BMJ Open

Father involvement in early child-rearing and behavioural outcomes in the pre-adolescent period

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-012034
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Mar-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Opondo, Charles; University of Oxford, National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit Redshaw, Maggie; University of Oxford, National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit Savage-McGlynn, Emily; University of Oxford, National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit Quigley, Maria; University of Oxford, National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit
Primary Subject Heading :	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Mental health
Keywords:	fathers involvement, child-rearing, behavioural outcomes, ALSPAC



BMJ Open

-	
1	
2	Father involvement in early child-rearing and behavioural outcomes in the pre-adolescent period
3	Charles Onande* Maggie Rodshaw, Emily Sayage McClypp, Maria A. Quigloy
4 5	Charles Opondo , Maggie Redshaw, Emily Savage-McGrynn, Maria A. Quigley
6	Policy Research Unit in Maternal Health and Care
7	National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit
8 9	Nuffield Department of Population Health
10	University of Oxford, Old Road Campus, Headington
11	Oxford OX3 7LF
12	
13 14	
15	*Corresponding author: charles.opondo@npeu.ox.ac.uk
16	
17	Word counts: abstract – 296; main text – 3,923; tables – 3; figures – 1.
18	
20	Key words: fathers involvement; child-rearing; behavioural outcomes; ALSPAC
21	
22	
23 24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29 30	
31	
32	
33	
34 25	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40 41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46 47	
48	
49	
50	
51 52	
52 53	
54	
55	
56	
57 58	
59	

Abstract

Objective: To explore the nature of paternal involvement in early child-rearing, and estimated its effect on behavioural outcomes in 9 and 11 year-old children.

Setting: The data come from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) cohort recruited in the southwest of England in the 1990s.

Participants: A total of 14,701 children were alive at 1 year; 10,440 children were living with both parents at 8 months and were therefore eligible. Outcome data were available for 6,898 children at 9 years and 6,328 children at 11 years.

Main exposure: Paternal involvement in infancy was measured using factor scores obtained through factor analysis of fathers' responses on their participation in, understanding of, and feelings about their child's early upbringing.

Outcome: Behavioural problems were measured using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) total difficulties score.

Results: Three factors were identified in the factor analysis: Factor 1 described fathers' emotional response to the child; Factor 2 measured the frequency of fathers' involvement in domestic and childcare activities; Factor 3 characterised fathers' feelings of security in their role as parent and partner. Children of fathers with high scores on factors 1 and 3 had 14% (OR 0.86, 95%CI 0.79–0.94, p=0.001) and 13% (OR 0.87, 95%CI 0.79–0.96, p=0.006) respectively lower adjusted odds of behavioural problems at 9 years. Factors 1 and 3 were associated with a comparable reduction in adjusted odds of behavioural problems at 11 years (OR 0.89, 95%CI 0.81–0.98, p=0.017 and OR 0.89, 95%CI 0.81–0.99, p=0.034 respectively). Factor 2 was not associated with the outcome.

Conclusion: Psychological and emotional aspects of paternal involvement in children's early upbringing, particularly how new fathers see themselves as parents and adjust to the role, rather than the quantity of direct involvement in childcare, is associated with positive behavioural outcomes in children.

Strengths and limitations

Strengths

- The study is based on a large sample derived from detailed cohort data.
- We have adopted a rigorous approach to explore the multi-faceted nature of the main exposure.

Limitations

• Findings are based on observational data which is often subject to unmeasured confounding.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012034 on 22 November 2016. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

tand

data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text

• The main exposure and outcome are based on self-report, which may be subject to bias.

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

Introduction

In most societies, the involvement of fathers in child rearing has traditionally been framed as the role of 'provider' [1], [2] with mothers doing most of the task-oriented caring and nurturing of children. However, in recent decades social changes including the rapid increase in the proportion of working mothers [3]–[5] and changes in employment regulations such as increased paternity leave have resulted in a shift towards more of the direct parenting duties being shared by both parents [6]. Understanding the nature and effect of fathers' involvement on the health and well-being of children could therefore help inform policies aimed at improving family psychological and health outcomes.

The nature of parenting in a child's early years is thought to play an important role in influencing the child's immediate and long-term well-being and mental health, including social development [7], [8], and cognitive and educational outcomes [9]. The nature and extent of fathers' involvement in parenting may change over the course of a child's life. However, early paternal involvement is often associated with continuing engagement and may be a proxy-measure of overall engagement [10]-[12]. Early parenting can also affect outcomes later in life [13], [14]. For these reasons we were interested in whether fathers' involvement early in their child's life was associated with the child's later mental health and social development. We focused on the child's behaviour as a component of mental health because of its strong link to cognitive and educational outcomes.

Paternal involvement can be characterised [15], [16] by: fathers' accessibility to their children measured by their frequency of contact with the child [17], [18], co-residence with the child [17] or even presence at the child's birth [19]; their engagement in childcare activities such as playing, feeding and bathing [20]–[22]; and their demonstration of responsibility in providing for the material [22] and emotional [23] needs of their children. Nevertheless, many studies have tended to characterise paternal involvement as a unidimensional construct [24]. The failure to adopt a more multi-dimensional approach may explain why the evidence for its effect on mental health outcomes in children is unclear.

In this study we sought to first identify the multi-dimensional aspects of paternal involvement before investigating their potential influence on pre-adolescent children's behaviour. We explored the relationship between paternal involvement in the child's upbringing at 8 weeks and 8 months postnatally and child behavioural outcomes at age 9 and 11 years.

Methods

Data

Data were drawn from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) cohort [25], [26]. It is based on a sample of children born to mothers living in the former county of Avon in the southwest of

England between April 1991 and December 1992. A detailed description of the sample profile has been provided elsewhere [27], [28] and the study website contains details of all the data that is available through a fully searchable data dictionary [29].

There were 14,701 children in the total sample who were alive at 1 year. Data on 14,688 term singletons and twins who were alive at age 1 year were provided for these analyses and 13 observations on higherorder multiple births omitted from our data to preserve confidentiality. We also excluded 713 children recruited retrospectively when the children in the original core sample were around 7 years old (Phase II and Phase III recruitment) and 3,535 children whose mothers did not live with (or report living with) a partner at 8 months. Out of the remaining 10,440 eligible children, the analysis was based on 6,898 and 6,328 children whose mothers completed the SDQ questionnaires at age 9 and 11 years respectively (Figure 1).



Figure 1: Sample profile of the children included in the analysis

Outcome, exposure and potential confounder variables

Data were collected using self-completion questionnaires sent to mothers and their partners after recruitment and when the child was aged 8 weeks, 8 months, 9 years and 11 years. The questionnaires asked about mental health, parenting and childcare, behaviour, socio-economic status of parents, and child development.

The outcome was the child's behaviour measured by the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) completed by the mother [30]. This tool has 5 scales, namely 'emotional symptoms', 'conduct problems', 'hyperactivity', 'peer relationship problems' and 'prosocial behaviour'. Each scale is made up of 5 items giving a total of 25 items. The items are statements about psychological attributes, some positive and others negative. One of three ordered responses are given to each question: 0 ('not true'), 1 ('somewhat true') or 2 ('certainly true'). These are then summed up to obtain the scale scores and the total SDQ score. In our analyses we used the SDQ total difficulty score derived by summing up the scores of the first 4 scales of the SDQ [31] measured at age 9 and 11 years.

Paternal involvement was measured by asking fathers to rate their level of agreement – on 3 to 6-point ordinal scales – with 58 statements reflecting attitudes to parenting, attachment to child, and moods and feelings in the post-partum period at 8 weeks (37 items) and 8 months (21 items) after the birth of the child.

Data on other factors measured after recruitment which were potentially associated with the main outcome and/or exposure were also obtained including parental age, level of education (O-level/CSE/vocational training, A-level or university degree), depression symptoms measured 8 weeks postnatally on the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS) [32], socio-economic status derived from self-reported occupation using the Computer Assisted Structured Coding Tool (CASCoT) and coded into quintiles from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) [33], number of hours worked in the current or most recently held job, and child's age and gender.

Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed on the items measuring fathers' attitudes, attachment, moods and feelings. Factors identified in this analysis were deemed to represent key aspects of paternal involvement. Next, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was undertaken to check whether the factor structure identified during EFA was a good fit for the data. To improve the fit of the CFA model items that loaded on more than one factor were removed from further analysis, as were items with low factor loadings (less than 0.3), because they were deemed to be poor measures of the underlying construct [34].

Once a well-fitting factor structure was identified, factor scores for each of the identified aspects of paternal involvement were calculated. Factor scores are standard normal estimates of each individual's relative position in the continuum of the latent characteristic being measured. They were calculated as the maximum of the posterior distribution (MAP) of the latent factors given the observed and unobserved responses corresponding to the individual [35]. Factor scores so derived yield unbiased regression slopes when used as predictors in models [36]. Labels corresponding to the construct represented by the items underpinning each factor were then attributed to the factor scores to facilitate interpretation of the results.

To explore the association between paternal involvement and behavioural outcomes a two-step procedure was undertaken. First, univariable ordered logistic regression models of SDQ total difficulties scores on the factor scores and paternal, maternal and child covariates were fitted to identify the factors which were associated with the outcome. Next, all factors found to be independently associated with SDQ score (likelihood ratio p-values less than 5%) were included in a multivariable model, retaining only those factors for which there was still evidence of association with the outcome even after adjustment. Potential differences in association for boys and girls were explored by fitting and testing interaction terms for gender. Separate models were fitted for SDQ measured at 9 and 11 years.

Missing data were dealt with in three ways. Firstly, the MAP estimation of factor scores allowed for the partial recovery of information contained in unobserved paternal involvement items. Secondly, missing data in SDQ component items were handled by prorating scale scores for up to two missing responses out of the five items in each scale [31]. It is a single imputation procedure which replaces an individual's missing item scores with the mean score for the scale to which the missing item belongs. Thirdly, missing values of covariates in the multivariable regression modelling were assumed to be missing completely at random. Multiple imputation was performed to recover the information contained in these missing values, with ten imputed datasets used to obtain the final estimates.

