B., & Zabriskie, R. B. (2004). Family functioning and leisure in single-parent families. Abstracts from the 2004 Leisure Research Symposium. Ashburn, VA: National Recreation and Parks Association.
- Stacks, A. M., & Oshio, T. (2009). Disorganized attachment and social skills as indicators of Head Start children's school readiness skills. *Attachment and Human Behavior*, 11(2), 143-164.
- Swinton, A. T., Zabriskie, R. B., Freeman, P. A., & Fields, P. J. (2008). Nonresident fathers' family leisure patterns during parenting time with their children. *Fathering*, 6(3), 205-225.
- Tabachink, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2008). American community survey: 2008 American community survey 1-year estimates. Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTTTable?_bm=y&-context=dt&-ds_name=ACS_2008_1YR_G00_-CONTEXT=dt&-mt_name=ACS_2008_1YR_G2000_B02001&-tree_id=306&-redoLog=false&-all_geo_types=N&-currentselections=ACS_2006_EST_G2000_B02001&-geo_id=01000US&-search_results=01000US&-format=&-_lang=en
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2009). America's families and living arrangements: Marital status of people 15 years and over, by age, sex, personal earnings, race, and Hispanic origin,

2009. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hh-fam/cps2009.html>.
- White, J. & Klein, D. (2008). The systems framework. In J. M. White & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Family theories* (pp. 151-177). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yogman, M. W., Kindlon, D., & Earls, F. (1995). Father involvement and cognitive/behavioral outcomes of preterm infants. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 34(1), 58-66.
- Zabriskie, R. B. (2000). An examination of family and leisure behavior among families with middle school aged children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.
- Zabriskie, R. B. (2001). The validity and reliability of the Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP). In M. E. Havitz & M. F. Floyed (Eds.), *Abstracts from the 2001 Symposium on Leisure Research* (p. 66). Ashburn, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2001). The influences of family leisure patterns on perceptions of family functioning. *Family Relations*, 50(3), 281-289.

Table 1

Summary of Blocked Regression Equations Predicting Family Cohesion: Father Data

| Predictor | B | SE B | β | p |
|--|-------|------|---------|---------|
| Block 1 $R^2 = .009$ ($p = .224$) | | | | |
| Highest level of education | -.383 | .308 | -.060 | .214 |
| Estimated annual income | .339 | .174 | .097 | .052 |
| Unemployed within past year | .422 | .975 | .018 | .665 |
| History of divorce | .641 | .871 | .029 | .462 |
| Block 2 $\Delta R^2 = .090$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | -.454 | .294 | -.071 | .124 |
| Estimated annual income | .204 | .167 | .058 | .224 |
| Unemployed within past year | .736 | .933 | .032 | .431 |
| History of divorce | .809 | .833 | .037 | .332 |
| Core family leisure | .098 | .025 | .181 | <.001** |
| Balance family leisure | .057 | .017 | .158 | .001** |
| Block 3 $\Delta R^2 = .123$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | -.484 | .274 | -.075 | .079 |
| Estimated annual income | .051 | .157 | .015 | .746 |
| Unemployed within past year | .404 | .870 | .018 | .642 |
| History of divorce | .583 | .776 | .027 | .453 |
| Core family leisure | .018 | .026 | .033 | .488 |
| Balance family leisure | .050 | .016 | .139 | .002** |
| Core leisure satisfaction | .541 | .093 | .359 | <.001** |
| Balance leisure satisfaction | .060 | .085 | .041 | .481 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; $n = 647$. Total amount of variance explained by model, $R^2 = .222$

Table 2

Summary of Blocked Regression Equations Predicting Family Adaptability: Father Data

| Predictor | B | SE B | β | p |
|--|-------|------|---------|---------|
| Block 1 $R^2 = .075$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | .467 | .236 | .092 | .049* |
| Estimated annual income | .499 | .134 | .180 | <.001** |
| Unemployed within past year | .084 | .749 | .005 | .911 |
| History of divorce | 1.448 | .669 | .084 | .031* |
| Block 2 $\Delta R^2 = .092$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | .419 | .225 | .082 | .063 |
| Estimated annual income | .394 | .128 | .142 | .002** |
| Unemployed within past year | .313 | .714 | .017 | .661 |
| History of divorce | 1.555 | .637 | .090 | .015** |
| Core family leisure | .090 | .019 | .208 | <.001** |
| Balance family leisure | .037 | .013 | .131 | .004** |
| Block 3 $\Delta R^2 = .199$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | .370 | .197 | .073 | .061 |
| Estimated annual income | .242 | .112 | .087 | .032* |
| Unemployed within past year | .028 | .625 | .002 | .965 |
| History of divorce | 1.345 | .557 | .078 | .016* |
| Core family leisure | .018 | .019 | .042 | .334 |
| Balance family leisure | .025 | .012 | .087 | .036* |
| Core leisure satisfaction | .451 | .066 | .376 | <.001** |
| Balance leisure satisfaction | .164 | .061 | .143 | .007** |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; $n = 647$. Total amount of variance explained by model, $R^2 = .365$.

Table 3

Summary of Blocked Regression Equations Predicting Family Functioning: Father Data

| Predictor | B | SE B | β | p |
|--|-------|------|---------|---------|
| Block 1 $R^2 = .032$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | -.003 | .049 | -.003 | .953 |
| Estimated annual income | .090 | .028 | .160 | .001** |
| Unemployed within past year | .033 | .155 | .009 | .833 |
| History of divorce | .193 | .139 | .055 | .165 |
| Block 2 $\Delta R^2 = .113$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | -.015 | .046 | -.014 | .751 |
| Estimated annual income | .066 | .026 | .117 | .013* |
| Unemployed within past year | .087 | .146 | .023 | .553 |
| History of divorce | .220 | .131 | .063 | .093 |
| Core family leisure | .019 | .004 | .218 | <.001** |
| Balance family leisure | .009 | .003 | .161 | <.001** |
| Block 3 $\Delta R^2 = .178$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | -.021 | .041 | -.020 | .612 |
| Estimated annual income | .036 | .024 | .064 | .126 |
| Unemployed within past year | .024 | .131 | .006 | .855 |
| History of divorce | .176 | .117 | .050 | .130 |
| Core family leisure | .004 | .004 | .043 | .337 |
| Balance family leisure | .008 | .002 | .136 | .002** |
| Core leisure satisfaction | .103 | .014 | .422 | <.001** |
| Balance leisure satisfaction | .014 | .013 | .061 | .267 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; $n = 647$. Total amount of variance explained by model, $R^2 = .323$.

Table 4

Summary of Blocked Regression Equations Predicting Family Cohesion: Youth Data

| Predictor | B | SE B | β | p |
|--|-------|------|---------|---------|
| Block 1 $R^2 = .013$ ($p = .143$) | | | | |
| Highest level of education | -.464 | .308 | -.073 | .133 |
| Estimated annual income | .482 | .174 | .139 | .006** |
| Unemployed within past year | -.429 | .977 | -.019 | .661 |
| History of divorce | -.143 | .878 | -.007 | .871 |
| Family size | .242 | .351 | .028 | .491 |
| Block 2 $\Delta R^2 = .090$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | -.372 | .295 | -.058 | .208 |
| Estimated annual income | .320 | .168 | .092 | .057 |
| Unemployed within past year | .075 | .935 | .003 | .936 |
| History of divorce | -.027 | .838 | -.001 | .974 |
| Family size | .035 | .336 | .004 | .916 |
| Core family leisure | .102 | .027 | .197 | <.001** |
| Balance family leisure | .043 | .016 | .134 | .009** |
| Block 3 $\Delta R^2 = .131$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | -.407 | .274 | -.064 | .137 |
| Estimated annual income | .110 | .157 | .032 | .484 |
| Unemployed within past year | .105 | .866 | .005 | .904 |
| History of divorce | -.142 | .776 | -.007 | .855 |
| Family size | .399 | .314 | .045 | .204 |
| Core family leisure | .039 | .026 | .075 | .135 |
| Balance family leisure | .025 | .016 | .076 | .121 |
| Core leisure satisfaction | .521 | .103 | .354 | <.001** |
| Balance leisure satisfaction | .084 | .097 | .060 | .388 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; $n = 633$. Total amount of variance explained by model, $R^2 = .234$.

Table 5

Summary of Blocked Regression Equations Predicting Family Adaptability: Youth Data

| Predictor | B | SE B | β | P |
|--|-------|------|---------|---------|
| Block 1 $R^2 = .089$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | .179 | .258 | .032 | .489 |
| Estimated annual income | .667 | .146 | .224 | <.001** |
| Unemployed within past year | .158 | .818 | .008 | .846 |
| History of divorce | 2.264 | .735 | .120 | .002** |
| Family size | -.758 | .294 | -.099 | .010* |
| Block 2 $\Delta R^2 = .068$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | .263 | .249 | .047 | .291 |
| Estimated annual income | .549 | .142 | .182 | <.001** |
| Unemployed within past year | .511 | .790 | .026 | .518 |
| History of divorce | 2.317 | .708 | .123 | .001** |
| Family size | -.923 | .284 | -.120 | .001** |
| Core family leisure | .104 | .023 | .229 | <.001** |
| Balance family leisure | .014 | .014 | .048 | .331 |
| Block 3 $\Delta R^2 = .159$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | .231 | .225 | .042 | .306 |
| Estimated annual income | .347 | .129 | .115 | .007** |
| Unemployed within past year | .536 | .713 | .027 | .453 |
| History of divorce | 2.207 | .639 | .117 | .001** |
| Family size | -.575 | .258 | -.075 | .026* |
| Core family leisure | .042 | .021 | .093 | .049* |
| Balance family leisure | -.004 | .013 | -.014 | .762 |
| Core leisure satisfaction | .510 | .085 | .398 | <.001** |
| Balance leisure satisfaction | .071 | .080 | .058 | .378 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; $n = 633$. Total amount of variance explained by model, $R^2 = .316$.