The proportional odds assumption underpinning the ordered logistic regression models was examined using the Brant test with χ^2 p-values less than 5% interpreted as a violation of this assumption [37]. Data management and manipulation were performed using Stata v13 [38]. Analyses were run in Stata v13 and MPlus v7 [39].

Results

The characteristics of the samples at 9 years and 11 years were very similar (Table 1). Overall there were slightly more boys than girls. Fathers were on average aged 31 years and educated to O-level or CSE (examinations completed in the final year of compulsory schooling at age 16 years) or had some vocational (skills) training. They reported working about 45 hours per week in their current or most

recent job around the time when the child was 8 months old and had low depression scores on the EPDS. Mothers were on average 2 years younger than the fathers, were educated to a similar level, had slightly higher EPDS scores than fathers, and had 1 child prior to the one included in the study. Parents tended to be in similar SES categories. Most children had low total difficulties scores, with medians of 6 and 5 at the two respective time points.

	9 years [n = 6,898]	11 years [n = 6,328]
Fathers		
Age in years, mean (SD)	31.27 (5.4)	31.30 (5.4)
Highest level of education, n (%)		
O-level, CSE ¹ or vocational	3,021 (43.8%)	2,758 (43.6%)
A-level ²	1,482 (21.5%)	1,366 (21.6%)
University degree	1,048 (15.2%)	1,002 (15.8%)
Missing	1,347 (19.5%)	1,202 (19.0%)
Hours worked per week, mean (SD)	44.83 (9.8)	44.77 (9.9)
EPDS ³ score, median (IQR)	3 (1 – 6)	3 (1 – 6)
SES ⁴ category, n (%)		
1 – lowest	138 (2.0%)	122 (1.9%)
2	499 (7.2%)	453 (7.2%)
3	2,516 (36.5%)	2,297 (36.3%)
4	2,361 (34.2%)	2,184 (34.5%)
5 – highest	875 (12.7%)	823 (13.0%)
Missing	509 (7.4%)	449 (7.1%)
Mothers		
Age in years at delivery, mean (SD)	29.30 (4.4)	29.33 (4.4)
Highest level of education, n (%)		
O-level, CSE or vocational	2,564 (37.2%)	2,317 (36.6%)
A-level	1,665 (24.1%)	1,564 (24.7%)
University degree	1,413 (20.5%)	1,329 (21.0%)
Missing	1,256 (18.2%)	1,118 (17.7%)
Parity, median (IQR)	1 (0 – 1)	1 (0 - 1)
EPDS score, median (IQR)	5 (2 – 8)	5 (2 – 8)
SES category, n (%)		
1 – lowest	86 (1.3%)	79 (1.3%)
2	443 (6.4%)	417 (6.6%)
3	2,844 (41.2%)	2,613 (41.3%)
4	2,099 (30.4%)	1,926 (30.4%)
5 – highest	441 (6.4%)	423 (6.7%)
Missing	985 (14.3%)	870 (13.6%)
Children		
Mean age difference in months, mean (SD)	0.00 (5.8)	0.00 (5.8)
Gender, n (%)		
Boys	3,499 (50.7%)	3,170 (50.1%)
Girls	3,399 (49.3%)	3,158 (49.9%)
SDQ ⁵ total difficulties score, median (IQR)	6 (3 – 9)	5 (3 – 9)
 O-level and CSE were the national exams which students in England sat A-levels are pre-university examinations EPDS is the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale 	n their last year of compulsory	school education at age 16

4. SES is socioeconomic status, derived from the Computer-assisted structured coding tool (CASCoT)

5. SDQ is the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

BMJ Open

There were complete responses to the 58 paternal involvement questions for between 4,560 and 5,381 children at 8 weeks and 8 months. A total of 45 out of the 58 items reflecting paternal involvement were included in the exploratory factor analysis. Reasons for exclusion of 13 items were: high uniqueness coefficients of greater than 0.9 affecting 8 items; low loadings on the retained factors affecting 1 item; large amounts of missing data – more than 50% – affecting 3 items; and similarity between two items leading to one of them being dropped. Table 2 presents the results of the exploratory factor analysis.

Three factors of paternal involvement, explaining 66.0% of the total variance in included items, were identified: items in the first factor, explaining 31.4% of total variance, described fathers' emotional response to the baby and their parenting role; items in the second factor, explaining 17.7% of total variance, measured fathers' level of engagement in domestic and childcare activities; and items in the third factor, explaining 16.9% of total variance, characterised fathers' security in their role as a parent and partner. Confirmatory factor analysis showed this factor structure to be an acceptable representation of the correlations between items in the data (CFI = 0.916, TLI = 0.911, RMSEA = 0.065).

Unadjusted ordered logistic regression showed strong evidence that the first and third factor scores were associated with the outcome (Table 3). Children of fathers whose responses corresponded to higher Factor 1 scores had 21% and 19% reductions in proportional odds of higher SDQ total difficulty scores at ages 9 and 11 respectively, and children of fathers whose responses corresponded to higher Factor 3 scores had 28% reduction in proportional odds of higher SDQ total difficulty scores at both times. Other factors were also found to be associated with the outcome. Specifically, higher parental age, level of education and SES category were associated with reduced proportional odds of higher behavioural difficulty scores, while more hours worked per week, higher EPDS scores, child's age and male gender were associated with poorer behavioural outcomes.

Multivariable models adjusting for these potential confounders were fitted, with multiple imputation of missing values of covariates. The adjusted proportional odds of higher behavioural problems scores were 15% lower at 9 years and 12% lower at 11 years per unit increase in Factor 1 scores and 12% lower at 9 years and 10% lower at 11 years per unit increase in Factor 3 scores, comparing children of the same age and gender, family size, socio-economic status, who were exposed to the same level of parental depression (Table 3). There was no evidence of a difference in the effect of paternal involvement in boys versus girls; p-values for interaction of child's gender with Factor 1 and with Factor 3 were 0.907 and 0.864 respectively in models of the outcome at 9 years, and 0.189 and 0.918 respectively at 11 years. The proportional odds assumption was not violated in these models; Brant test p-values were 0.078 and 0.050 for models on data at 9 years and 0.316 and 0.514 on models at 11 years.

Table 2: Exploratory facto	r analysis on the	indicators of paternal	involvement
----------------------------	-------------------	------------------------	-------------

,	Indicator	Rotated loadings*		
)	Indicator	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
0	Helped with shopping since birth		0.4891	
1	Helped with cleaning home since birth		0.7112	
2	Helped with meal preparation since birth		0.7013	
3	Helped with washing up since birth		0.6077	
4	Helped with housework since birth		0.7573	
5	Helped with cooking meals since birth		0.6882	
b 7	Helped with clothes wash since birth		0.5878	
7 8 9	How frequently partner changes nappy per week		0.5178	
5	How frequently partner bathes child per week		0.4293	
1	How frequently partner plays with child per week	0.4324	0.4107	
3 4	How frequently partner walks child outside per week		0.4284	
5	How frequently partner puts child to bed per week		0.4225	
3	How frequently partner feeds/helps at night per week		0.4294	
5)	Mum excludes partner from childcare			0.7346
1	Feel confident with child	0.3857		-0.3201
2	Feel mum does not trust partner with child			0.6817
3	Happy with the way mum brings up child	0.3652		-0.4507
4	Happy with the way partner brings up child	0.5094		-0.4468
5	Making a strong bond with child	0.6147		
5	My stress is a bad influence on child	-0.3728		0.4486
/ 0	Home is woman's place, no part for me		-0.3643	0.3871

Indicator	Rotated loadings*		
indicator	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Partner always getting under mum's feet			0.4928
Mum dislikes partner being involved with child			0.7315
Partner guilty at not enjoying child	-0.5480		0.4373
Partner regrets having child	-0.6553		
Partner regrets lack of experience of children			0.3160
This child has made partner more fulfilled	0.6465		
Parenthood has made partner and mum closer	0.5038		
Mum no longer gives partner attention			0.5413
Feel hurt by attention mum gives child			0.5760
Partner well prepared for birth and childcare			-0.3166
Partner enjoys getting home to see mum & child	0.6307		
Enjoy the baby	0.8294		
Preferred not to have had baby	-0.5550		
Feel confident with baby	0.5776		
Dislike mess surrounding baby	-0.3707		
Pleasure watching baby develop	0.8240		
Find baby crying unbearable	-0.3836		
Constantly unsure whether doing right thing			0.3160
Feel should enjoy baby but am not	-0.6869		
No time to self	-0.4583		
Baby made feel more fulfilled	0.7315		
Feel babies are fun	0.8185		
Talking to baby is important	0.4211		
Cuddling baby is very important	0.4612		
*Displaying only loadings greater than 0.3			

Page 10 of 17

 48
 136/bmjogen-2016-012034 on 22 November 2016. Downloaded from http://bmjogen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de 187

 49
 6
 Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

 79
 Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

 79
 Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

 79
 Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

 70
 Enseignement (ABES)

 70
 <td

BMJ Open

 Table 3: Unadjusted and adjusted proportional odds ratios for the effect of paternal involvement on

 SDQ scores at ages 9 and 11 years, with 95% confidence intervals and p-values

Determel invelvement forten	9 y	ears	11 years	
scores	Unadjusted [n = 5,717]	Adjusted* [n = 6,223]	Unadjusted [n = 5,262]	Adjusted* [n = 5,500]
Factor 1: "emotional response to baby and parenting"	0.79 0.73 – 0.86 <0.001	0.86 0.79 – 0.94 0.001	0.81 0.74 - 0.88 <0.001	0.89 0.81 – 0.98 0.017
Factor 2: "engagement in domestic and childcare activities"	1.01 0.90 - 1.14 0.854	_	1.09 0.97 – 1.24 0.160	_
Factor 3: "security in role as parent and partner"	0.72 0.66 - 0.78 <0.001	0.87 0.79 – 0.96 0.006	0.72 0.66 – 0.79 0.001	0.89 0.81 – 0.99 0.034
*Adjusting for notornal and maternal EDDC			U.UUI	0.054

*Adjusting for paternal and maternal EPDS score, parity, maternal age, family SES score, child's age and child's gender

Discussion

This analysis of data from almost 7,500 children in the south-west of England characterised the nature of paternal involvement in early child upbringing and explored its effects on behavioural outcomes in pre-adolescent children. We found that the children of fathers whom we characterised as having a positive emotional response to parenting and a sense of security in their role as a parent and partner early in the child's life – corresponding to higher scores on Factor 1 and Factor 3 respectively – were less likely to exhibit behavioural problems at 9 and 11 years of age. Our analyses also show that the amount of paternal involvement with childcare and household tasks such as shopping, cleaning, cooking, and childcare activities was not associated with behavioural problems.

Our findings are consistent with previous suggestions that paternal involvement may encompass different aspects of how fathers interact with their children and partners, and these aspects potentially differ in terms of how they manifest themselves in father-child interactions, and also in their effects on child outcomes. While paternal involvement is broadly associated with a variety of positive outcomes for children – either directly or indirectly such as through resource-related benefits on health, education and general well-being – previous evidence for whether it contributes to mental health outcomes has not been consistent. For example, paternal presence and involvement in childcare [40], and shared activities, supportive behaviour and feelings of affection towards children [41] have been shown to be associated with lower likelihood of behavioural problems in 3 and 5 to 18 year olds respectively. Similarly, fathers' involvement in childcare has been linked to cognitive outcomes in 2 to 6 year olds [42], [43]. However, other studies have found little or no evidence of an effect of fathers' involvement in childcare on behavioural outcomes [42]–[44]. This may imply that the

amount of paternal involvement in these activities may not be as important for this outcome as the type of involvement [23].

Although we measured paternal involvement as a multi-dimensional construct, our approach did not mirror the three defining elements of an involved father – engagement, accessibility and responsibility – proposed by Lamb, Pleck and others [16]. We included in our analysis only children whose fathers (or father-figures) were present in the early years but who varied in terms of their level of financial contribution to their families; so although we attempted to ensure that the level of fathers' accessibility was approximately the same for these children, we were not able to distinguish between different levels of fathers' financial contributions. However our analysis adjusted for socio-economic differences between families based on the likely income level of both parents. This may be a better way of dealing with financial contribution in general since it is increasingly common for either or both parents to be breadwinners, and as such fathers making little or no financial contribution to their family would not necessarily imply a of lack of responsibility. Further deviating from the original Lamb-Pleck conceptual framework, our analysis suggests that paternal engagement may extend beyond activities encompassing direct childcare to include those performed for the general well-being of the child and the rest of the family, including cooking, cleaning and shopping.

Positive parenting by fathers may contribute to good outcomes in children in a number of ways. Involved fathers may influence children indirectly by being a source of instrumental and emotional support to mothers who provide more of the direct care for children [23]. The potential positive effect of this on mothers' well-being and parenting strategies [45] may then lead to better outcomes in children [46]. There is evidence that fathers' involvement can also alleviate the impact of factors such as maternal depression which are known to increase children's risk of behavioural problems [47]. Greater paternal involvement may also lead to or be a manifestation of a happy and cohesive family [48], and this may bring about better outcomes in children. Social and cultural differences within and across societies may limit the generalisability of these findings.

These findings are based on observational data, and although we have adjusted for several factors known to be associated with child behaviour, we cannot rule out the possibility of residual confounding. There were also a number of sources of potential bias. For example, child behavioural outcome measures reported by mothers could have been influenced by the mothers' own mental health or her attitudes to her children which in turn could be associated with paternal involvement [49]–[51]. However in these data parent-level predictors preceded child-level outcomes by up to a decade, which is likely to have weakened this bias. We used fathers' own reports of their involvement, and this may have further reduced the potential for information bias that may arise with mother-reported measures of paternal involvement. The large sample size, detailed data on fathers'

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

involvement and our rigorous approach to the analysis were also a strength, particularly in exploring the multi-faceted nature of paternal involvement. Lastly, a number of plausible mechanisms of the association between paternal involvement and child behaviour support the observed associations.

There is some scope for further research to address some related questions. These include exploring the effect of paternal involvement on other mental health outcomes such as identity, self-esteem, emotional and social development, and how they vary over time. For example, the effect of paternal involvement on child behaviour may become less important over time especially in the adolescent period when other factors such as age and gender start being more influential. This could be explored using growth curve models, but would have required at least a third data point for the outcome.

Conclusion

The findings of this research study suggest that it is psychological and emotional aspects of paternal involvement in a child's infancy that are most powerful in influencing later child behaviour and not the amount of time that fathers are engaged in childcare or domestic tasks in the household. How new fathers see themselves as parents, how they value their role as a parent and how they adjust to this new role, rather than the amount of direct involvement in childcare in this period, appears to be associated with positive behavioural outcomes in children.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012034 on 22 November 2016. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Ron Gray for his input during the planning of this project. We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for their help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists and nurses.

Author contributions

All authors contributed to the study design. CO conducted the analysis and all authors interpreted the results. CO produced the draft manuscript to which all authors contributed and provided feedback during its development. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript and will serve as guarantors for its contents.

Competing interests

There are no competing interests.

Data availability

Data are available from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) at the University of Bristol for researchers who meet the criteria for access to confidential data. The authors do not own this data, and have signed a legal agreement with the data owners not to share the data publicly. Permission to access the data is granted by the ALSPAC project at the University of Bristol. Information on data access is available at http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/data-access/.

Ethical approval

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee and the Local Research Ethics Committees.

Funding

This paper reports on an independent study which was funded by the Policy Research Programme in the Department of Health, England (grant 108/0001). The views expressed are not necessarily those of

BMJ Open

the Department. The UK Medical Research Council and the Wellcome Trust (grant 102215/2/13/2), and the University of Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC.

References

- [1] W. de M. F. e Freitas, A. T. M. C. da Silva, E. de A. C. Coelho, R. N. Guedes, K. D. T. de Lucena, and A. P. T. Costa, "Paternity: social responsibility of man's role as provider.," *Rev. Saúde Pública*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 85–90, Feb. 2009.
- [2] K. Nyström and K. Ohrling, "Parenthood experiences during the child's first year: literature review.," J. Adv. Nurs., vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 319–30, May 2004.
- [3] Office for National Statistics, "Women in the labour market," 2013.
- [4] A. Cipollone, E. Patacchini, and G. Vallanti, "Women labor market participation in Europe: novel evidence on trends and shaping factors," 2013.
- [5] S. Cohany and E. Sok, "Trends in labor force participation of married mothers of infants," *Mon. Lab. Rev.*, 2007.
- [6] L. Barclay and D. Lupton, "The experiences of new fatherhood: a socio-cultural analysis.," J. Adv. Nurs., vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 1013–20, Apr. 1999.
- [7] K. L. Raby, G. I. Roisman, R. C. Fraley, and J. A. Simpson, "The enduring predictive significance of early maternal sensitivity: social and academic competence through age 32 years.," *Child Dev.*, vol. 86, no. 3, pp. 695–708, Jan. 2015.
- [8] B. H. Schneider, L. Atkinson, and C. Tardif, "Child-parent attachment and children's peer relations: a quantitative review.," *Dev. Psychol.*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 86–100, Jan. 2001.
- [9] C. Desforges and A. Abouchaar, "The impact of parental involvement, parental support and family education on pupil achievements and adjustment: A literature review," 2003.
- [10] E. Flouri, *Fathering and child outcomes*. 2005.
- [11] E. Flouri and A. Buchanan, "What predicts fathers' involvement with their children? A prospective study of intact families," *Br. J. Dev. Psychol.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 81–97, Mar. 2003.
- [12] J. Aldous, Mulligan, and G. M., "Fathers' Child Care and Children's Behavior Problems: A Longitudinal Study," *J. Fam. Issues*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 624–647, Jul. 2002.
- [13] H. A. Raikes and R. A. Thompson, "Attachment security and parenting quality predict children's problem-solving, attributions, and loneliness with peers.," *Attach. Hum. Dev.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 319–44, Sep. 2008.
- [14] G. S. Pettit, R. D. Laird, K. A. Dodge, J. E. Bates, and M. M. Criss, "Antecedents and behaviorproblem outcomes of parental monitoring and psychological control in early adolescence.," *Child Dev.*, vol. 72, no. 2, pp. 583–98, Jan. 2001.
- [15] J. Pleck, "Why could father involvement benefit children? Theoretical perspectives," *Appl. Dev. Sci.*, 2007.
- [16] M. Lamb, J. Pleck, E. Charnov, and J. Levine, "Paternal Behavior in Humans," 1985.
- [17] S. McLanahan and A. N. Beck, "Parental relationships in fragile families.," *Future Child.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 17–37, Jan. 2010.

[18] M. J. Carlson, S. S. McLanahan, and J. Brooks-Gunn, "Coparenting and nonresident fathers' involvement with young children after a nonmarital birth.," *Demography*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 461–88, May 2008.