Table 6

Summary of Blocked Regression Equations Predicting Family Functioning: Youth Data

| Predictor | B | SE B | β | P |
|--|-------|------|---------|---------|
| Block 1 $R^2 = .038$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | -.022 | .050 | -.021 | .661 |
| Estimated annual income | .111 | .028 | .197 | <.001** |
| Unemployed within past year | -.063 | .157 | -.017 | .687 |
| History of divorce | .173 | .141 | .049 | .219 |
| Family size | -.051 | .056 | -.035 | .370 |
| Block 2 $\Delta R^2 = .104$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | -.004 | .047 | -.004 | .929 |
| Estimated annual income | .083 | .027 | .147 | .002** |
| Unemployed within past year | .022 | .149 | .006 | .881 |
| History of divorce | .190 | .133 | .054 | .154 |
| Family size | -.088 | .053 | -.061 | .102 |
| Core family leisure | .020 | .004 | .241 | <.001** |
| Balance family leisure | .006 | .003 | .110 | .029* |
| Block 3 $\Delta R^2 = .178$ ($p < .001$)** | | | | |
| Highest level of education | -.009 | .042 | -.009 | .825 |
| Estimated annual income | .043 | .024 | .076 | .075 |
| Unemployed within past year | .025 | .133 | .007 | .853 |
| History of divorce | .169 | .119 | .048 | .157 |
| Family size | -.021 | .048 | -.014 | .668 |
| Core family leisure | .008 | .004 | .093 | .049* |
| Balance family leisure | .003 | .002 | .049 | .288 |
| Core leisure satisfaction | .108 | .016 | .450 | <.001** |
| Balance leisure satisfaction | .006 | .015 | .027 | .679 |

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; $n = 633$. Total amount of variance explained by model, $R^2 = .319$.

Appendix A
Prospectus

Chapter 1

Introduction

Two families living next to each other may appear to be very similar, but in actuality are extremely different. Let us suppose that both families are comprised of a mother, a father, and children. In both families the mother is a traditional caregiver, staying home to nurture and teach her children. The father is a traditional breadwinner, working long, hard hours to provide for his wife and children. Each family is comparable in levels of monetary income, opportunity for education, and availability of community resources. Yet, one family is happy and the other is not. What could make families that are so much alike, so different? If we investigated deeper into the lives of these families, we might find that in one family, the father is present and actively involved in the lives of his children and family. In the other, the father is absent, physically, mentally and emotionally.

Based on personal experience, I have often observed families similar to those described above. In the family where the father is not around, children become used to him being gone. When he steps back into family life, a lack of trust ensues and children do not want to, or may not be able to interact with him. They feel that all he does is step into their lives and mess everything up and walk back out. He does not play with them because he may not like to play sports or games or even know how, which can make it difficult to even talk with his children who are active in such activities. He cannot seem to make any sort of meaningful connection. There is a lack of bonding between family members and certainly a lack of flexibility among family relationships.

In the family where the father is around and active in the lives of his children, there seems to be greater happiness, love, and bonding. After coming home from a long day at work,

the father kicks off his shoes, loosens his tie, and heads outdoors to shoot some hoops with his children. One child struggles getting the basketball high enough to go in the hoop. This father encourages, helps, and shows an outpouring of love toward his young child. This child feels that because his father cares enough to help him make a basket, his dad must care about the bigger things in life, such as school, friends, and other extracurricular activities. Relationships among all members of the family are stronger because this father cares. The family loves to be together, laughing and playing games every spare minute. When problems arise, as they do in all families, healthy communication skills are used among members to overcome the difficult situations.

Research on fathers has focused on identifying how child outcomes are associated with patterns of father involvement, and has also been focused on investigating how fathers balance work away from the home, work inside the home, and involvement in child-rearing (Marks & Palkovitz, 2004). Although child outcomes are an important area of research, broader family outcomes in relation to father involvement, such as family functioning, have been overlooked. A family's ability to function at an optimal level is achieved through a balance of cohesion and adaptability (Olson & DeFrain, 1997). Olson and DeFrain describe cohesion as the family's ability to bond, and adaptability as the family's ability to manage change and separateness. As suggested in the cases above, a father participating in leisure with his children may be related to aspects of greater family functioning, such as cohesion and adaptability.

Research suggests that family leisure has a direct relationship with family cohesion and adaptability (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). The Core and Balance Model of Family Leisure Functioning suggests that core family activities, or those activities which are frequent, common, inexpensive and home-based, are primarily related to cohesion; while balance activities, meaning those that are less frequent, uncommon, done away from home, and require planning, are

primarily related to adaptability (Zabriskie & McCormick). Many studies have used the Core and Balance Model as a framework to examine family functioning and have consistently reported significant relationships between family leisure involvement and aspects of family functioning (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003; Hornberger, Zabriskie, & Freeman, in press; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

The majority of responses (between 70 and 90 percent) in most of these studies, however, has been from a mother's perspective, and may or may not have included family leisure with the father present. With the exception of one study that examined aspects of family leisure among nonresident fathers (Swinton, Zabriskie, Freeman & Fields, 2008), no studies have focused specifically on father involvement in family leisure and related family outcomes, especially from the fathers' perspective. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the contribution of fathers' involvement in family leisure to aspects of family functioning.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to examine the contribution of fathers' involvement in family leisure to aspects of family functioning.

Purpose of the Study

Little is known about the contribution of a father's involvement in family leisure to family functioning. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to gain further understanding of this relationship. Such information may provide insight and direction for researchers, family life educators, and program facilitators in their attempt to strengthen father involvement in the home, particularly in leisure with his children, as well as to improve family functioning.

Justification of the Study

There has been an increase of father involvement among the lives of their children in recent decades (Casper & Bianchi, 2002). Many positive outcomes for children have been related to this trend of increased father involvement (Marisglio, 1991; Pettit, Brown, Mize, Lindsey, 1998; Salem, Zimmerman, Notaro, 1998). Some outcomes include positive cognitive development (Bronte-Tinkew, Carrano, Horowitz, & Kinukawa, 2008), greater problem solving skills (Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984), healthier levels of attachment (Grossman, Grossman, Fremmer-Bombik, Kindler, Scheuerer-Englisch, & Zimmerman, 2002), greater peer competence (Pettit et al.), school readiness (Fagan & Iglesias, 1999), and greater mental health including psychosocial outcomes (Videon, 2005; Salem et al.). Considerable research has been done to examine the relationship between father involvement and child outcomes. However, the specific contribution of a father being involved with his children in family leisure to broader family outcomes, such as family functioning, has been overlooked.

Family functioning is often examined through a family systems framework. Family systems theory describes the family as a working system that interacts as it progresses through the dynamics of family life. Because the family is a working unit, each individual affects the family as a whole, while the family also affects each individual (White & Klein, 2008). Therefore, a father's involvement with his children in the home will likely influence individual child outcomes, and according to family systems theory, such involvement is also likely to influence broader family outcomes such as family functioning. Many behavioral characteristics have been linked to healthy family functioning, one of which is family leisure.

Researchers have reported a consistent relationship between family leisure and aspects of family functioning for decades (Hawks, 1991; Holman & Epperson, 1984; Orthner & Mancini,

1991). Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) reported a direct relationship between different types of family leisure and aspects of family functioning. Such findings have been consistent among different types of families such as adoptive families (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003), single parent families (Hornberger et al., in press), and families with a child with a disability (Dodd, Zabriskie, Widmer, & Eggett, 2009) and have been examined from both a parent and child perspective. Researchers have expressed the need for further study in the area of fatherhood and leisure (Kay, 2006). This study will strive to answer this call for further research by attempting to understand the relationship between a father's involvement in family leisure to family functioning. If a positive relationship is found between father involvement in family leisure and family functioning, findings will have meaningful implications for fathers and their families.

The information gained from this study may help strengthen the involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially in family leisure. It may also help to improve the functioning of families. Social policy is one major area to which this study may contribute. Laws and policies shape the borders of fatherhood, fathering, and father identities. "Policy frameworks shape the kinds of choices men make as fathers and foster certain kinds of identities and interests. Public discourse creates hegemonic ideologies around fatherhood, which can be enabling or constraining for fathers" (Hobson, 2002, p. 14). By informing policymakers about leisure and fatherhood, and shaping policy to encourage and support fatherhood, perhaps fathers will feel more enabled to fill their role. This information could, in turn, help family life education programs as well as civic entities that are in place to provide support and other services to encourage and strengthen father involvement.