- [19] C. F. Garfield and P. J. Chung, "A qualitative study of early differences in fathers' expectations of their child care responsibilities.," *Ambul. Pediatr.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 215–20, Jan. 2006.
- [20] A. M. Romirowsky and A. Chronis-Tuscano, "Paternal ADHD symptoms and child conduct problems: is father involvement always beneficial?," *Child. Care. Health Dev.*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 706–14, Sep. 2014.
- [21] W. T. Boyce, M. J. Essex, A. Alkon, H. H. Goldsmith, H. C. Kraemer, and D. J. Kupfer, "Early father involvement moderates biobehavioral susceptibility to mental health problems in middle childhood.," J. Am. Acad. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry, vol. 45, no. 12, pp. 1510–20, Dec. 2006.
- [22] M. M. Black, H. Dubowitz, and R. H. Starr, "African American fathers in low income, urban families: development, behavior, and home environment of their three-year-old children.," *Child Dev.*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 967–78, Jan. 1999.
- [23] M. Lamb, "How do fathers influence children's development? Let me count the ways," in *The role of the father in child development*, 2010, pp. 1–26.
- [24] G. Brunton, K. Sutcliffe, K. Twamley, K. Hinds, and J. Thomas, "Becoming a Dad: the impact of fathers' involvement on the mental health of children, mothers and fathers: a systematic rapid evidence assessment of Millennium Cohort Study analyses," EPPI Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Oct. 2010.
- [25] J. Golding, M. Pembrey, R. Jones, and ALSPAC Study Team, "ALSPAC-The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children," *Paediatr. Perinat. Epidemiol.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 74–87, Jan. 2001.
- [26] J. Golding, "Children of the nineties. A longitudinal study of pregnancy and childhood based on the population of Avon (ALSPAC).," *West Engl. Med. J.*, 1990.
- [27] A. Fraser, C. Macdonald-Wallis, and K. Tilling, "Cohort profile: the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort," *Int. J. Epidemiol.*, 2013.
- [28] A. Boyd, J. Golding, J. Macleod, and D. Lawlor, "Cohort profile: the 'children of the 90s'—the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children," *Int. J. Epidemiol.*, 2012.
- [29] ALSPAC Study Team, "Accessing the resource," 2016. [Online]. Available: http://www.bris.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/data-access/data-dictionary/. [Accessed: 18-Jan-2016].
- [30] R. Goodman, "The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a research note," J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry, 1997.
- [31] R. Goodman, "SDQ: Information for Researchers and Professionals about Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaires," Youth In Mind, 2000. [Online]. Available: http://www.sdqinfo.com/py/sdqinfo/c0.py. [Accessed: 08-Feb-2015].
- [32] L. Murray and A. Carothers, "The validation of the Edinburgh Post-natal Depression Scale on a community sample.," *Br. J. Psychiatry*, 1990.
- [33] Warwick Institute for Employment Research, "Computer Assisted Structured Coding Tool (CASCOT)." 2000.
- [34] A. Costello and J. Osborne, "Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis.," *Pract. Assess. Res. Eval.*, no. 10, 2005.

BMJ Open

[35]	T. Asparouhov and B. Muthén, "Plausible values for latent variables using Mplus," 2010. [Online]. Available: http://www.statmodel.com/download/Plausible.pdf. [Accessed: 01-Feb- 2016].
[36]	A. Skrondal and P. Laake, "Regression among factor scores," <i>Psychometrika</i> , vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 563–575, Dec. 2001.
[37]	J. S. Long and J. Freese, "Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables using Stata, 2nd Edition," StataCorp LP, 2006.
[38]	StataCorp, "Stata 13." StataCorp LP, College Station, TX:, 2013.
[39]	L. K. Muthén and B. O. Muthén, "MPlus 7." Muthén & Muthén, Los Angeles, CA, 2015.
[40]	S. Dex and K. Ward, "Parental care and employment in early childhood: Analysis of the Millenium Cohort Study (MCS) Sweeps 1 and 2," 2007.
[41]	P. Amato and F. Rivera, "Paternal involvement and children's behavior problems," <i>J. Marriage Fam.</i> , 1999.
[42]	M. del C. Huerta, W. Adema, J. Baxter, WJ. Han, M. Lausten, R. Lee, and J. Waldfogel, "Fathers' Leave, Fathers' Involvement and Child Development." OECD Publishing, 14-Jan-2013.
[43]	A. Sullivan, O. Cara, H. Joshi, S. Ketende, and P. Obolenskaya, "The consequences of childhood disadvantage in Northern Ireland at age 5," 2010.
[44]	N. Cabrera and C. Tamis-LeMonda, "Fatherhood in the twenty-first century," Child Dev., 2000.
[45]	R. Feldman, "Maternal versus child risk and the development of parent-child and family relationships in five high-risk populations.," <i>Dev. Psychopathol.</i> , vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 293–312, Jan. 2007.
[46]	P. Amato, "Father-child relations, mother-child relations, and offspring psychological well-being in early adulthood," J. Marriage Fam., 1994.
[47]	J. J. Chang, C. T. Halpern, and J. S. Kaufman, "Maternal depressive symptoms, father's involvement, and the trajectories of child problem behaviors in a US national sample.," <i>Arch. Pediatr. Adolesc. Med.</i> , vol. 161, no. 7, pp. 697–703, Jul. 2007.
[48]	J. Aldous, G. Mulligan, and T. Bjarnason, "Fathering over time: What makes the difference?," J. Marriage Fam., 1998.
[49]	D. Harmon and A. Perry, "Fathers' unaccounted contributions: Paternal involvement and maternal stress," <i>Fam. Soc.</i> , 2011.
[50]	A. Kalil, K. M. Ziol-Guest, and R. L. Coley, "Perceptions of father involvement patterns in teenage-mother families: Predictors and links to mothers' psychological adjustment," <i>Fam. Relat.</i> , vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 197–211, Apr. 2005.
[51]	J. Hobcraft and K. Kiernan, "Predictive factors from age 3 and infancy for poor child outcomes at age 5 relating to children's development, behaviour and health: evidence from the Millennium Cohort Study," 2010.

	Item	Recommendation	Included
Fitle and	1	(<i>a</i>) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or	Yes – p2
abstract		the abstract	
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what	Yes – p2
		was done and what was found	
Introduction			
Background/	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being	Yes-p4
rationale		reported	
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Yes-p4
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Yes – p4, p5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of	Yes – p4, p5
		recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	
Participants	6	(a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	Yes – p4, p5
		methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	
		Case-control study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and	
		methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for	
		the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the	
		eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	
		(b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number	No – not a matched study
		of exposed and unexposed	
		number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes exposures predictors potential confounders	Ves_n6
v allables	7	and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria if applicable	1 cs = po
Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest give sources of data and details of methods	Yes – p4 p5 p6
measurement	Ū.	of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment	r ·, r ·, r ·
		methods if there is more than one group	
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Included in description of
			overarching study, referenced
			in [28] (p5)
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	No - not estimating effect size
			in this secondary analysis
Quantitative	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If	Yes – p6
variables		applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	
Statistical	12	(<i>a</i>) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for	Yes – p6
methods		confounding	
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	Yes-p6
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Yes-p6
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was	Yes – p5: loss-to-follow-up
		addressed	was an exclusion criterion
		Case-control study—It applicable, explain how matching of cases and	
		controls was addressed	
		<i>cross-sectional study</i> —II applicable, describe analytical methods taking	
		(a) Describe any constituity and rec	Constitute analysis + 1-
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	Sensitivity analysis not done

Page 19 of 19

57

58

59 60

BMJ Open

	Item	Recommendation	Done?
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included	Yes – p5
		in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	Yes – p5
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Yes – p5
Descriptive	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical,	Yes-p8
data		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of	Vac nº
		(b) indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	res - ps
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total	Yes – p6: analysis limited to
		amount)	11 years
Outcome data	15*	Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Yes – p6 reported at 9 and 1
		over time	years
		Case-control study-Report numbers in each exposure category, or	Not applicable
		summary measures of exposure	
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary	Not applicable
		measures	
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted	Yes – p9, p11
		estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear	
		which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were	Yes – p6: for SES in
		categorized	'Methods'
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute	Not applicable
		risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions,	Yes – p9
		and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Yes – p11
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential	Yes – p11
		bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential	
		bias	
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives,	Yes – p11
		limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other	
		relevant evidence	
Generalisabilit v	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Yes-p12
Other informat	tion		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study	Yes-p14
		and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen?bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

Father involvement in early child-rearing and behavioural outcomes in their pre-adolescent children: evidence from the ALSPAC UK birth cohort

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-012034.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Jun-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Opondo, Charles; University of Oxford, National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit Redshaw, Maggie; University of Oxford, National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit Savage-McGlynn, Emily; University of Oxford, National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit Quigley, Maria; University of Oxford, National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit
Primary Subject Heading :	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Mental health
Keywords:	fathers involvement, child-rearing, behavioural outcomes, ALSPAC



1	Father involvement in early child-rearing and behavioural outcomes in their pre-adolescent children: evidence from the
2	AI SPAC UK birth cohort
3	
4 5 6	Charles Opondo*, Maggie Redshaw, Emily Savage-McGlynn, Maria A. Quigley
7	Policy Research Unit in Maternal Health and Care
8	National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit
9	Nuffield Department of Population Health
10	Liniversity of Oxford, Old Road Campus, Headington
12	Ovford OX3 7LE
12	
14	
15	
16	*Corresponding author: charles.opondo@npeu.ox.ac.uk
17	
18	Word counts: abstract – 300; main text – 3,361; tables – 3; figures – 1.
19	
20	Key words: fathers involvement; child-rearing; behavioural outcomes; ALSPAC
21	
22	
23	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33 34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44 45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54 55	
00 56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

Abstract

Objective: To explore the nature of paternal involvement in early child-rearing adopting a social developmental perspective, and estimate its effect on behavioural outcomes of 9 and 11 year-olds.

Setting: The data come from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) cohort recruited in the former county of Avon in the southwest of England.

Participants: Out of the 14,701 children in this cohort who were alive at 1 year, 10,440 children were living with both parents at 8 months and were therefore eligible. Outcome data were available for 6,898 children at 9 years and 6,328 children at 11 years.

Main exposure: Paternal involvement was measured using factor scores obtained through factor analysis of fathers' responses on their participation in, understanding of, and feelings about their child's early upbringing.

Outcome: Behavioural problems were measured using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) total difficulties score.

Results: Three factors were identified in the factor analysis: Factor 1 described fathers' emotional response to the child; Factor 2 measured the frequency of fathers' involvement in domestic and childcare activities; Factor 3 characterised fathers' feelings of security in their role as parent and partner. Children of fathers with high scores on factors 1 and 3 had 14% (OR 0.86, 95%CI 0.79-0.94, p=0.001) and 13% (OR 0.87, 95%CI 0.79–0.96, p=0.006) respectively lower adjusted odds of behavioural problems at 9 years. Factors 1 and 3 were associated with comparable reduction in adjusted odds of behavioural problems at 11 years (OR 0.89, 95%CI 0.81–0.98, p=0.017 and OR 0.89, 95%CI 0.81–0.99, p=0.034 respectively). Factor 2 was not associated with the outcome.

Conclusion: Psychological and emotional aspects of paternal involvement in children's early upbringing, particularly how new fathers see themselves as parents and adjust to the role, rather than the quantity of direct involvement in childcare, is associated with positive behavioural outcomes in children.

Strengths and limitations

Strengths

- The study is based on a large sample derived from detailed cohort data.
- A rigorous approach has been adopted to explore the multi-faceted nature of the main exposure.
- The study highlights the role of fathers in child development, which has been relatively underresearched.

Limitations

- Findings are based on observational data which is often subject to unmeasured confounding.
- The main exposure and outcome are based on self-report, which may be subject to bias.

Introduction

In most societies, the involvement of fathers in child rearing has traditionally been framed as the role of 'provider' [1], [2] with mothers doing most of the task-oriented caring and nurturing of children. However, in recent decades social changes including the rapid increase in the proportion of working mothers [3]–[5] and changes in employment regulations such as increased paternity leave have resulted in a shift towards more of the direct parenting duties being shared by both parents [6]. Understanding the nature and effect of fathers' involvement on the health and well-being of children could therefore help inform policies aimed at improving family psychological and health outcomes.

The nature of parenting in a child's early years is thought to play an important role in influencing the child's immediate and long-term well-being and mental health, including social development [7], [8], and cognitive and educational outcomes [9]. The years of middle childhood preceding adolescence represent a developmental stage that is marked by rapid physical growth, cognitive change and the development of social awareness and skills[10]. The nature and extent of fathers' involvement in parenting may change over the course of a child's life. However, early paternal involvement is often associated with continuing engagement and may be a proxy-measure of overall engagement [11]–[13]. Early parenting can also affect outcomes later in life [14], [15]. For these reasons we were interested in whether fathers' involvement early in their child's life was associated with the child's later mental health and social development. We focused on the child's behaviour as a component of mental health because of its strong link with cognitive [16] and educational outcomes [17].

Paternal involvement, as with maternal involvement and that of the family more broadly, is multifaceted [18], [19]. It can be characterised by: fathers' *accessibility* to their children measured by their frequency of contact with the child [20], [21], co-residence with the child [20] or even presence at the child's birth [22]; their *engagement* in childcare activities such as playing, feeding and bathing [23]–[25]; and their demonstration of *responsibility* in providing for the material [25] and emotional [26] needs of their children. Nevertheless, many studies have tended to characterise paternal involvement as a unidimensional construct [27]. The failure to adopt a more multi-dimensional approach may explain why the evidence for its effect on mental health outcomes in children is unclear.

In this study we sought to first identify the multi-dimensional aspects of paternal involvement before investigating their potential influence on pre-adolescent children's behaviour. We then explored the relationship between paternal involvement in the child's upbringing at 8 weeks and 8 months postnatally and child behavioural outcomes at age 9 and 11 years, hypothesising that greater early paternal involvement would be associated with positive behavioural outcomes.

Data

Data were drawn from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) cohort [28], [29]. It is based on a sample of children born to mothers living in the former county of Avon in the southwest of England between April 1991 and December 1992. A detailed description of the sample profile has been provided elsewhere [30], [31] and the study website contains details of all the data that is available through a fully searchable data dictionary [32].

There were 14,701 children in the total sample who were alive at 1 year. Data on 14,688 term singletons and twins who were alive at age 1 year were provided for these analyses and 13 observations on higherorder multiple births omitted from our data to preserve confidentiality. We also excluded 713 children recruited retrospectively when the children in the original core sample were around 7 years old (Phase II and Phase III recruitment) and 3,535 children whose mothers did not live with (or report living with) a partner at 8 months. Out of the remaining 10,440 eligible children, the analysis was based on 6,898 and 6,328 children whose mothers completed the SDQ questionnaires at age 9 and 11 years respectively (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Sample profile of the children included in the analysis

Outcome, exposure and potential confounder variables

Data were collected using self-completion questionnaires sent to mothers and their partners after recruitment and when the child was aged 8 weeks, 8 months, 9 years and 11 years. The questionnaires asked about mental health, parenting and childcare, behaviour, socio-economic status of parents, and child development.

The outcome was the child's behaviour measured by the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) completed by the mother [33]. This tool has 5 sub-scales, namely 'emotional symptoms', 'conduct problems', 'hyperactivity', 'peer relationship problems' and 'prosocial behaviour'. Each scale is made up of 5 items giving a total of 25 items. The items are statements about psychological attributes, some positive (e.g. 'considerate of other people's feelings' and 'kind to younger children') and others negative (e.g. 'restless, overactive, cannot stay still for long' and 'nervous or clingy in new situations, easily loses confidence'). One of three ordered responses are given to each question: 0 ('not true'), 1 ('somewhat true') or 2 ('certainly true'). These are then summed up to obtain the scale scores and the total SDQ score. In our analyses we used the SDQ total difficulty score derived by summing up the scores of the first 4 scales of the SDQ [34] measured at age 9 and 11 years.

Paternal involvement was measured by asking fathers to rate their level of agreement – on 3 to 6-point ordinal scales – with items developed exclusively for the study by the ALSPAC study team and not drawn from an existing scale. We identified and selected 58 statements based on paternal report which reflected direct care and associated household tasks, fathers' attitudes to parenting, relationship with child, and fathers' moods and feelings in the post-partum period at 8 weeks (37 items) and 8 months (21 items) after the birth of the child.

Data on other factors measured after recruitment which, according to the literature [35]–[40], were potentially associated with the main outcome and/or exposure were also obtained including parental age, level of education (O-level/CSE/vocational training, A-level or university degree), depression symptoms measured 8 weeks postnatally on the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS) [41], socio-economic status derived from self-reported occupation using the Computer Assisted Structured Coding Tool (CASCoT) and coded into quintiles from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) [42], number of hours worked in the current or most recently held job, and child's age and gender.

Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed on the items measuring fathers' direct care and associated household tasks, attitudes, relationship with child, and moods and feelings in the early months. Factors identified in this analysis were deemed to represent key aspects of paternal involvement. Next, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was undertaken to check whether the factor structure identified during EFA was a good fit for the data. To improve the fit of the CFA model items that loaded on more than one factor were removed from further analysis, as were items with low factor loadings (less than 0.3), because they were deemed to be poor measures of the underlying construct [43].Once a well-fitting factor structure was identified, factor scores for each of the identified aspects of paternal involvement were calculated. Factor scores are standard normal estimates of each individual's relative position in the continuum of the latent characteristic being measured. They were calculated as the maximum of the posterior distribution (MAP) of the latent factors given the observed and unobserved responses corresponding to the individual [44]. Factor scores so derived yield unbiased regression slopes when used as predictors in models [45]. Labels corresponding to the construct represented by the items underpinning each factor were then attributed to the factor scores to facilitate interpretation of the results.

To explore the association between paternal involvement and behavioural outcomes a two-step procedure was undertaken. First, univariable ordered logistic regression models of SDQ total difficulties scores on the factor scores and paternal, maternal and child covariates were fitted to identify the factors which were associated with the outcome. Next, all factors found to be independently associated

BMJ Open

with SDQ score (likelihood ratio p-values less than 5%) were included in a multivariable model, retaining only those factors for which there was still evidence of association with the outcome even after adjustment. Potential differences in association for boys and girls were explored by fitting and testing interaction terms for gender. Separate models were fitted for SDQ measured at 9 and 11 years.

Missing data were dealt with in three ways. Firstly, the MAP estimation of factor scores allowed for the partial recovery of information contained in unobserved paternal involvement items. Secondly, missing data in SDQ component items were handled by prorating scale scores for up to two missing responses out of the five items in each scale [34]. It is a single imputation procedure which replaces an individual's missing item scores with the mean score for the scale to which the missing item belongs. Thirdly, missing values of covariates in the multivariable regression modelling were assumed to be missing completely at random. Multiple imputation was performed to recover the information contained in these missing values, with ten imputed datasets used to obtain the final estimates.

The proportional odds assumption underpinning the ordered logistic regression models was examined using the Brant test with χ^2 p-values less than 5% interpreted as a violation of this assumption [46]. Data management and manipulation were performed using Stata v13 [47]. Analyses were run in Stata v13 and MPlus v7 [48].

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012034 on 22 November 2016. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Results

The characteristics of the samples at 9 years and 11 years were very similar (Table 1). Overall there were slightly more boys than girls. Fathers were on average aged 31 years and educated to O-level or CSE (examinations completed in the final year of compulsory schooling at age 16 years) or had some vocational (skills) training. They reported working about 45 hours per week in their current or most recent job around the time when the child was 8 months old and had low depression scores on the EPDS. Mothers were on average 2 years younger than the fathers, were educated to a similar level, had slightly higher EPDS scores than fathers, and had 1 child prior to the one included in the study. Parents tended to be in similar SES categories. Most children had low total difficulties scores, with medians of 6 and 5 at the two respective time points.