Delimitations

The scope of the study will be delimited to the following:

1. The study will include 500 families from around the nation, which include a resident father and at least one child between 11 and 15 years old in the home.
2. Responses will be collected from the father and one child between the ages of 11 and 15.
3. The Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP) (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001) will be used to measure family leisure patterns.
4. The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES II) (Olson, 2000) will be used to measure family functioning (cohesion and adaptability).
5. Data will be collected online starting November 2009, until a sufficient amount of participants have responded (500).

Limitations

The following are limitations to the study:

1. The influence of the parent on the child's responses to the questionnaire cannot be followed.
2. Some people may be excluded from participating in the study due to the nature of online data collection, such as not having access to a computer with Internet.
3. Because methods of this study are correlational, causal relationships and directionality cannot be determined.
4. Due to the nature of data collection, the sample will not be random. Therefore, broad generalizability will not be possible.

Assumptions

The study will be based on the following assumptions:

1. Participants will answer to the best of their abilities and be honest in completing the questionnaire.

2. The FLAP instrument (Family Leisure Activity Profile) will provide a valid and reliable measure of family leisure involvement (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).
3. The FACES II instrument (Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales II) will provide a valid and reliable measure of family functioning (Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Larsen, Muxen, & Wilson, 1992).

Hypotheses

The study is designed to test the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no significant relationship between father involvement in total family leisure involvement and family functioning from a father and youth perspective.
2. There is no relationship between core and balance family activities and family cohesion from a father and youth perspective.
3. There is no relationship between core and balance family activities and family adaptability from a father and youth perspective.
4. There is no relationship between core and balance activities and family functioning from a father and youth perspective.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms are defined to clarify their use in the study:

Father involvement. A father is involved when he acts as an active participant in the details of day-to-day childcare and child activity. He is also involved in a more intimate and expressive way with his children, playing a larger part in the socialization process of his children (Rotundo, 1985). The most frequent interactions between fathers and children at home involve play. A father's participation in play activities can lead to the socialization of children (Roggman, Boyce, Cook, Christiansen & Jones, 2004).

Balance leisure patterns. Balance leisure patterns provide novel experiences through activities that are less common and frequent than core activities. Balance activities also usually require more planning, time, effort and money than core activities and are usually not home based (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

Core leisure patterns. Core leisure patterns are activities that are more frequent, more common, and require fewer resources, such as planning, time, effort and money, than balance activities. These activities are usually home-based, spontaneous, and informal (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

Family adaptability. Family adaptability is the family's ability, in response to situational and developmental stress, to change its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules (Olson, Portner, & Bell, 1982).

Family cohesion. Family cohesion refers to the emotional bonding between family members (Olson et al., 1982).

Family functioning. Family functioning can be explained and measured by levels of family adaptability and family cohesion (Olson et al., 1982).

Family leisure involvement. "All recreation and leisure activities family members participate in with other family members, including both core and balance family leisure patterns" (Zabriskie, 2000, p. 7).

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The problem of this study is to examine the contribution of fathers' involvement in family leisure to aspects of family functioning. For organizational purposes, the literature will be presented under the following topics: (a) father involvement, (b) family functioning, (c) family leisure and family functioning, and (d) father involvement in family leisure.

Father Involvement

Over the past two decades, researchers have tried to define father involvement and discover its impact on children (Marks & Palkovitz, 2004). Doherty, Kouneski, and Erickson (1998) define father involvement in terms of "responsible fathering," conveying that fathers who are responsible are those who are present at their child's birth and actively share with the mother in the continuing emotional and physical care of their child during and after pregnancy (p. 278), and share in the financial responsibility from pregnancy onwards. Pleck (1987) describes a *new father* as one that is involved in seeking to establish intimate bonds with his children while providing nurturance and affection, engaging in day-to-day caregiving tasks on his own, and is involved with his daughters as much as he is with his sons. Marks and Palkovitz (2004) argue that it is not a *new father* that is emerging, but a return to post-industrial ideals of fatherhood, wherein the father is involved in many aspects of their child's life, returning to roles such as "pedagogue, guidance counselor, benefactor, moral overseer, psychologist, model, progenitor, companion, caregiver, disciplinarian, and provider" (p. 115). Other ideas of fathering include engagement, accessibility, and responsibility (Marsiglio, 1991) as well as generative fathering (Dollahite & Hawkins, 1998), which all encompass similar characteristics to the new father.

Hawkins and Palkovitz (1999) argue that conceptualizations of father involvement have been limited to the amount of time spent in caring for children and that this conceptualization lacks other important dimensions of father involvement such as the nature and experience of the activities a father is involved in with his children. Drawing upon Erikson's (1963) concept of generativity, Hawkins and Palkovitz suggest it is an ethic of care and desire to nurture the rising generation that is a central component of father involvement. Dollahite and Hawkins (1998) further this conceptualization of father involvement describing this ethic as generative fathering, or *fatherwork*. They pose seven types of generative work that respond to the challenges of the human condition, including the work of recreation. The work of recreation that fathers are involved in incorporates teaching children about cooperation and challenge through play. According to Dollahite and Hawkins, this work of recreation is among the most valuable in caring for the next generation. Among this as well as other conceptualizations of fatherhood is the underlying trend that fathers are becoming more involved with their children in an effort to provide them with better outcomes.

Bianchi (2000) reported an increase in the number of hours a father spends in any activity with his child. In 1965, married fathers reported spending an average of 2.8 hours a day in any activity with his children, compared with 3.8 hours in 1998. Concurrent to the increase in father involvement, there has been an increase of attention in the popular press and research to father involvement (Eggebeen, 2002). One main area of research among fathers has been the relationship between father involvement and child outcomes (Eggebeen). Father involvement is often defined by participating in caregiving tasks and playing with their children (Marsiglio, 1991). Studies have shown that mothers and fathers are similar in the amounts of affection, object play, physical play, and conventional play interaction when they are playing with their

young children (Goldberg, Clarke-Stewart, Rice, & Dellis, 2002; Laflamme, Pomerleau, & Malcuit, 2002; Pettit et al., 1998). The outcomes, however, of these play interactions with the child may be quite different. Some children react uniquely to playing with fathers over playing with mothers, particularly the reaction of fathers' play with their sons over their daughters (Goldberg et al.; Marsiglio; Pettit et al.). Fathers' play involvement with their children may have many positive child outcomes in areas such as cognitive development, problem solving, attachment, peer competence, and school readiness (Bronte-Tinkew et al., 2008; Grossman et al., 2002; Pettit et al.; Salem et al., 1998).

Cognitive development. Fathers' play involvement may provide unique sources of cognitive stimulation and emotional support for infants as they explore their environments and acquire knowledge and skills (Nugent, 1991; Yogman, Kindlon, & Earls, 1995). Infant cognitive outcomes are precursors of later child outcomes, including motor outcomes which lay the building blocks for subsequent language development, higher thought processes, and language acquisition (Ejiri & Masatake, 2001). Roggman et al. (2004) found father-toddler social toy play, meaning play interactions that included conversation and meaningful responses, was positively related to children's cognitive development, language development, and emotional regulation at both 24 and 36 months, even after controlling for earlier childhood functioning. Some fathers were noted as having complex toy play interactions. These interactions extend beyond simply playing with and talking about the toys to include returning the toys, imitating each other with the toys, or continuing the conversation after playing with toys. Roggman et al. found the more complex the toy play interactions were between a father and their two-year olds, the better the children's cognitive, language, and emotional development. In other words, there is a clear

relationship between greater cognitive development and fathers' play interactions with their toddlers.

Bronte-Tinkew et al. (2008) suggest that the association between father involvement and infant cognitive outcomes varied by disability status. The positive influence of father involvement on cognitive outcomes was stronger for children with special needs than those without. This supports the findings of De Falco, Esposito, Venuti, and Bornstein (2008) who argue that father-child interaction can successfully enhance the level of play among children with Down Syndrome. According to De Falco et al., children first explore through play which help them learn concrete properties of objects. Later, children play symbolically, engaging in play interactions which are representative. This ability to symbolize is related to both cognitive and interpersonal development, making important the symbolic level of play (Beeghly, Weiss-Perry, & Cicchetti, 1989). When fathers of a child with Down Syndrome interact and play with their child, they provide the proper amount of cognitive help needed to increase the level of play from exploratory to symbolic (De Falco et al.). This increase in the level of play also suggests that a father's play involvement with a child with a disability enhances cognitive development. There is also evidence that greater cognitive development and higher thought processes may be related to problem solving skills (Ejiri & Masatake, 2001).

Problem solving and attachment. Fathers' play with their children may also provide a context to achieve better problem solving skills (Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984). Easterbrooks and Goldberg argue that the amount of time fathers spend with their children in play and caregiving activities is more related to their performance in a socio-cognitive task (i.e. problem-solving behavior) rather than socio-emotional development (i.e., attachment). They also argue that in the father-child relationship, children who were securely attached to their fathers

exhibited more positive affect and orientation in a problem-solving task. Grossman et al. (2002) also support the idea that fathers mainly provide sensitive support during explorative play of their toddlers allowing for secure attachment to take place. This secure attachment that is arguably influenced by a father's involvement (Grossman et al.) may provide insight into areas of child development such as peer competence and school readiness (Stacks & Oshio, 2009).