2	
3	
4	
4	
5	
6	
7	
0	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
47	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
21	
24	
25	
26	
27	
20	
20	
29	
30	
31	
22	
32	
33	
34	
35	
26	
30	
37	
38	
39	
40	
40	
41	
42	
43	
11	
44	
45	
46	
47	
10	
40	
49	
50	
51	
50	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
50	
5/	
58	
59	
60	
(1)	

Table 1: Characteristics of the parents and children included in the samples at the two time points

	9 years [n = 6,898]	11 years [n = 6,328]
Fathers		
Age in years 18 weeks after birth of child, mean (SD)	31.27 (5.4)	31.30 (5.4)
Highest level of education, n (%)		
O-level, CSE ¹ or vocational	3,021 (43.8%)	2,758 (43.6%)
A-level ²	1,482 (21.5%)	1,366 (21.6%)
University degree	1,048 (15.2%)	1,002 (15.8%)
Missing	1,347 (19.5%)	1,202 (19.0%)
Hours worked per week, mean (SD)	44.83 (9.8)	44.77 (9.9)
EPDS ³ score, median (IQR)	3 (1 – 6)	3 (1 – 6)
SES ⁴ category, n (%)		
1 – lowest	138 (2.0%)	122 (1.9%)
2	499 (7.2%)	453 (7.2%)
3	2,516 (36.5%)	2,297 (36.3%)
4	2,361 (34.2%)	2,184 (34.5%)
5 – highest	875 (12.7%)	823 (13.0%)
Missing	509 (7.4%)	449 (7.1%)
Mothers		
Age in years at birth of child, mean (SD)	29.30 (4.4)	29.33 (4.4)
Highest level of education, n (%)		
O-level, CSE or vocational	2,564 (37.2%)	2,317 (36.6%)
A-level	1,665 (24.1%)	1,564 (24.7%)
University degree	1,413 (20.5%)	1,329 (21.0%)
Missing	1,256 (18.2%)	1,118 (17.7%)
Parity, median (IQR)	1 (0 - 1)	1 (0 - 1)
EPDS score, median (IQR)	5 (2 – 8)	5 (2 – 8)
SES category, n (%)		
1 – lowest	86 (1.3%)	79 (1.3%)
2	443 (6.4%)	417 (6.6%)
3	2,844 (41.2%)	2,613 (41.3%)
4	2,099 (30.4%)	1,926 (30.4%)
5 – highest	441 (6.4%)	423 (6.7%)
Missing	985 (14.3%)	870 (13.6%)
Children		
Mean age difference in months, mean (SD)	0.00 (5.8)	0.00 (5.8)
Gender, n (%)		
Boys	3,499 (50.7%)	3,170 (50.1%)
Girls	3,399 (49.3%)	3,158 (49.9%)
SDQ ⁵ total difficulties score, median (IQR)	6 (3 – 9)	5 (3 – 9)
 O-level and CSE were the national exams which students in England sat A-levels are pre-university examinations EPDS is the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale 	n their last year of compulsory	school education at age 16

4. SES is socioeconomic status, derived from the Computer-assisted structured coding tool (CASCoT)

5. SDQ is the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

There were complete responses to the 58 paternal involvement questions for between 4,560 and 5,381 children at 8 weeks and 8 months. A total of 45 out of the 58 items reflecting paternal involvement were included in the exploratory factor analysis. Reasons for exclusion of 13 items were: high uniqueness coefficients of greater than 0.9 affecting 8 items; low loadings on the retained factors affecting 1 item;

large amounts of missing data – more than 50% – affecting 3 items; and similarity between two items leading to one of them being dropped. Table 2 presents the results of the exploratory factor analysis.

Three factors of paternal involvement, explaining 66.0% of the total variance in included items, were identified: items in the first factor, explaining 31.4% of total variance, described fathers' emotional response to the baby and their parenting role; items in the second factor, explaining 17.7% of total variance, measured fathers' level of engagement in domestic and childcare activities; and items in the third factor, explaining 16.9% of total variance, characterised fathers' security in their role as a parent and partner. Confirmatory factor analysis, which excluded cross-loading items (since this implies that they poorly discriminate between factors [49]), showed this factor structure to be an acceptable representation of the correlations between items in the data (CFI = 0.916, TLI = 0.911, RMSEA = 0.065).

Unadjusted ordered logistic regression showed strong evidence that the first and third factor scores were associated with the outcome (Table 3). Children of fathers whose responses corresponded to higher Factor 1 scores had 21% and 19% reductions in proportional odds of higher SDQ total difficulty scores at ages 9 and 11 respectively, and children of fathers whose responses corresponded to higher Factor 3 scores had 28% reduction in proportional odds of higher SDQ total difficulty scores at both times. Other factors were also found to be associated with the outcome. Specifically, higher parental age, level of education and SES category were associated with reduced proportional odds of higher behavioural difficulty scores, while more hours worked per week, higher EPDS scores, child's age and male gender were associated with poorer behavioural outcomes.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012034 on 22 November 2016. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Multivariable models adjusting for these potential confounders were fitted, with multiple imputation of missing values of covariates. The adjusted proportional odds of higher behavioural problems scores were 15% lower at 9 years and 12% lower at 11 years per unit increase in Factor 1 scores and 12% lower at 9 years and 10% lower at 11 years per unit increase in Factor 3 scores, comparing children of the same age and gender, family size, socio-economic status, who were exposed to the same level of parental depression (Table 3). There was no evidence of a difference in the effect of paternal involvement in boys versus girls; p-values for interaction of child's gender with Factor 1 and with Factor 3 were 0.907 and 0.864 respectively in models of the outcome at 9 years, and 0.189 and 0.918 respectively at 11 years. The proportional odds assumption was not violated in these models; Brant test p-values were 0.078 and 0.050 for models on data at 9 years and 0.316 and 0.514 on models at 11 years.

Table 2: Exploratory factor analysis on the indicators of paternal involvement

	Indicator	Rotated loadings*			
	Indicator	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	
0	Helped with shopping since birth		0.4891		
1	Helped with cleaning home since birth		0.7112		
2	Helped with meal preparation since birth		0.7013		
3	Helped with washing up since birth		0.6077		
4	Helped with housework since birth		0.7573		
5	Helped with cooking meals since birth		0.6882		
0 7	Helped with clothes wash since birth		0.5878		
7 3 9	How frequently partner changes nappy per week		0.5178		
5	How frequently partner bathes child per week		0.4293		
2 2	How frequently partner plays with child per week	0.4324	0.4107		
3 4	How frequently partner walks child outside per week		0.4284		
5	How frequently partner puts child to bed per week		0.4225		
3	How frequently partner feeds/helps at night per week		0.4294		
פ ר	Mum excludes partner from childcare			0.7346	
	Feel confident with child	0.3857		-0.3201	
2	Feel mum does not trust partner with child			0.6817	
3	Happy with the way mum brings up child	0.3652		-0.4507	
ł	Happy with the way partner brings up child	0.5094		-0.4468	
5	Making a strong bond with child	0.6147			
) 7	My stress is a bad influence on child	-0.3728		0.4486	
,	Home is woman's place, no part for me		-0.3643	0.3871	

Indicator	Rotated loadings*			
indicator	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	
Partner always getting under mum's feet			0.4928	
Mum dislikes partner being involved with child			0.7315	
Partner guilty at not enjoying child	-0.5480		0.4373	
Partner regrets having child	-0.6553			
Partner regrets lack of experience of children			0.3160	
This child has made partner more fulfilled	0.6465			
Parenthood has made partner and mum closer	0.5038			
Mum no longer gives partner attention			0.5413	
Feel hurt by attention mum gives child			0.5760	
Partner well prepared for birth and childcare			-0.3166	
Partner enjoys getting home to see mum &	0.6307			
	0.0004			
Enjoy the baby	0.8294			
Preferred not to have had baby	-0.5550			
Feel confident with baby	0.5776			
Dislike mess surrounding baby	-0.3707			
Pleasure watching baby develop	0.8240			
Find baby crying unbearable	-0.3836			
Constantly unsure whether doing right thing			0.3160	
Feel should enjoy baby but am not	-0.6869			
No time to self	-0.4583			
Baby made feel more fulfilled	0.7315			
Feel babies are fun	0.8185			
Talking to baby is important	0.4211			
Cuddling baby is very important	0.4612			
*Displaying only loadings greater than 0.3				

Page **10** of **18**

RMJ Open: first published as 10.136/bmjopen-2016-012034 on 22 November 2016. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I ⁸⁷ 50 - 50 91 - 50 92 - 50 949 - 50 940 -

BMJ Open

Table 3: Unadjusted and adjusted proportional odds ratios for the effect of paternal involvement on SDQ scores at ages 9 and 11 years, with 95% confidence intervals and p-values

Determed invelvencent feater	9 years		11 years	
scores	Unadjusted	Adjusted*	Unadjusted	Adjusted*
	[n = 5,717]	[n = 6,223]	[n = 5,262]	[n = 5,500]
Factor 1: "emotional response to baby and parenting"	0.79	0.86	0.81	0.89
	0.73 – 0.86	0.79 – 0.94	0.74 - 0.88	0.81 – 0.98
	<0.001	0.001	<0.001	0.017
Factor 2: "engagement in domestic and childcare activities"	1.01 0.90 - 1.14 0.854	_	1.09 0.97 – 1.24 0.160	_
Factor 3: "security in role as parent and partner"	0.72	0.87	0.72	0.89
	0.66 – 0.78	0.79 – 0.96	0.66 – 0.79	0.81 – 0.99
	<0.001	0.006	0.001	0.034

*Adjusting for paternal and maternal EPDS score, parity, maternal age, family SES score, child's age and child's gender

Discussion

This analysis of data from over 6,000 fathers and children in the south-west of England characterised the nature of paternal involvement in early child upbringing and explored its effects on behavioural outcomes in pre-adolescent children. We found that the children of fathers whom we characterised as having a positive emotional response to parenting and a sense of security in their role as a parent and partner early in the child's life – corresponding to higher scores on Factor 1 and Factor 3 respectively – were less likely to exhibit behavioural problems at 9 and 11 years of age. These factors may reflect ways of behaving and interacting that are a marker of favourable parental characteristics and positive parenting in the longer term. Our analyses also show that the amount of paternal involvement with childcare and household tasks such as shopping, cleaning, cooking, and childcare activities was not associated with later child behavioural problems. This may be because provision of more direct childcare by fathers may simply reflect temporary circumstances and needs, for example, the absence of extended family support and type of partner employment.