School readiness and peer competence. After examining father involvement in the Head Start program, Fagan and Iglesias (1999) found that children of fathers who were involved in the program showed improved academic readiness skills. Their involvement included volunteering in the classroom, coming to "Father's day" activities (i.e., participating in recreational activities during class), and playing more with their children (p. 249). Specifically, fathers who were more involved in the Head Start program were found to be effective in increasing the applied problem skills of their children. Fathers who were more involved in self-initiated and spontaneous play with their children were also shown to have a positive impact on their children's mathematical readiness. Stacks and Oshio (2009) argue that there is a link between social skills and school readiness. Among children in the Head Start program, social skills among peers that were not properly regulated were negatively correlated to school readiness (Fagan & Iglesias).

Another essential construct related to father-child play behavior is peer competence. Pettit et al. (1998) found that both mothers' and fathers' individual hands-on involvement in their children's play with a peer predicted children's competence, but in different ways: mothers' active involvement was associated with lower levels of peer acceptance, whereas fathers' active involvement was associated with higher levels of peer acceptance. Children were more likely to learn peer competence skills from experiences in play with their father than from their mother.

This suggests that father involvement in play with their children provides unique and meaningful opportunities to teach relationship skills.

Mental health. Father involvement in the home may also provide children with better mental health during adolescence. Videon (2005) indicated an association between high levels of satisfaction in a father-adolescent relationship and fewer depressive symptoms; this was found even after controlling for the impact of the adolescent's relationship with the mother. Findings of Flouri and Buchanan (2003) contradict those of Videon as they suggest early father involvement could not predict mental health outcomes in adolescence and adult life. Although, Flouri and Buchanan do suggest that when fathers were involved in the lives of their children growing up, if the parents were to divorce, adolescent children would have an easier time psychologically adjusting after the separation than those whose fathers were less involved.

Salem et al. (1998) found father involvement may play an integral part in preventing psychological distress among daughters while helping sons avoid problem behaviors. They suggest time with fathers was inversely correlated with marijuana use, cigarette use, alcohol use, and depression. Furthermore, when adolescents viewed their relationship with their father as important they reported less alcohol use, marijuana use, delinquency, anxiety, and depression. In other words, the more fathers are involved in the home with their adolescent children, the less likely their children are to use drugs, alcohol, be delinquent, and have anxiety issues or depression. Although father involvement in the home, including play activities and caregiving activities with their children, appears to be related to positive individual child outcomes, limited research extends beyond father involvement and individual child outcomes to include broader family outcomes such as quality of family life, family life satisfaction, and family functioning.

Family Functioning

Family systems theory is a widely accepted framework utilized to understand family behaviors. This framework suggests that a family is greater than the sum of its parts; each individual in the family affects the whole, while the whole family affects each individual member (White & Klein, 2008). Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) summarize family systems theory by stating it “holds that families are goal directed, self-correcting, dynamic, interconnected systems that both affect and are affected by their environment and by qualities within the family system itself” (p. 281). Because family systems theory suggests that each individual affects the family as a whole, then a father’s involvement in the home should also be associated with family outcomes, such as family functioning, as well as individual child outcomes.

Olson and DeFrain (1997) have attempted to capture the dynamics of family systems in the Family Circumplex Model. Three main dimensions are embodied in the Family Circumplex Model: (a) cohesion, (b) adaptability, and (c) communication. Olson and DeFrain define cohesion as “a feeling of emotional closeness with another person” (p. 72) and adaptability as “the ability of the family to change power structure, roles and rules in the relationship” (p. 75). The third dimension, communication, allows the family to move through levels of cohesion and adaptability. The Family Circumplex Model suggests that family cohesion and family adaptability are defining characteristics of family functioning (Olson & DeFrain).

Esposito (1995) used the Family Circumplex Model to examine the quality of nonresident father interaction and family functioning. Father interaction was defined by how the father feels about the interactions he has with his child(ren). A correlation was found between the quality of the father-child interaction and cohesion, but not adaptability. These findings are also supported

by Nicholls and Pike (2002) who suggest that the quality of father-child interactions among contact fathers, or nonresident fathers, predicted cohesion but not adaptability in the contact father-child family. Although these studies have examined the relationship between father involvement and family functioning, these studies are limited by only examining nonresident fathers as well as the way in which they define father involvement. Among studies examining family functioning (Esposito; Nicholls & Pike), father involvement has only been defined by how fathers feel about the quality of interactions with their child. Other behavioral characteristics that happen to be consistently related to family functioning, such as a father's involvement with family leisure and recreational habits, have not been examined.

Family Leisure and Family Functioning

Historically, it has been argued that family leisure is beneficial to families in the areas of family satisfaction, marital interaction, and family stability (Orthner & Mancini, 1991). Multiple studies have found married couples who participate in joint leisure are more satisfied in their relationships than those who participate in individual leisure activities (Orthner, 1975, 1976; Orthner & Mancini, 1990; Palisi, 1984; Smith, Snyder, & Monsma, 1988). Limitations to these early research studies are that most of the research has been among married couples, and these studies generalized findings from marital leisure to the family as a whole.

In more recent decades, several studies have investigated the family as a whole. Shaw and Dawson (2001) found that families intentionally used family leisure as a means to enhance family functioning, calling this type of leisure *purposive leisure*. They reported that parents tend to set goals to improve family communication, cohesion, and create a strong sense of family through the use of family leisure. Hawks (1991) also concluded after six decades of research, that family leisure is related to cohesiveness among family members. Zabriskie and McCormick

(2001) have consistently reported a direct relationship between family leisure involvement and family cohesion, adaptability, and overall family functioning using a Core and Balance family leisure framework.

The Core and Balance Model of Family Leisure Functioning is grounded in family systems theory and implies a direct relationship between family leisure and aspects of family functioning, namely cohesion and adaptability (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). It classifies family leisure into two basic types, core and balance. Core family activity patterns tend to meet the need “for familiarity and stability” by providing regular experiences in family leisure that are predictable and promote closeness among family members as well as personal relatedness (Zabriskie & McCormick, p. 283). On the other hand, balance family activity patterns, tend to meet the need for challenge and change as they provide avenues for the family to grow, be challenged, and develop as a functioning system (Zabriskie & McCormick).

Core activities are those which are done usually inside or near the home and are performed often. These activities usually do not cost any money or very little, if necessary. Examples of core activities include shooting hoops in the driveway, playing board games, or going on family walks. These activities provide a context for families to deepen and build relationships in a nonthreatening environment. Core leisure activities are often engaged in a socializing context which provides a means for families to communicate, not only about common everyday events, but those events, feelings, or emotions that may be more difficult for family members to express (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

Zabriskie & McCormick (2001) describe balance patterns as activities which are usually done away from the home, are novel experiences, not done often, and may require more resources such as time, effort, and money. Because they usually require more planning, they are

often less spontaneous, occur less often, and tend to last longer than core activities. Examples of these activities include family vacation, camping out, going on a hike, or attending a public swimming pool. Because balance family leisure activities are usually accompanied with novelty and unpredictability, they create an environment for challenges, new input, and experiences that involve family members needing to adapt to and negotiate with each other (Zabriskie & McCormick). Zabriskie & McCormick suggest that balance activities are theoretically linked to adaptability. They provide families with the skills to cope with change and be flexible when needed.

The Core and Balance Model suggests that families who participate in both core and balance family leisure activities are more likely to report higher cohesion, adaptability, and overall family functioning than those that do not (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). In a study among college-aged young adults, Zabriskie and McCormick found core activity patterns were related to greater family cohesion and balance family leisure involvement was related to family adaptability. Overall, those who reported more family leisure involvement also reported higher family functioning. Freeman and Zabriskie (2003) found among families with bi-racial adoptive children that family leisure involvement was the strongest predictor of family functioning even when considering socio-demographic variables such as age, gender, race, family size, religion, history of divorce, and annual income. Among parents of this study, both core and balance activity patterns were significant predictors of family functioning. Similar findings among different types of families, such as families with a child with a disability (Dodd et al., 2009) and single-parent families (Hornberger et al., in press), suggest that both core and balance activities are essential, and that families who regularly participate in both types of leisure activities report higher levels of family functioning than those who participate in low amounts of either category.

The Core and Balance Model appears to offer a sound theoretical framework from which to examine fathers' leisure involvement and family functioning. These studies provide meaningful insights into family recreation and family functioning, however, the majority of responses (between 70 and 90 percent) in most of these studies, has been from a mother's perspective, and may or may not have included family leisure with the father present.

Father Involvement in Family Leisure

Family functioning in relation to family leisure and father involvement has been overlooked. One study links aspects of family leisure and nonresident fathers' involvement. Swinton et al. (2008) used the Core and Balance Model as a framework to examine the relationship between nonresident fathers and family leisure patterns. They reported nonresident fathers participated in more core activities than balance activities. They also found leisure constraints, such as interpersonal (constraints within oneself), intrapersonal (constraints related to relationships), and structural constraints (constraints related to society), were negatively correlated with satisfaction of family leisure, but leisure facilitators were not. In other words, the more leisure constraints associated with self, others, and society at large a nonresident father perceived, the less satisfied they were with family leisure, whereas, facilitators to leisure were unrelated to satisfaction with family leisure. Although this study provides some insight into family leisure patterns and father involvement, family functioning was not specifically examined. Another limitation to this study was that only the leisure patterns of nonresident fathers were explored. Only a few qualitative studies have found links between father involvement, leisure, and aspects of family functioning among resident fathers (Brotherson, Dollahite, and Hawkins, 2005; Harrington, 2006).

In a qualitative analysis of interviews from 16 resident fathers, Brotherson et al. (2005) discovered avenues of achieving connectedness among fathers and children. They found fathers were able to feel connected with their children through spending meaningful time together in activities of recreation (e.g., camping, hunting and picnicking) and activities of play or learning (e.g., hide and seek, checkers, and word games). While spending time doing recreational activities, fathers expressed a sense of companionship and enjoyment. One father mentioned how playing soccer with his children provided an opportunity for meaningful connections. Brotherson et al. argue that “in a society that increasingly demands the time and attention of parents, these connecting moments in a father-child relationship gain greater importance and suggest the value of the ‘little things’ that create a sense of connection” (p. 16). Call (2002) also suggests that common, ordinary parts of fathers’ relationships with their children (e.g., cuddling on the couch, talking over dinner, or sharing drinks) are crucial to experiencing a connection between father and child. These studies provide evidence that core activities and common leisure experiences help in providing cohesiveness among fathers and children.

In a qualitative study among Australian fathers, Harrington (2006) found that sports were a common way fathers interacted and bonded with their children. Fathers sought to instill positive memories of family life that would hopefully be passed on through generations. Fathers expressed using the context of sports because they felt knowledgeable in that area and felt they could share sporting knowledge with their children. Lamb (1987) has theorized that fathers are more likely to be more involved with their children when they feel they have self-confidence and skills to meet the needs of the role. Seeing that these Australian fathers have more confidence in the area of sports and leisure, it would seem natural for them to want to be more involved with their children in this area of life. Coakley (2006) argues that fathers use sports because they feel

comfortable using them as sites to be with their children. Most fathers have greater competence in their parenting abilities in the context of sports. They can also nurture relationships with their children and claim they are sharing the childrearing responsibilities.

Brotherson et al. (2005) and Harrington (2006) both support the idea of purposive leisure in which Shaw and Dawson (2001) describe families using leisure centered around a purpose, mainly the opportunity to teach children to have healthy habits and values, to communicate better, and to have healthier family functioning. Families in the study of Shaw and Dawson expressed a “sense of urgency” (p. 224) to teach their children values and principles through leisure. Fathers in Harrington’s study also expressed this same sense of urgency as they realized their children are only under their influence for a limited amount of time. Fathers undertook activities in sports and leisure to have greater connectedness with their children and to teach their children values; in turn, fathers hoped their children would carry those principles with them and perhaps teach the next generation the same morals. Fathers hoped future generations would have the same connectedness with their children that they feel they presently have.

Among these qualitative studies (Brotherson et al., 2005; Harrington, 2006), fathers expressed that their leisure interactions with their children have led to greater cohesion, which is an aspect of family functioning. The specific contribution of fathers’ leisure involvement with their children and the relationship to family functioning, however, has not been examined on a broad scale. Previous studies have shown that fathers’ play interactions with their children and involvement in caregiving tasks have shown a relationship with positive individual child outcomes (Bronte-Tinkew et al., 2008; Grossman et al., 2002; Pettit et al., 1998; Salem et al., 1998). Considering the trend of increased father involvement (Bianchi, 2000), it is likely that a father’s involvement with their children in leisure is related to broader family outcomes such as

family functioning. The Core and Balance Model would also suggest that fathers who are involved in more family leisure with their children are likely to report higher levels of family functioning than those who participate in less. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the contribution of fathers' involvement in family leisure to aspects of family functioning.

Chapter 3

Methods

The problem of this study is to examine the contribution of fathers' involvement in family leisure to aspects of family functioning. Included in this chapter are the following: (a) sample, (b) data collection procedures, (c), instrumentation, and (d) analysis.

Sample

The sample for this study will be a national sample of 500 families that consist of a mother, father, and at least one child between the ages of 11 and 15. The specific child's age range will be chosen to involve children at a cognitive level with the ability to use abstract thinking necessary to complete the questionnaire. Children in this age range still rely heavily upon the security found in relationships with parents and other family members as they psychosocially separate themselves to create their own identity (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). This age range will also allow comparisons to other studies (Agate, Zabriskie, Agate, & Poff, in press; Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003; Hornberger et al., in press). As has been suggested in previous research (Freeman & Zabriskie; Zabriskie & McCormick), this study will include perspectives of both a parent (i.e., the father) and a child in hope that gathering data from both a parent and youth will provide a greater understanding of family leisure and family functioning within a family as whole.

Data Collection Procedures

Data will be collected in cooperation with an online survey sampling company, SSI, which draws subjects from a representative multi-source Internet panel of 2.2 million households willing to participate in online research based on the researcher's sample criteria.

An online questionnaire will be used to collect data beginning November 2009 and end when an adequate sample size has been reached. An electronic invitation to the questionnaire will be sent to a random sample representative of geographical regions of the country. The subjects will be expected to complete the questionnaire on their own upon receiving the Internet location. At the beginning of the questionnaire, participants will read that by completing the questionnaire, they are consenting to participate. They will also be told that their participation is voluntary, and thus, will be able to end their participation at any time. The father will complete his survey and then invite his child to complete the survey. Confidentiality of the participants will be ensured because no questions about personal identification will be asked, although demographic questions will be presented. After completion of the instrument, the information will be downloaded to the research database through an automated system. The data provided will then be analyzed.

Instrumentation

Three scales have been selected for use in this study. The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales (FACES II) will provide a measure of the family's perceptions of their family cohesion, family adaptability, and overall indicators of family functioning (Olson et al., 1992). The Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP) will be used to measure core, balance, and overall family leisure involvement (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). Relevant demographic questions will also be included.

FACES II. The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales include 30 items used to measure an individual's perceptions of family adaptability and family cohesion. It is also used to calculate overall family functioning based on Olson's Family Circumplex Model (Olson & DeFrain, 1997). There are 16 questions that measure family cohesion. The other 14 questions

measure family adaptability (Olson et al., 1982). Answers are rated on a five-point Likert scale with one being “almost never” and five being “almost always.” Scores for family adaptability and cohesion are calculated based on a scoring formula that accounts for reverse coded questions. After obtaining total family adaptability and family cohesion scores, corresponding values of one through eight will be assigned based on the linear scoring interpretation of Olson et al. (1992). These two scores will be averaged together to obtain the family type score which is used as an indicator of overall family functioning. Acceptable psychometric properties have been reported for FACES II including internal consistency with a score of 0.90, and reliability with Cronbach alpha levels as 0.78 and 0.79 for adaptability and 0.86 and 0.88 for cohesion (Olson et al., 1992).

FLAP. The Family Leisure Activity Profile measures family leisure involvement based on the Core and Balance Model of Family Leisure Functioning (Zabriskie, 2000). The questionnaire includes 16 questions with eight items measuring core family leisure involvement and eight items measuring balance family leisure involvement. In each question, the respondent is asked if he or she participates in activities of that specific category with other family members, and if so, how often and for how long. Satisfaction with current involvement in these family leisure activities are also indicated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from one (very dissatisfied) to five (very satisfied).

An index score is found for each item by multiplying frequency and duration. The core index score is calculated by summing the index scores of items one through eight. The balance index score is calculated by summing the index scores of items nine through 16. The total family leisure score is calculated by summing the core and balance index scores (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). The FLAP has demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties among

construct validity, content validity, inter-rater reliability, and test-retest reliability for core ($r = 0.74$), balance ($r = 0.78$), and total family leisure involvement ($r = 0.78$) (Zabriskie, 2001).

The directions of this scale will be modified from its original form to ask fathers specifically about their participation in family leisure. Furthermore, on the youth survey, the directions will be modified to ask about family leisure involvement in which the father was involved or included.

Demographics. Socio-demographic questions will be included to identify the underlying characteristics of the sample. These items will include age of the father and youth, ethnicity of the father and youth, gender of father and youth, marital status, history of divorce, state of residence, population of place of residence, highest level of education, annual family income, employment status, and family size.

Analysis

The statistical package SPSS will be used to analyze the data. Data will be reviewed for missing responses. It will then be examined for outliers to be sure all responses fit within the sample parameters. Data will be compiled into two data sets: response of fathers, and response of youth. Underlying characteristics of the research variables will be examined with descriptive statistics. Pearson Product Moment zero-order correlations between variables in each of the three data sets will be examined for multicollinearity as well as to identify possible controlling factors that could be included in subsequent multiple regression equations. A blocked entry method will be used in each analysis. Socio-demographic variables, which indicate zero-order correlation coefficients with the dependent variable, will be included in the first block as controlling factors in the multiple regression models to examine the unique contribution of fathers' involvement in family leisure to family functioning. The second block will include the family leisure variables

(core family leisure participation and balance family leisure participation). Multiple regression analyses will be performed on each of the three dependent variables (family cohesion, family adaptability, and family functioning) for both the father and youth perspective. The multiple regression coefficients will be examined for each model at an alpha level of 0.05. The relative contribution of each variable in significant models will be determined with standardized regression coefficients (Beta).

References

- Agate, J., Zabriskie, R., Agate, S., & Poff, R. (2009). Family leisure satisfaction and satisfaction with family. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(2), 205-223.
- Beeghly, M., Weiss-Perry, B. W., & Cicchetti, D. (1989). Structural and affective dimensions of play development in young children with Down Syndrome. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 12*, 257-277.
- Bianchi (2000). Employment and time with children: Dramatic change or surprising continuity? *Demography, 37*(4), 401-414.
- Bronte-Tinkew, J., Carrano, J., Horowitz, A., & Kinukawa, A. (2008). Involvement among resident fathers and links to infant cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues, 29*(9), 1211-1244.
- Brotherson, S. E., Dollahite, D. C., & Hawkins, A. J. (2005). Generative fathering and the dynamics of connection between fathers and their children. *Fathering, 3*(1), 1-28.
- Call, J. (2002). Finding the extraordinary in the ordinary. *Marriages and Families, 7*, 7-18.
- Casper, L. M., & Bianchi, S. M. (2002). Fathering. In L. M. Casper & S. M. Bianchi (Eds.), *Continuity and change in the American family* (pp. 123-147). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Coakley, J. (2006). The good father: Parental expectations and youth sports. *Leisure Studies, 25*(2), 153-163.
- De Falco, S., Esposito, G., Venuti, P., & Bornstein, M. H. (2008). Fathers' play with their Down Syndrome children. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 52*(6), 490-502.

- Dodd, D., Zabriskie, R., Widmer, M., & Eggett, D. (2009). Contributions of family leisure to family functioning among families that include children with developmental disabilities. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(2), 261-286.
- Doherty, W. J., Kouneski, E. F., & Erickson, M. F. (1998). Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual framework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*(2), 277-292.
- Dollahite, D. C., & Hawkins, A. J. (1998). A conceptual ethic of generative fathering. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 7*(1), 109-132.
- Easterbrooks, M. A., & Goldberg, W. A. (1984). Toddler development in the family: Impact of father involvement and parenting characteristics. *Child Development, 55*(3), 740-752.
- EGgebeen, D. J. (2002). The changing course of fatherhood: Men's experiences with children in demographic perspective. *Journal of Family Issues, 23*(4), 486-506.
- Ejiri, K., & Masatake, N. (2001). Co-occurrence of preverbal vocal behavior and motor action in early infancy. *Developmental Science, 4*(1), 40-48.
- Erikson, E. (1963). *Childhood and Society*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Esposito, S. A. (1995). Cohesion and adaptability in the non-custodial father-child relationship: The effects of interaction quality. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 23*(1), 21-38.
- Fagan, J., & Iglesias, A. (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.
- Flouri, E., & Buchanan, A. (2003). The role of father involvement in children's later mental health. *Journal of Adolescence, 26*(1), 63-78.
- Freeman, P. A., & Zabriskie, R. B. (2003). Leisure and family functioning in adoptive families: Implications for therapeutic recreation. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal, 37*(1), 73-93.

- Goldberg, W. A., Clarke-Stewart, A., Rice, J. A., & Dellis, E. (2002). Emotional energy as an explanatory construct for fathers' engagement with their infants. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 2*(4), 379-408.
- Grossman, K., Grossman, K. E., Fremmer-Bombik, E., Kindler, H., Scheuerer-Englisch, H., & Zimmerman, P. (2002). The uniqueness of the child-father attachment relationship: Fathers' sensitive and challenging play as a pivotal variable in a 16-year longitudinal study. *Social Development, 11*(3), 307-331.
- Harrington, M. (2006). Sport and leisure as contexts for fathering in Australian families. *Leisure Studies, 25*(2), 165-183.
- Hawkins, A. J., & Palkovitz, R. (1999). Beyond ticks and clicks: The need for more diverse and broader conceptualizations and measures of father involvement. *Journal of Men's Studies, 8*(1), 11-32.
- Hawks, S. R. (1991). Recreation in the family. In S. J. Bahr (Ed.), *Family research: A sixty year review, 1930-1990, Vol. 1* (pp. 387-433). New York: Lexington books.
- Hobson, B. (2002). *Making men into fathers: Men, masculinities and the social politics of fatherhood*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Holman, T. B., & Epperson, A. (1984). Family leisure: A review of the literature with research recommendations. *Journal of Leisure Research, 16*(4), 277-294.
- Hornberger, L., Zabriskie, R., & Freeman, P. (in press). Contributions of family leisure to family functioning among single-parent families. Submitted to *Marriage and Family Review*.
- Kay, T. (2006). Where's dad? Fatherhood in leisure studies. *Leisure Studies, 25*(2), 133-152.

- Laflamme, D., Pomerleau, A., & Malcuit, G. (2002). A comparison of fathers' and mothers' involvement in childcare and stimulation behaviors during free-play with their infants at 9 and 15 months. *Sex Roles, 47*(11), 507-518.
- Lamb, M. E. (1987). Introduction: The emergent American father. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father's role: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 3-25). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Marks, L., & Palkovitz, R. (2004). American Fatherhood Types: The good, the bad, and the uninterested. *Fathering, 2*(2), 113-129.
- Marsiglio, W. (1991). Paternal engagement activities with minor children. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 53*(4), 973-986.
- Nicholls, W. J. & Pike, L. T. (2002). Contact fathers' experience of family life. *Journal of Family Studies, 8*(1), 74-88.
- Nugent, J. K. (1991). Cultural and psychological influences on the father's role in infant development. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 53*(2), 475-485.
- Olson, D. H. (2000). Circumplex model of marital and family systems. *Journal of Family Therapy, 22*, 144-167.
- Olson, D. H., & DeFrain, J. (1997). Understanding family relationships. In D. H. Olson & J. DeFrain (Ed.), *Marriage and the family: Diversity and strengths* (pp. 65-97). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Olson, D. H., McCubbin, H. I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M., & Wilson, M. (1992). *Family inventories: 2nd revision*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Olson, D. H., Portner, J., & Bell, R. (1982). *FACES II: Family adaptability and cohesion evaluation scales*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.

Orthner, D. K. (1975). Leisure activity patterns and marital satisfaction over the marital career.

Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50(1), 60-77.

Orthner, D. K. (1976). Patterns of leisure and marital interaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*,

37(7), 91-102.

Orthner, D. K., & Mancini, J. A. (1990). Leisure impacts on family interaction and cohesion.

Journal of Leisure Research, 22(1), 125-137.

Orthner, D. K., & Mancini, J. A. (1991). Benefits of leisure for family bonding. In B. L. Driver,

P. J. Brown, & G. L. Peterson (Eds.), *Benefits of leisure* (pp. 215-247). State College,

PA: Venture Publishing.

Palisi, B. J. (1984). Marriage companionship and marriage well-being: A comparison of

metropolitan areas in three countries. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 15, 43-56.

Pettit, G. S., Brown, E. G., Mize, J., & Lindsey, E. (1998). Mothers' and fathers' socializing

behaviors in three contexts: Links with children's peer competence. *Merrill-Palmer*

Quarterly, 44(2), 173-188.

Pleck, J. H. (1987). American fathering in historical perspective. In M.S. Kimmel (Ed.),

Changing men: New directions in research on men and masculinity (pp. 83-97). Newbury

Park, CA: Sage.

Pleck, J. H. (1997). Paternal involvement: Levels, sources, and consequences. In M. E. Lamb

(Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed., pp. 27-39). New York: Wiley.

Roggman, L. A., Boyce, L. K., Cook, G. A., Christiansen, K., & Jones, D. (2004). Playing with

daddy: Social toy play, early head start, and developmental outcomes. *Fathering*, 2(1),

83-108.

Rotundo, E. A. (1985). American fatherhood. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 29, 7-24.

- Salem, D. A., Zimmerman, M. A., & Notaro, P. C. (1998). Effects of family structure, family process, and father involvement on psychosocial outcomes among African American adolescents. *Family Relations, 47*(4), 331-341.
- Shaw, S. M. & Dawson, D. (2001). Purposive leisure: Examining parental discourses on family activities. *Leisure Sciences, 23*(4), 217-231.
- Smith, G. T., Snyder, T. J., & Monsma, B. R. (1988). Predicting relationship satisfaction from couples' use of leisure time. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 16*(1), 3-13.
- Stacks, A. M., & Oshio, T. (2009). Disorganized attachment and social skills as indicators of Head Start children's school readiness skills. *Attachment and Human Behavior, 11*(2), 143-164.
- Swinton, A. T., Zabriskie, R. B., Freeman, P. A., & Fields, P. J. (2008). Nonresident fathers' family leisure patterns during parenting time with their children. *Fathering, 6*(3), 205-225.
- Videon, T. M. (2005). Parent-child relations and children's psychological wellbeing: Do dad's matter? *Journal of Family Issues, 26*(1), 55-78.
- White, J. & Klein, D. (2008). The systems framework. In J. M. White & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Family theories* (pp. 151-177). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yogman, M. W., Kindlon, D., & Earls, F. (1995). Father involvement and cognitive/behavioral outcomes of preterm infants. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 34*(1), 58-66.
- Zabriskie, R. B. (2000). *An examination of family and leisure behavior among families with middle school aged children*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Zabriskie, R. B. (2001). The validity and reliability of the Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP). In M. E. Havitz & M. F. Floyed (Eds.), *Abstracts from the 2001 Symposium on Leisure Research* (p. 66). Ashburn, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.

Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2001). The influences of family leisure patterns on perceptions of family functioning. *Family Relations*, 50(3), 281-289.

Appendix A-1a
Consent to Participate

Consent To Be A Participant (Father)

Thank you for participating in this study. Please complete the following questionnaire. This survey should take approximately 20 minutes total to complete for both you and your youth (age 11-15). The intent of this study is to examine recreation involvement among fathers. Results may benefit families through a better understanding of the relationship between fathers' involvement in family recreation and family functioning. There are minimal risks to this study. Participation in this study is voluntary; you may withdraw at any time. There will be no reference to your identification at any point in the research. By completing the survey, you give consent to participate in this study. If you have questions about this study please contact Ramon Zabriskie at zabriskie@byu.edu. If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant please contact BYU IRB Administrator, A-285 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602, (801) 422-1461, or irb@byu.edu.

Please read the following instructions before you begin the survey. You must answer all questions, unless otherwise specified, to continue. If the next page does not load properly, click the "back" button on your browser and try again. Please read the following instructions before you begin the survey.

This section is for the FATHER. You will be told when it is time for your child to take their portion of the survey.

The following questions ask about the activities you do with family members. Please refer to the last year or so. These questions ask about groups of activities, so try to answer in terms of the group as opposed to any one specific example. This may require you to "average" over a few different activities. Don't worry about getting it exactly right. Just give your best estimate.

Consent To Be A Participant (Youth)

The next portion of the survey is for YOUTH. Please allow your child to take the survey alone, if at all possible.

Please complete the following questionnaire. This questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. There will be questions about your family leisure participation and your family functioning. Participation in this questionnaire is optional and completely voluntary. You have the right to refuse or stop at any time. Your responses will not be linked to your name and the results of this study will only report data as a group and not individuals. There will be no way to identify you in the report, presentation, or publication of results.

Please answer all the questions to the best of your ability. If the next page does not load properly, click the "back" button on your browser and try again. Please read the following instructions before you begin the survey.

The following questions ask about the activities you do with family members, particularly including your father. Please refer to your father who just took the survey before you. Please refer to the last year or so. These questions ask about groups of activities, so try to answer in terms of the group as opposed to any one specific example. This may require you to "average" over a few different activities. Don't worry about getting it exactly right. Just give your best estimate.

Appendix A-1b

Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP)

Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP)

Father Survey

The following questions ask about the activities you do with family members. Please refer to the last year or so. These questions ask about groups of activities, so try to answer in terms of the group as opposed to any one specific example. This may require you to “average” over a few different activities. Don’t worry about getting it exactly “right.” Just give your best estimate.

Take a moment to look at the example below. This will give you some instruction on how to fill in your answers.

QUESTION: Do you participate in home-based activities (for example watching TV/videos, listening to music, reading books, singing, etc.) with family members?

First do you do these activities? → YES X NO ___

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|---|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | x |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |



| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|--|-----------|---|
| < 1 hour | | 1-2 hrs | | 2-3 hours | x |
| 3-4 hours | | 4-5 hours | | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | | 7-8 hours | | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | | >10 hours | | > 1 day | |

Next, how often do you usually do these activities?



Then, about how long, on average, do you typically do this type of activity each time you do it?



Last, how satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? Please answer this question **EVEN IF YOU DO NOT** do these activities with your family.

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied

1

2

3

4

Very Satisfied

5



| Symbol Key | |
|---|--|
| <= less than (e.g. < 1 hour reads “less than one hour”) | |
| >= more than (e.g. > 10 hours reads “ more than ten hours”) | |

1. Do you have dinners, at home, with family members?

YES _____ NO ____

| If YES how often? | | ➔ | For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| At least daily | | | < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| At least weekly | | | 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| At least monthly | | | | | | |
| At least annually | | | | | | |

How satisfied are you with your participation or lack of participation, with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|--|-------------------|
| Very Dissatisfied | | | | | | Very Satisfied |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |

2. Do you participate in home-based activities (for example watching TV/videos, listening to music, reading books, singing, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO ____

| If YES how often? | | ➔ | For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| At least daily | | | < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| At least weekly | | | 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| At least monthly | | | 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| At least annually | | | 9-10 hours | >10 hours | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|--|-------------------|
| Very Dissatisfied | | | | | | Very Satisfied |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |

3. Do you participate in games (for example playing cards, board games, video games, darts, billiards, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO ____

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |

| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Very Dissatisfied | | | | | Very Satisfied |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

4. Do you participate in crafts, cooking, and/or hobbies (for example drawing, scrap books, baking cookies, sewing, painting, ceramics, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO ____

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |

| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Very Dissatisfied | | | | | Very Satisfied |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

5. Do you participate in home-based outdoor activities (for example star gazing, gardening, yard work, playing with pets, walks, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO ____

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |

| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

| | | | | | |
|------|--|--|--|--|------|
| Very | | | | | Very |
|------|--|--|--|--|------|

Dissatisfied

Satisfied

1

2

3

4

5

6. Do you participate in home-based sport/games activities (for example playing catch, shooting baskets, frisbee, bike rides, fitness activities, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO ___

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |



| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|--|-----------|--|
| < 1 hour | | 1-2 hrs | | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | | 4-5 hours | | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | | 7-8 hours | | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | | >10 hours | | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very
Dissatisfied

Very
Satisfied

1

2

3

4

5

7. Do you attend other family members' activities (for example watching or leading their sporting events, musical performances, scouts, etc.)?

YES _____ NO ___

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |



| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|--|-----------|--|
| < 1 hour | | 1-2 hrs | | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | | 4-5 hours | | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | | 7-8 hours | | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | | >10 hours | | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very
Dissatisfied

Very
Satisfied

1

2

3

4

5

8. Do you participate in religious/spiritual activities (for example going to church activities, worshipping, scripture reading, Sunday school, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO ____

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| If YES how often? | |
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Very Dissatisfied | | | | | Very Satisfied |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

9. Do you participate in community-based social activities (for example going to restaurants, parties, shopping, visiting friends/ neighbors, picnics, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO ____

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| If YES how often? | |
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Very Dissatisfied | | | | | Very Satisfied |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

10. Do you participate in spectator activities (for example going to movies, sporting events, concerts, plays or theatrical performances, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO ____

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| If YES how often? | |
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very
Dissatisfied

Very
Satisfied

1

2

3

4

5

11. Do you participate in community-based sporting activities (for example bowling, golf, swimming, skating, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO ___

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |



| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|---|--|-----------|--|
| < 1 hour | | 1-2 hrs | |
| 3-4 hours | | 4-5 hours | |
| 6-7 hours | | 7-8 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | | >10 hours | |
| | | 2-3 hours | |
| | | 5-6hours | |
| | | 8-9 hours | |
| | | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very
Dissatisfied

Very
Satisfied

1

2

3

4

5

12. Do you participate in community-based special events (for example visiting museums, zoos, theme parks, fairs, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO ___

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |



| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--|
| < 1 hour | | 1-2 hrs | |
| 3-4 hours | | 4-5 hours | |
| 6-7 hours | | 7-8 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | | >10 hours | |
| 1 day | | 8 days | |
| 2 days | | 9 days | |
| 3 days | | 10 days | |
| 4 days | | 11 days | |
| 5 days | | 12 days | |
| 6 days | | 13 days | |
| One week | | Two weeks | |
| | | 3 or more weeks | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very
Dissatisfied

Very
Satisfied

1 2 3 4 5

13. Do you participate in outdoor activities (for example camping, hiking, hunting, fishing, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO ___

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |

| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------------|--|
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | | |
| 1 day | 8 days | 15 days | |
| 2 days | 9 days | 16 days | |
| 3 days | 10 days | 17 days | |
| 4 days | 11 days | 18 days | |
| 5 days | 12 days | 19 days | |
| 6 days | 13 days | 20 days | |
| One week | Two weeks | 3 or more weeks | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 Very Satisfied

14. Do you participate in water-based activities (for example water skiing, jet skiing, boating, sailing, canoeing, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO ___

| If YES how often? | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly (during season) | |
| At least annually | |

| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------------|--|
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | | |
| 1 day | 8 days | 15 days | |
| 2 days | 9 days | 16 days | |
| 3 days | 10 days | 17 days | |
| 4 days | 11 days | 18 days | |
| 5 days | 12 days | 19 days | |
| 6 days | 13 days | 20 days | |
| One week | Two weeks | 3 or more weeks | |

YES _____ NO ____

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| If YES how often? | |
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members, including your father, in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied
 1 2 3 4 5

4. Do you participate in crafts, cooking, and/or hobbies (for example drawing, scrap books, baking cookies, sewing, painting, ceramics, etc.) with family members, including your father?

YES _____ NO ____

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| If YES how often? | |
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members, including your father, in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied
 1 2 3 4 5

5. Do you participate in home-based outdoor activities (for example star gazing, gardening, yard work, playing with pets, walks, etc.) with family members, including your father?

YES _____ NO ____

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| If YES how often? | |
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members, including your father, in these activities? (please circle one)

Very
Dissatisfied

Very
Satisfied

1

2

3

4

5

6. Do you participate in home-based sport/games activities (for example playing catch, shooting baskets, frisbee, bike rides, fitness activities, etc.) with family members, including your father?

YES ____ NO ____

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |



| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|---|--|-----------|--|
| < 1 hour | | 1-2 hrs | |
| 3-4 hours | | 4-5 hours | |
| 6-7 hours | | 7-8 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | | >10 hours | |
| | | 2-3 hours | |
| | | 5-6hours | |
| | | 8-9 hours | |
| | | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members, including your father, in these activities? (please circle one)

Very
Dissatisfied

Very
Satisfied

1

2

3

4

5

7. Do you attend other family members' activities, particularly with your father (for example watching or leading their sporting events, musical performances, scouts, etc.)?

YES ____ NO ____

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |



| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|---|--|-----------|--|
| < 1 hour | | 1-2 hrs | |
| 3-4 hours | | 4-5 hours | |
| 6-7 hours | | 7-8 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | | >10 hours | |
| | | 2-3 hours | |
| | | 5-6hours | |
| | | 8-9 hours | |
| | | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members, including your father, in these activities? (please circle one)

Very
Dissatisfied

Very
Satisfied

1

2

3

4

5

8. Do you participate in religious/spiritual activities (for example going to church activities, worshipping, scripture reading, Sunday school, etc.) with family members, including your father?

YES _____ NO ____

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|--|-----------|--|-----------|--|
| If YES how often? | | For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | | | |
| At least daily | | < 1 hour | | 1-2 hrs | | 2-3 hours | |
| At least weekly | | 3-4 hours | | 4-5 hours | | 5-6hours | |
| At least monthly | | 6-7 hours | | 7-8 hours | | 8-9 hours | |
| At least annually | | 9-10 hours | | >10 hours | | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members, including your father, in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied
 1 2 3 4 5

9. Do you participate in community-based social activities (for example going to restaurants, parties, shopping, visiting friends/ neighbors, picnics, etc.) with family members, including your father?

YES _____ NO ____

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|--|-----------|--|-----------|--|
| If YES how often? | | For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | | | |
| At least daily | | < 1 hour | | 1-2 hrs | | 2-3 hours | |
| At least weekly | | 3-4 hours | | 4-5 hours | | 5-6hours | |
| At least monthly | | 6-7 hours | | 7-8 hours | | 8-9 hours | |
| At least annually | | 9-10 hours | | >10 hours | | > 1 day | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members, including your father, in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied
 1 2 3 4 5

10. Do you participate in spectator activities (for example going to movies, sporting events, concerts, plays or theatrical performances, etc.) with family members, including your father?

YES _____ NO ____

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|--|-----------|--|-----------|--|
| If YES how often? | | For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | | | |
| At least daily | | < 1 hour | | 1-2 hrs | | 2-3 hours | |
| At least weekly | | 3-4 hours | | 4-5 hours | | 5-6hours | |

| | | | | | |
|----------|--|-----------|--|-----------------|--|
| 2 days | | 9 days | | 16 days | |
| 3 days | | 10 days | | 17 days | |
| 4 days | | 11 days | | 18 days | |
| 5 days | | 12 days | | 19 days | |
| 6 days | | 13 days | | 20 days | |
| One week | | Two weeks | | 3 or more weeks | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members, including your father, in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied
 1 2 3 4 5

15. Do you participate in outdoor adventure activities (for example rock climbing, river rafting, off-road vehicles, scuba diving, etc.) with family members, including your father?

YES _____ NO ____

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |

| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------------|--|
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | | |
| 1 day | 8 days | 15 days | |
| 2 days | 9 days | 16 days | |
| 3 days | 10 days | 17 days | |
| 4 days | 11 days | 18 days | |
| 5 days | 12 days | 19 days | |
| 6 days | 13 days | 20 days | |
| One week | Two weeks | 3 or more weeks | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members, including your father, in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied
 1 2 3 4 5

16. Do you participate in tourism activities (for example family vacations, traveling, visiting historic sites, visiting state/national parks, etc.) with family members, including your father?

YES _____ NO ____

| If YES how often? | |
|-------------------|--|
| At least daily | |
| At least weekly | |
| At least monthly | |
| At least annually | |

| For about how long per time? (check only one) | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------------|--|
| < 1 hour | 1-2 hrs | 2-3 hours | |
| 3-4 hours | 4-5 hours | 5-6hours | |
| 6-7 hours | 7-8 hours | 8-9 hours | |
| 9-10 hours | >10 hours | | |
| 1 day | 8 days | 15 days | |
| 2 days | 9 days | 16 days | |
| 3 days | 10 days | 17 days | |
| 4 days | 11 days | 18 days | |
| 5 days | 12 days | 19 days | |
| 6 days | 13 days | 20 days | |
| One week | Two weeks | 3 or more weeks | |

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members, including your father, in these activities? (please circle one)

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Very Dissatisfied | | | | | Very Satisfied |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

Appendix A-1c

Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES II)

Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES II)

Please answer the following questions in reference to your family currently. Please be as open and honest as possible. All responses are strictly confidential.

Use the following scale:

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|-----------|------------|---------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Almost never | Once in awhile | Sometimes | Frequently | Almost always |

Describe your family:

- 1. Family members are supportive of each other during difficult times.
- 2. In our family, it is easy for everyone to express his/her opinion.
- 3. It is easier to discuss problems with people outside the family than with other family members.
- 4. Each family member has input regarding major family decisions.
- 5. Our family gathers together in the same room.
- 6. Children have a say in their discipline.
- 7. Our family does things together.
- 8. Family members discuss problems and feel good about the solutions.
- 9. In our family, everyone goes his/her own way.
- 10. We shift household responsibilities from person to person.
- 11. Family members know each other's close friends.
- 12. It is hard to know what the rules are in our family.
- 13. Family members consult other family members on personal decisions.
- 14. Family members say what they want.
- 15. We have difficulty thinking of things to do as a family.
- 16. In solving problems, the children's suggestions are followed.
- 17. Family members feel very close to each other.
- 18. Discipline is fair in our family.
- 19. Family members feel closer to people outside the family than to other family members.
- 20. Our family tries new ways of dealing with problems.
- 21. Family members go along with what the family decides to do.
- 22. In our family, everyone shares responsibilities.
- 23. Family members like to spend their free time with each other.
- 24. It is difficult to get a rule changed in our family.
- 25. Family members avoid each other at home.
- 26. When problems arise, we compromise.
- 27. We approve of each other's friends.
- 28. Family members are afraid to say what is on their minds.
- 29. Family members pair up rather than do things as a total family.
- 30. Family members share interests and hobbies with each other.

Appendix A-1d
Socio-demographic Questions

Socio-demographic Questions (Father)

1. What is your age?
2. What is your ethnicity?
Asian___ Black, Non-Hispanic___ Hispanic___ Native American___ White, Non-Hispanic___ Other___
3. What is your gender? Male___ Female___
4. What is your current marital status? Single, never married___ Single, divorced___ Married___ Separated___ Widowed___ Unmarried, living with partner___
5. Have you ever been divorced? Yes _____ No _____
6. In which state do you currently reside?
7. What is the population of your place of residence? Urban/Suburban (>50,000)_____ or Rural (< 50,000) _____
8. What is your highest level of education?
 - a. Less than high school
 - b. High school/GED
 - c. Some college
 - d. 2-year college degree (Associates degree)
 - e. 4-year college degree (BS, BA)
 - f. Master's degree
 - g. Doctoral degree
 - h. Professional degree (MD, JD)
9. Please indicate the estimated annual income for your family?
 - a. Less than \$10,000

- b. \$10,000-\$19,999
- c. \$20,000-\$29,999
- d. \$30,000-\$39,999
- e. \$40,000-\$49,999
- f. \$50,000-\$59,999
- g. \$60,000-\$69,999
- h. \$70,000-\$79,999
- i. \$80,000-\$99,999
- j. \$100,000-\$124,999
- k. \$125,000-\$150,000
- l. Over \$150,000

10. Have you been unemployed within the last 12 months? Yes____ No____. If yes, then
for how many months?

11. Please indicate the total number of immediate family members (parents and
child[ren]).____

Socio-demographic Questions (Youth)

1. What is your age?

2. What is your ethnicity?

Asian___ Black, Non-Hispanic___ Hispanic___ Native American___ White, Non-
Hispanic___ Other___

3. What is your gender? Male___ Female___