Our findings are consistent with previous suggestions that paternal involvement may encompass different aspects of how fathers interact with their children and partners, and these aspects potentially differ in terms of how they manifest themselves in father-child interactions, and also in their effects on child outcomes. While paternal involvement is broadly associated with a variety of positive outcomes for children – either directly or indirectly such as through resource-related benefits on health, education and general well-being – previous evidence for whether it contributes to mental health outcomes has not been consistent. For example, paternal presence and involvement in childcare [50], and shared activities, supportive behaviour and feelings of affection towards children [51] have been shown to be associated with lower likelihood of behavioural problems in 3 and 5 to 18

year olds respectively. Similarly, fathers' involvement in childcare has been linked to cognitive outcomes in 2 to 6 year olds [52], [53]. However, as in this study, others have found little or no evidence of an effect of fathers' involvement in childcare on behavioural outcomes [52]–[54], suggesting that the amount of paternal involvement in these activities may not be as important for this outcome as the type of involvement and attitudes towards parenting [26].

Although we measured paternal involvement as a multi-dimensional construct, our approach did not mirror the three defining elements of an involved father – engagement, accessibility and responsibility – originally proposed by Lamb, Pleck and others in 1985 [19]. We included in our analysis only children whose fathers (or father-figures) were present in the early years but who varied in terms of their level of financial contribution to their families, and as such were not able to distinguish between different levels of fathers' financial contributions. However our analysis adjusted for socio-economic differences between families based on the likely income level of both parents. This may be a better way of dealing with financial contribution in general since it is increasingly common for either or both parents to be breadwinners, and as such fathers making little or no financial contribution to their family would not necessarily imply a of lack of responsibility. Further deviating from the original Lamb-Pleck conceptual framework, our analysis suggests that paternal involvement may extend beyond activities encompassing direct childcare to associated activities and fathers' attitudes towards the child and themselves as parents.

Positive parenting by fathers may contribute to good outcomes in children in a number of ways. Involved fathers may influence children indirectly by being a source of instrumental and emotional support to mothers who provide more of the direct care for children [26]. The potential positive effect of this on mothers' well-being and parenting strategies [55] may then lead to better outcomes in children [56]. There is evidence that fathers' involvement can also alleviate the impact of factors such as maternal depression which are known to increase children's risk of behavioural problems [57]. Greater paternal involvement may also lead to or be a manifestation of a happy and cohesive family [58], and this may bring about better outcomes in children. Social and cultural differences within and across societies may limit the generalisability of these findings.

There are several limitations to this study. The nature of paternal involvement continues to evolve over time, and because this study is based on a cohort which was born 25 years ago there may be a limit to how generalizable its findings are to the present day. This was an analysis of observational data, and although we have adjusted for several factors known to be associated with child behaviour, we cannot rule out the possibility of residual confounding. There were a number of sources of potential bias. For example, child behavioural outcome measures reported by mothers could have been influenced by the mothers' own mental health or her attitudes to her children which in turn

BMJ Open

could be associated with paternal involvement [59]–[61]. However in these data parent-level predictors preceded child-level outcomes by up to a decade, which is likely to have weakened this bias. We used fathers' own reports of their involvement, and this may have further reduced the potential for information bias that may arise with mother-reported measures of paternal involvement. The large sample size, detailed data on fathers' involvement and our rigorous approach to the analysis were also a strength, particularly in exploring the multi-faceted nature of paternal involvement. Lastly, a number of plausible mechanisms of the association between paternal involvement and child behaviour support the observed associations.

While acknowledging the impact of both parents on children's development and outcomes, there is scope for further research to address some related questions concerning the role of fathers. These include exploring the effect of paternal involvement on other mental health outcomes such as identity, self-esteem, emotional and social development, and how they vary over time. For example, the effect of paternal involvement on child behaviour may become less important over time especially in the adolescent period when peer relationships and other factors such as age and gender start being more influential. This could be explored using growth curve models, but would require further outcome data points.

Conclusion

The findings of this research study suggest that it is psychological and emotional aspects of paternal involvement in a child's infancy that are most powerful in influencing later child behaviour and not the amount of time that fathers are engaged in childcare or domestic tasks in the household. How new fathers see themselves as parents, how they value their role as a parent and how they adjust to this new role, rather than the amount of direct involvement in childcare in this period, appears to be associated with positive behavioural outcomes in children.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Ron Gray for his input during the planning of this project. We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for their help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists and nurses.

Author contributions

All authors contributed to the study design. CO conducted the analysis and all authors interpreted the results. CO produced the draft manuscript to which all authors contributed and provided feedback during its development. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript and will serve as guarantors for its contents.

Competing interests

There are no competing interests.

Data availability

Data are available from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) at the University of Bristol for researchers who meet the criteria for access to confidential data. The authors do not own this data, and have signed a legal agreement with the data owners not to share the data publicly. Permission to access the data is granted by the ALSPAC project at the University of Bristol. Information on data access is available at http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/data-access/.

Ethical approval

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee and the Local Research Ethics Committees.

Funding

This paper reports on an independent study which was funded by the Policy Research Programme in the Department of Health, England (grant 108/0001). The views expressed are not necessarily those of

BMJ Open

the Department. The UK Medical Research Council and the Wellcome Trust (grant 102215/2/13/2), and the University of Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC.

References

- [1] W. de M. F. e Freitas, A. T. M. C. da Silva, E. de A. C. Coelho, R. N. Guedes, K. D. T. de Lucena, and A. P. T. Costa, "Paternity: social responsibility of man's role as provider.," *Rev. Saúde Pública*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 85–90, Feb. 2009.
- [2] K. Nyström and K. Ohrling, "Parenthood experiences during the child's first year: literature review.," J. Adv. Nurs., vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 319–30, May 2004.
- [3] Office for National Statistics, "Women in the labour market," 2013.
- [4] A. Cipollone, E. Patacchini, and G. Vallanti, "Women labor market participation in Europe: novel evidence on trends and shaping factors," *IZA J. Eur. Labor Stud.*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2014.
- [5] S. Cohany and E. Sok, "Trends in labor force participation of married mothers of infants," *Mon. Lab. Rev.*, 2007.
- [6] L. Barclay and D. Lupton, "The experiences of new fatherhood: a socio-cultural analysis.," J. Adv. Nurs., vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 1013–20, Apr. 1999.
- K. L. Raby, G. I. Roisman, R. C. Fraley, and J. A. Simpson, "The enduring predictive significance of early maternal sensitivity: social and academic competence through age 32 years.," *Child Dev.*, vol. 86, no. 3, pp. 695–708, Jan. 2015.
- [8] B. H. Schneider, L. Atkinson, and C. Tardif, "Child-parent attachment and children's peer relations: a quantitative review.," *Dev. Psychol.*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 86–100, Jan. 2001.
- [9] C. Desforges and A. Abouchaar, "The impact of parental involvement, parental support and family education on pupil achievements and adjustment: A literature review," 2003.
- [10] K. Durkin, *Developmental social psychology: from infancy to old age*. Blackwell, 1995.
- [11] E. Flouri, *Fathering and child outcomes*. 2005.
- [12] E. Flouri and A. Buchanan, "What predicts fathers' involvement with their children? A prospective study of intact families," *Br. J. Dev. Psychol.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 81–97, Mar. 2003.
- [13] J. Aldous, Mulligan, and G. M., "Fathers' child care and children's behavior problems: a longitudinal study," *J. Fam. Issues*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 624–647, Jul. 2002.
- [14] H. A. Raikes and R. A. Thompson, "Attachment security and parenting quality predict children's problem-solving, attributions, and loneliness with peers.," *Attach. Hum. Dev.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 319–44, Sep. 2008.
- [15] G. S. Pettit, R. D. Laird, K. A. Dodge, J. E. Bates, and M. M. Criss, "Antecedents and behaviorproblem outcomes of parental monitoring and psychological control in early adolescence.," *Child Dev.*, vol. 72, no. 2, pp. 583–98, Jan. 2001.
- [16] R. Plomin, T. S. Price, T. C. Eley, P. S. Dale, and J. Stevenson, "Associations between behaviour problems and verbal and nonverbal cognitive abilities and disabilities in early childhood.," J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry., vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 619–33, Jul. 2002.
- [17] L. M. Gutman and J. Vorhaus, "The impact of pupil behaviour and wellbeing on educational

outcomes," London, UK, 2012.

- [18] J. Pleck, "Why could father involvement benefit children? Theoretical perspectives," *Appl. Dev. Sci.*, 2007.
- [19] M. Lamb, J. Pleck, E. Charnov, and J. Levine, "Paternal Behavior in Humans," 1985.
- [20] S. McLanahan and A. N. Beck, "Parental relationships in fragile families.," *Future Child.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 17–37, Jan. 2010.
- [21] M. J. Carlson, S. S. McLanahan, and J. Brooks-Gunn, "Coparenting and nonresident fathers' involvement with young children after a nonmarital birth.," *Demography*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 461–88, May 2008.
- [22] C. F. Garfield and P. J. Chung, "A qualitative study of early differences in fathers' expectations of their child care responsibilities.," *Ambul. Pediatr.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 215–20, Jan. 2006.
- [23] A. M. Romirowsky and A. Chronis-Tuscano, "Paternal ADHD symptoms and child conduct problems: is father involvement always beneficial?," *Child. Care. Health Dev.*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 706–14, Sep. 2014.
- [24] W. T. Boyce, M. J. Essex, A. Alkon, H. H. Goldsmith, H. C. Kraemer, and D. J. Kupfer, "Early father involvement moderates biobehavioral susceptibility to mental health problems in middle childhood.," J. Am. Acad. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry, vol. 45, no. 12, pp. 1510–20, Dec. 2006.
- [25] M. M. Black, H. Dubowitz, and R. H. Starr, "African American fathers in low income, urban families: development, behavior, and home environment of their three-year-old children.," *Child Dev.*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 967–78, Jan. 1999.
- [26] M. Lamb, "How do fathers influence children's development? Let me count the ways," in *The* role of the father in child development, 2010, pp. 1–26.
- [27] G. Brunton, K. Sutcliffe, K. Twamley, K. Hinds, and J. Thomas, "Becoming a Dad: the impact of fathers' involvement on the mental health of children, mothers and fathers: a systematic rapid evidence assessment of Millennium Cohort Study analyses," EPPI Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Oct. 2010.
- [28] J. Golding, M. Pembrey, R. Jones, and ALSPAC Study Team, "ALSPAC-The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children," *Paediatr. Perinat. Epidemiol.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 74–87, Jan. 2001.
- [29] J. Golding, "Children of the nineties. A longitudinal study of pregnancy and childhood based on the population of Avon (ALSPAC).," *West Engl. Med. J.*, 1990.
- [30] A. Fraser, C. Macdonald-Wallis, and K. Tilling, "Cohort profile: the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort," *Int. J. Epidemiol.*, 2013.
- [31] A. Boyd, J. Golding, J. Macleod, and D. Lawlor, "Cohort profile: the 'children of the 90s'—the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children," *Int. J. Epidemiol.*, 2012.
- [32] ALSPAC Study Team, "Accessing the resource," 2016. [Online]. Available: http://www.bris.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/data-access/data-dictionary/. [Accessed: 18-Jan-2016].
- [33] R. Goodman, "The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a research note," J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry, 1997.
- [34] R. Goodman, "SDQ: Information for Researchers and Professionals about Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaires," *Youth In Mind*, 2000. [Online]. Available: http://www.sdqinfo.com/py/sdqinfo/c0.py. [Accessed: 08-Feb-2015].

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35 36

37

38 39

40 41

42

43

44 45

46

47 48

49

50 51

52

53 54

55

56

57 58

59 60

BMJ Open

T. M. Achenbach and C. S. Edelbrock, "Behavioral problems and competencies reported by [35] parents of normal and disturbed children aged four through sixteen," Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Dev., vol. 46, no. 1, p. 1, 1981. [36] R. H. Bradley and R. F. Corwyn, "Socioeconomic status and child development," Annu. Rev. Psychol., vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 371–399, Feb. 2002. [37] R. E. Bulanda, "Paternal involvement with children: the influence of gender ideologies," J. Marriage Fam., vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 40–45, Feb. 2004. [38] K. M. Harris and S. P. Morgan, "Fathers, sons, and daughters: differential paternal involvement in parenting," J. Marriage Fam., vol. 53, no. 3, p. 531, Aug. 1991. E. Harvey, "Short-term and long-term effects of early parental employment on children of the [39] National Longitudinal Survey of Youth.," Dev. Psychol., vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 445–459, 1999. [40] S. Saha, A. G. Barnett, S. L. Buka, and J. J. McGrath, "Maternal age and paternal age are associated with distinct childhood behavioural outcomes in a general population birth cohort," Schizophr. Res., vol. 115, no. 2–3, pp. 130–5, Dec. 2009. [41] L. Murray and A. Carothers, "The validation of the Edinburgh Post-natal Depression Scale on a community sample.," Br. J. Psychiatry, 1990. Warwick Institute for Employment Research, "Computer Assisted Structured Coding Tool [42] (CASCOT)." 2000. [43] A. Costello and J. Osborne, "Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis.," Pract. Assess. Res. Eval., no. 10, 2005. [44] T. Asparouhov and B. Muthén, "Plausible values for latent variables using Mplus," 2010. [Online]. Available: http://www.statmodel.com/download/Plausible.pdf. [Accessed: 01-Feb-2016]. [45] A. Skrondal and P. Laake, "Regression among factor scores," Psychometrika, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 563-575, Dec. 2001. [46] J. S. Long and J. Freese, "Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables using Stata, 2nd Edition," StataCorp LP, 2006. StataCorp, "Stata 13." StataCorp LP, College Station, TX:, 2013. [47] [48] L. K. Muthén and B. O. Muthén, "MPlus 7." Muthén & Muthén, Los Angeles, CA, 2015. [49] M. Pett and N. Lackey, Making sense of factor analysis. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 2003. [50] S. Dex and K. Ward, "Parental care and employment in early childhood: Analysis of the Millenium Cohort Study (MCS) Sweeps 1 and 2," 2007. [51] P. Amato and F. Rivera, "Paternal involvement and children's behavior problems," J. Marriage Fam., 1999. [52] M. del C. Huerta, W. Adema, J. Baxter, W.-J. Han, M. Lausten, R. Lee, and J. Waldfogel, "Fathers' Leave, Fathers' Involvement and Child Development." OECD Publishing, 14-Jan-2013. [53] A. Sullivan, O. Cara, H. Joshi, S. Ketende, and P. Obolenskaya, "The consequences of childhood disadvantage in Northern Ireland at age 5," 2010. [54] N. Cabrera and C. Tamis-LeMonda, "Fatherhood in the twenty-first century," Child Dev., 2000. R. Feldman, "Maternal versus child risk and the development of parent-child and family [55] For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

relationships in five high-risk populations.," Dev. Psychopathol., vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 293–312, Jan. 2007.

- P. Amato, "Father-child relations, mother-child relations, and offspring psychological well-being [56] in early adulthood," J. Marriage Fam., 1994.
- J. J. Chang, C. T. Halpern, and J. S. Kaufman, "Maternal depressive symptoms, father's [57] involvement, and the trajectories of child problem behaviors in a US national sample.," Arch. Pediatr. Adolesc. Med., vol. 161, no. 7, pp. 697–703, Jul. 2007.
- J. Aldous, G. Mulligan, and T. Bjarnason, "Fathering over time: What makes the difference?," J. [58] Marriage Fam., 1998.
- [59] D. Harmon and A. Perry, "Fathers' unaccounted contributions: Paternal involvement and maternal stress," Fam. Soc., 2011.
- A. Kalil, K. M. Ziol-Guest, and R. L. Coley, "Perceptions of father involvement patterns in [60] teenage-mother families: Predictors and links to mothers' psychological adjustment," Fam. *Relat.*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 197–211, Apr. 2005.
- [61] J. Hobcraft and K. Kiernan, "Predictive factors from age 3 and infancy for poor child outcomes at age 5 relating to children's development, behaviour and health: evidence from the Millennium Cohort Study," 2010.



ection	Item	Recommendation	Included
itle and	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or	Yes-p2
bstract		the abstract	_
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what	Yes – p2
		was done and what was found	
ntroduction			
ackground/	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation	Yes-p4
tionale		being reported	1
bjectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Yes-p4
Lethods			*
tudy design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Yes – p5, p6
etting	5	Describe the setting locations and relevant dates including periods of	$\frac{Yes - p5}{Yes - p5} p6$
	U	recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	100 pc, pc
articipants	6	(a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria and the sources and	Yes – p5, p6
· · r ·····	-	methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	- r->r*
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria. and the sources and	
		methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale	
		for the choice of cases and controls Cross-sectional study—Give the	
		eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of	
		participants	
		(b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and	No – not a matched study
		number of exposed and unexposed	5
		Case-control study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the	
		number of controls per case	
ariables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential	Yes – p5, p6
		confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	
ata sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods	Yes – p5, p6, p7
easurement		of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment	
		methods if there is more than one group	
ias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Included in description of
			overarching study, referenced
			in [28] (p5)
tudy size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	No - not estimating effect size
			in this secondary analysis
uantitative	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If	Yes – p6, p7
ariables		applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	
tatistical	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for	Yes – p6, p7
ethods		confounding	
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	Yes – p6, p7
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Yes – p6, p7
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was	Yes – p5: loss-to-follow-up
		addressed	was an exclusion criterion
		Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and	
		controls was addressed	
		Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking	
		account of sampling strategy	
		(<u>e</u>) Describe any sensitivity analyses	Sensitivity analysis not done

Page 21 of 21

BMJ Open

Section	Item	Recommendation	Done?
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study-eg numbers	Yes – p5
		potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included	
		in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	Yes – p5
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Yes – p5
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical,	Yes – p8, p9
		social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of	Yes – p9
		interest	
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total	Yes – p5: analysis limited to
		amount)	11 years
Outcome data	15*	Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Yes – p5 reported at 9 and 1
		over time	years
		Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or	Not applicable
		summary measures of exposure	
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary	Not applicable
		measures	
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted	Yes – p9, p11
		estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear	
		which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were	Yes – p6: for SES in
		categorized	'Methods'
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute	Not applicable
		risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions,	Yes – p9
		and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Yes – p11
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential	Yes – p12, p13
		bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any	
		potential bias	
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives,	Yes – p11, p12
		limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and	
		other relevant evidence	
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Yes – p13
Other informatio	n		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present	Yes – p14
-		study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present	-
		article is based	
	. 1	f	

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen?bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml