

## Fatherhood as a Personality Development Factor in Men

Julia Borisenko

Kemerovo State University, Russia

The article represents an empirical study of paternity as a male personality development factor in men. Consensus is emerging that responsible fatherhood entitles the father to establish paternity, be present in the child's life, share economic support, and be personally involved in the child's life in collaboration with the mother. Literature reviews on fatherhood yield numerous empirical studies of specific fatherhood behaviors, whereas theory and the "bigger picture" have been notably insufficient. In the present article, problems of fatherhood in modern society, methodological problems of studying fathering, and cultural specifics of fatherhood are discussed. In addition, in order to aid further study of the phenomenon, the theoretically developed and experimentally approved model of the structure of paternity and the description of a specially developed training for fathers are presented. A principal finding of this report is that fatherhood is socially determined and influenced by contextual forces within the family and the community. The absence of a father-figure is detrimental to child personality development. At the same time, fatherhood can be a factor of male personality development of the father.

*Keywords: fatherhood, social determination, personality development, structural model*

Este artículo representa un estudio empírico de la paternidad como factor de desarrollo de la personalidad masculina en los hombres. Está emergiendo un consenso de que la paternidad responsable permite al padre establecer su paternidad, estar presente en la vida del niño, compartir la carga económica e implicarse personalmente en la vida del niño, en colaboración con la madre. La revisión bibliográfica ofrece numerosos estudios empíricos sobre comportamientos paternos específicos, mientras que han faltado notablemente la teoría y una visión general. En este artículo, se comentan los problemas de la paternidad en la sociedad moderna, los problemas metodológicos del estudio de la paternidad y aspectos culturales específicos de la paternidad. Además, para contribuir a al estudio futuro del fenómeno, se presentan el modelo teóricamente desarrollado y experimentalmente aprobado de la estructura de la paternidad y la descripción de un entrenamiento especialmente desarrollado para padres. Uno de los resultados principales de este informe es el hecho de que la paternidad se determina socialmente y es afectado por fuerzas contextuales dentro de la familia y la comunidad. La ausencia de una figura paterna es perjudicial para el desarrollo de la personalidad del niño. Al mismo tiempo, la paternidad puede ser un factor de desarrollo de la personalidad masculina del padre. *Palabras clave: paternidad, determinación social, desarrollo de la personalidad, modelo estructural*

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Julia Borisenko, Kemerovo State University, Krasnaya, 6, 650043 Kemerovo, Russia

Phones: +007 (38454) 3 4837 and +007 (3842) 58 39 39. E-mails: laboratory\_cno@mail.ru and Evseenkova@mail.ru

The processes and rules of the peak of ontogenesis have not been ignored by researchers. In the fields of psychology, pedagogy, physiology, pathophysiology, and their junctions, many studies have been devoted, both to discrete and interrelated personality prognosis. However, despite the widespread declaration of the humanistic individual approach to this topic, attempts to construct a personality change determination system allowing for the comprehensive description of the trajectory of individual and personality development of the human male are rare and are usually fraught with internal contradictions. Contemporary society is facing the destruction of traditional sex stratification, leading to alterations in gender roles, including parenting. As a result, problems of the family as a social unit and a social system, familial upbringing, the influence of the family on personality development of the child and adult, and the social functioning of the family are currently of great relevance.

Currently there are many studies on the role of the mother, the influence of motherhood on the personality development of the human female. These studies cover a broad scope of directions; from studies of pregnancy to studies about the influence of the mother's the acceptance of her child and her emotional relationship on the child's development. The particularities of fatherhood and the emotional-motivational and value aspects of the role of the father are few and far between, despite the fact that these issues are of great relevance and practically significant in the compilation of correctional child development or family psychological support programs, and in particular, during pregnancy and various family conflicts.

Issues of male involvement in the interaction between the generations, upbringing, and experience transference have been raised even during the era of Rousseau. Various aspects of this issue have been studied at different times by the psychoanalytic school (the role of the father in the development of the child was noted by Freud (1933), although later studies about the family's influence on the child focused predominantly on the interrelationship between mother and child), by behavior studies (teaching, gender roles), humanistic and existentialist psychology, by researchers following the theory of social training and pedagogical, child, age-specific psychology, deviant behavior psychology, by pedagogues, sociologists, and even lawyers. However, studies on the relationship between father and child and the influence of fatherhood on the man may lead to the clarification of many aspects that are less evident, and therefore less studied, but theoretically denoted by Fthenakis (1988), about the influence of fatherhood on personality development. This would shed light on certain problems of child and family psychology, developmental psychology as well and personality psychology.

Due to significant changes over the past 50 years in the system of gender roles within society, the role of the father-figure has undergone greater changes than the role of the mother, leading to the formation of a functional vacuum of

the father's role in novel conditions and the development of new stereotypes of fatherhood activity, which indicate the establishment of new gender systems, the reassessment or clarification by society of the father's functions and further differentiation of gender roles (Fthenakis, 1985). In Germany and the USA, this problem is already being studied in a broad range of theoretical and applied fields, although consensus has yet to be reached. Fatherhood is being studied as a social role, status, in terms of conceptions and stereotypes, gender psychology and personality psychology as a factor influencing personality changes, and personality characteristics. The majority of studies are being carried out within the framework of child psychology, researching the father's influence on the child's personality development (Abramova, 1998).

In Russia, this topic is of particular relevance, due to historical reasons and the nature of the influence of totalitarian rule on the male role in general and fatherhood in particular, although this topic has remained practically unstudied. Thus, it is important to emphasize the importance of this topic and study the issue of the influence of fatherhood on personality development both of the child and the father. Research covers an extensive range of aspects: psychophysiology (Ilyin, 2002; Kon, 1988), history, sociology (Fthenakis, 1988), various aspects of family psychology (Filippova, 2002; Popova, 1989), as well as personality and child psychology.

Biological and historical preconditions play a vital role in the formation of the personality of contemporary man. This is also applicable to the formation of ways, features, and characteristics of the performance of fatherhood functions by the individual male. Biological and social factors are closely intertwined although, whereas biological factors determine psychophysiological one's preparedness for fatherhood, social factors stringently regulate its fulfillment (Bocharov, 1999; Kon, 1988). In humans, the differentiation of motherhood and fatherhood and the specific features of fatherhood depend on a multitude of socio-cultural factors and conditions and they vary significantly. Society makes not only specific demands on the adult and on the financial, professional, and social status of the father, but it also regulates the behavior of the individual who has a specific status by means of the system of social roles. Due to the increase of divorce rates, the contemporary tendency towards single parenting (in most cases, the mother) is leading to impoverishment of the rearing process, disruption of communication between generations, issues of personality formation of the young generation, and an increase in social conflict, as noted by Vygotsky (1984) at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

On the other hand, there is an opposing tendency: Contemporary western psychology of the 1980s frequently used the terms "new," "responsible," and "productive" father (Boss, Doherty, LaRossa, Schumm, & Steinmetz, 1993; Fthenakis, 1988) to depict the father recognizing the value of fatherhood and actively participating in the upbringing of his child.

Traditionally, the phenomenon of parenthood has been studied by psychologists as a function of the theoretical approach to the problem. There are two principal approaches to studying parenthood, depending on the research starting point—the child or the parent: the former is the most widespread and examines parenthood in relation to the child's development of (Abramova, 1998; Kon, 1988). In the present study, the latter approach is used, examining fatherhood through the prism of the father's personality.

Due to the fact that parenthood, and in particular fatherhood, usually occurs during adulthood, it is necessary to examine fatherhood within the framework of the research of personality development in this phase of life. A majority of studies of adulthood are carried out by followers of the concept of age-specific crises (Abramova, 1998). Although there are two opposing approaches to crises—normal states and evidence of unresolved developmental problems—representatives of this approach are unanimous in that each age is fraught with its own difficulties and critical developmental moments, determined by the developmental aims of the specific age period. These aims of adulthood are defined differently by researchers; however they are all separate manifestations of the primal developmental aim of adulthood: the attainment of maturity.

Contemporary science has frequently used the term "maturity" to describe adulthood although these terms are not synonyms. Researchers involved in this problem define various criteria of maturity: for example, Rean (2000), based on the works of Ananyev (2002), differentiated individual personality maturity, maturity of subject activity and individuality, and used as criteria personality development during adulthood, tolerance, self-development, and positive social thinking. Polivanova (2000) used as criteria of personality development during adulthood the achievement of life's aims that are observed in social life, pro-social behavior, intimacy, and parenthood. Frankl (1963) and Fromm (1942) defined the following as vital criteria: love, responsibility, caring, respect, knowledge, spirituality, and freedom, and for Erikson (1982), criteria were attainment of intimacy, productivity, generation of interactions, and pro-social behavior. This point of view was shared by Abramova (1998), who defined the following goals of the above-mentioned age period: formation of intimate relations, pro-social behavior, and the performance of parental functions. Parenthood is the most eminent developmental goal of this life phase and specifically leads to the achievement not only of social, but also of existential goals. It is related to pro-social behavior, tolerance, and caring, is unfeasible without love for another individual—the child—and permits the achievement of productivity, and furthermore, it is the fulfillment of the individual's needs.

The phenomenon of fatherhood is closely associated with concepts such as emotion, motivation, values, self-appraisal, self-perception, ego conception ("I"; see Kon, 1978), satisfaction with life and lifestyle, as well as with

the father's social role. Fatherhood is differentiated depending on social systems, social, economic and political spheres of society, the status of the man within society, social stereotypes that determine the rules for the performance of this role, including gender stereotypes. Thus, the definition of fatherhood by conceptions such as "role," "instinct," or "feeling" would be incorrect just as it would be with maternal instinct. Firstly, a sufficiently accurate definition of maternal instinct and its structure is yet to be found; and secondly, these concepts do not exhaust the multifaceted and complex conception of "fatherhood," which includes socio-cultural aspects such as historically existing behavior stereotypes, social requirements, and socio-personality characteristics as defined by the terms "role" and "status." Thus, fatherhood can be defined as a category of personality psychology that reflects the principal stages of personality development, and is characterized by a series of integral, social, and individual personality characteristics that manifest at all levels of the individual's activity: emotional axiological, cognitive, and functional, including an appraisal component and the requirement to fulfill the following functions: protection (breadwinner and protector), presentation (personification of authority, teacher, and supreme discipliner), mental (exemplification of imitation), and socialization (instructor in extra-familial social activity and relations, translator of social norms, figure providing a link between generations). Productive fatherhood refers to the father's involvement, and emotional participation in the life and development of his child.

Many of the problems faced by men/fathers may have social causes, for example, in society, the role of the mother is considered to be practically sacred and sufficiently regulated. Specific manifestations of maternal feelings are "normal," resulting in erroneous assessment of the father's attitude towards the child, as men usually curb emotional display in general and in particular in relation to their child (Abramova, 1998).

Furthermore, the relationship between the father and his *own* father—assuming his behavior patterns and his masculine stereotypes, which do not facilitate the expression of emotion by men—is a vital factor in the father's relationship with his child.

Thus, many of the problems of contemporary society, family, and child rearing systems have social prerequisites. The father's participation in the upbringing of the child is required for normal personality development and it is possible that some contemporary social problems are specifically associated with men's exclusion from participating in the upbringing of the young generation. At the same time, the contemporary paternity crisis is largely due to contradictory and stereotypic conceptions of the father's role, a shift in maternal and paternal roles, and the fulfillment of paternal functions by the mother for numerous reasons. Nevertheless, a majority of researchers believe that it is impossible to overrate the father's participation in the

upbringing of the child, as it is essential for the formation of a fully harmonious personality under the conditions of clear distinction of parental roles, and it has a positive influence on the child's development. For the child's harmonious development, the father should make greater efforts to achieve warm relations with his child and to jointly experience and discover the surrounding environment as of infancy. In order to attain these conditions, corresponding socio-economic conditions should be fulfilled; that is, fixed working hours, and equal pay for men and women—as varying labor remuneration is, on the one hand, discrimination of women in professional fields, and on the other hand, it does not allow men to spend time with their child even if they wish to—as well as other socio-economic conditions that are viable if the conception of the irreplaceable nature of the father's role and the importance of fatherhood for man himself as part of society is accepted. The acceptance of such a conception can be guaranteed only by timely and reliable research of the phenomenon of fatherhood and its influence on personality development.

Bearing in mind the above problems, it is crucial to study the influence of fatherhood on the development of the personality of the father himself. The present study was carried out in two phases: (a) the study of differences in personality development characteristics of fathers compared to those of men without children; (b) experimental study of the influence of fatherhood on the optimization of personality development.

## Study 1

### *Method*

#### *Participants*

A total of 50 persons participated in this first phase, 25 fathers (mean age 32 years old; children's age range 4-8 years), and 25 childless men (mean age 31 years old).

#### *Instruments*

The following instruments were implemented in the study: the Sixteen Personality Factors (Cattell, Saunder, & Stice, 1994), The Purpose-in-Life Test (Crumbaugh, & Maholick, 1969), The Personality Differential (Burlachuck & Morozov, 1999), the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI; Schaefer, & Bell, 1958, quoted in Ilyin, 2002), as well as specially developed questionnaires.

*Sixteen Personality Factors (16PF;* Cattell, Saunder, & Stice, 1994). This questionnaire, which is extensively used in psychodiagnostic practices, was employed to reveal the larval particularities of the fathers and the men with no children.

*The Purpose-in-Life Test (PIL;* Crumbaugh, & Maholick, 1969). An adapted version of the test, based on the theories of the longing for meaning and on Frankl's logotherapy, was used. The Russian-language version of the test was adapted by Leontiev in 1992. The results are gathered in 5 scales:

1. Life goals. The results of this scale show whether or not the person has goals, and a prospect of the future, which adds precision, direction, and a temporal aspect to life.
2. Life process or interest and emotional saturation of life. This factor refers to whether person perceives the process of his or her life as interesting or emotional saturated.
3. Life results or complacency self-realization. The results on this scale reflect whether or not the person has the sensation of living productively and intelligently.
4. Locus of control over "Ego" (I, as the master of my life). High scores correspond to the belief that one has a strong personality, and sufficient freedom of choice to build one's life according to one's own purpose and beliefs oneself.
5. Locus of control over life. High scores on this scale indicate the belief that one can control one's life.

*The Personality Differential (PD).* The Personality Differential was designed in the psychoneurological institute named after V. M. Behterev in Saint-Petersburg (Burlachuck & Morozov, 1999). The test has three factors: (a) Self-esteem (factor O) indicates the level of self-respect; (b) Power (Factor C) refers to self-confidence, independence, depending on one's own power in difficult in tight situations; and (c) Activities (Factor A) are interpreted as a sign of high activity, sociability, and impulsivity.

*The Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI;* Schaefer & Bell, 1958). This questionnaire is examines general parental particularities in upbringing and education. The fourth form of the questionnaire consists of 115 statements, concerning household life and education of children.

#### *Procedure*

The first phase was carried out during 2002-2003. The two groups of fathers and childless men were tested with the instruments described above and subsequently the fathers' personality characteristics were compared to those of men without children. The measure of family structure used in this paper was derived from information about the entire household. Childless respondents were asked about their age, their feelings, communication with the children, preferred sex of a child, and their relationship with their own parents. They were also asked the customary questions about the need for contraception and family planning in married couples, accidental pregnancy, and specific questions such as: "Do you think the birth of your child will change your life?" "Have

you ever imagined your possible (fancied) future child? "Have you ever imagined yourself as a father?" "What difficulties do you think the birth of a child involves for a man?" "What do you think about the father's presence and partaking in child-birth?" "What do you think a father should give to his child?" "Do you think people will change their attitudes towards you, when you become a father?" "Do you think you will change when you become a father?" Fathers were asked routine questions and special questions about how the birth of the child changed their life, attitudes, and purposes in life.

### Statistical Analyses

Sample means were analyzed using Student's criteria. Correlations were calculated with a 5% significance level. A two-factor analysis, using principal components and varimax rotation was also carried out on the results of the PD, the 16PF, and the PIL.

### Results

Comparison of the results of this investigation with statistic normative values showed that the mean and standard deviation of the values of the PD and PIL scales were within the range of normative values of these instruments. Whereas the results of the PARI questionnaire are high-normal, the results of 16PF correspond to average normative values. The *t*-test revealed the two groups to be different in such parameters as tolerance for stress (16PF), expressiveness (16PF), awareness of social norms (16PF), tact (16PF), self control (PD), strength factor (PD), concepts of life goals (PIL), satisfaction with current life results (PIL), domineering (16PF), risks (16PF), suspiciousness (16PF), efficiency (16PF), conservativeness (16PF), conformism (16PF).

Rank correlations between the presence of children and various factors (see Table 2) showed that fathers had greater tolerance for stress ( $r = .67$ ), were more expressive ( $r = .37$ ), and more aware of social norms ( $r = .81$ ), had more tact ( $r =$

$.54$ ) and self control ( $r = 0.45$ ), and they rated themselves as having a higher strength factor ( $r = .33$ ), better concepts of life goals ( $r = .44$ ), and being more satisfied with current results ( $r = .29$ ). The fathers were also less domineering ( $r = -.35$ ), less inclined to take risks ( $r = -.65$ ), less suspicious ( $r = -.37$ ), more efficient ( $r = -.43$ ), more conservative ( $r = -.055$ ) and more conformist ( $r = -.54$ ).

Factor analysis (see Table 1) of the results yielded two persistent factors that were typical of these samples, and which differentiated them: general concept of life (Factor 1), and the fulfillment of social norms (Factor 2). Additional questioning revealed that men self-evaluate themselves on these parameters differently before and after the birth of their child.

On the whole, it was observed that the fathers were more satisfied with life, had more self-control, and were more inclined to abide by social norms and behavior rules, and less inclined to take risks, less suspicious, more tolerant, more responsible, and more efficient. This corresponds with personality developmental criteria as defined by the analysis of theoretic sources (Abramova, 1998; Frankl, 1963; Fromm, 1942; Rean, 2000; Polivanova, 2000; Ilyin, 2002; Kon, 1988; Boss et al., 1993). These data are confirmed by the fathers' self-appraisal of having become more responsible and tolerant after the birth of their child. It's notable, that fathers' self-appraisal of positive changes in relation to their environment (noted in the interview) is also evidence of further socialization. The interview also showed that each individual father (apart from the protection status and upbringing) helps the child to acquire practical skills, in a broad sense, by participating in the transfer of experience from one generation to the next. According to Erikson (1982), this is known as generativeness and is the principal aim of adulthood.

These results are in accordance with the position of Abramova (1998) and Polivanova (2000), who defined the principal parameters of personality development as pro-social behavior and fulfilment of parental functions; and with that of standing of Frankl (1963) and Fromm (1942), who defined development criteria as responsibility,

Table 1  
Factor Analysis Results of the 16PF, the PIL, and the PARI

| Factor 1- Life Conception                                    |         | Factor 2 - Performance of Social Norms    |          |
|--|---------|---|----------|
| Variable (Test)  | Loading | Variable (Test)                           | Loading  |
| Life goals (PIL)   | .815392 | G (susceptibility to social norms) (16PF) | .799054  |
| Life process (PIL)   | .888908 | Q2 (Conformism – nonconformism) (16PF)    | .654399  |
| Life results (PIL)   | .795097 | N (directness – tact) (16PF)              | .698795  |
| Locus of control over "Ego" (PIL)                            | .825203 | H (risk tendency) (16PF)                  | .5410 43 |
| Locus for the control over the controllability of life (PIL) | .717228 | C (stress tolerance) (16PF)               | .545964  |
| General life conception (PIL)                                | .942219 | Parental sacrifice (PARI)                 | –.512188 |
|  |         | Presence of children (PARI)               | –.920849 |
|  |         | Father's age                              | –.501321 |

Note: 16PF = 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire; PIL = Purpose in Life Test; PARI = Parental Attitude Research Instrument.

Table 2  
Correlations between the Presence of Children and Various Factors from the 16PF, the PIL, and the PARI

| Positive correlations ( $p = .05$ )       |     | Negative correlations ( $p = .05$ )                   |      |
|---|-----|---|------|
| Variable (Test)                           | $r$ | Variable (Test)                                       | $r$  |
| 4 Strength (PIL)                          | .33 | Assessment of the equality of parent and child (PARI) | -.30 |
| Goals (PIL)                               | .44 | Dominance (16PF)                                      | -.35 |
| Result (PIL)                              | .29 | Risk tendency (16PF)                                  | -.65 |
| Assessment of parental "sacrifice" (PARI) | .55 | Inflexibility (16PF)                                  | -.65 |
| Stress tolerance (16PF)                   | .67 | Suspiciousness (16PF)                                 | -.37 |
| Restraint (16PF)                          | .37 | Imagination (16PF)                                    | -.43 |
| Standard behavior (16PF)                  | .81 | Radicalism (16PF)                                     | -.55 |
| Tact (16PF)                               | .54 | Nonconformism (16PF)                                  | -.54 |
| Self-control (16PF)                       | .45 |   |      |

Note: 16PF = 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire; PIL = Purpose in Life Test; PARI = Parental Attitude Research Instrument.

spirituality, love for another individual, and caring. According to Rean (2000), the birth of a child is associated with personality development, as was seen in the increase in responsibility, tolerance, and pro-social thinking in fathers in comparison to men without children.

## Study 2

During the second study, we attempted to determine the influence of productive fatherhood on the enhancement of personality development, by using specially developed training programs aimed at accepting the father-role. It is not the fact of having children but specifically the fulfillment and acceptance of the paternal role that influences the enhancement of personality development. Therefore, in order to carry out in-depth research and to detect the nature of the influence of fatherhood on male personality development in adulthood, training was carried out to increase the generativeness of fatherhood.

## Method

### Participants

The experimental study was carried out in 2004. Ninety-five men with one or more children (of pre-school and primary-school age) took part in the study. There were 45 men in the experimental groups (3 groups of 15). The control group consisted of 50 men. Both groups were comparable in age (mean age 32 and 33 years, respectively, for the experimental and control group) and social characteristics.

### Instruments

The same questionnaires and scales as in Study 1 were used for this study

### Procedure

Experimental participants took part in a 2-month specially developed training course aimed at acceptance of the father-role and formation of productive fatherhood.

Training was made up of several standard blocks: Block 1: "warm-up"; Block 2: development of trustworthy relations; Block 3: lectures; Block 4: practical training; Block 5: relaxation. The training program was part theoretical and part practical. In the theoretical course, information about the following aspects was presented: postulates about children, family and personality psychology, child development, specific functions and the role of the father in the life of the child and family. In addition, acmeological information about the development of personality in adulthood, ways of interacting with the child, information about specific activities (e.g., ways of solving conflictive situations and examples of interaction with other men's children) were provided. The practical part of the course consisted of exercises of father-role acceptance at various levels: cognitive, behavioral, and self-regulatory (emotional and motivational).

The main concept of the training program was a model of the phenomenon of fatherhood (Evseenkova & Portnova, 2003a), based on the works of Filippova (2002) and Fthenakis (1988), to prevent missing any of the aspects of fatherhood. It included the following components: (a) emotional needs, including biological and social aspects of motivation, the need for contact, emotional reactions and feelings; and (b) operational aspects such as knowledge and skills, functions involved in child care and communication, and values, such as the relationship between father and child and existential feelings. Furthermore, included within the training structure was a general integral component: appraisal, which included: (a) self-appraisal as an element of the "ego" (I) concept, and acceptance or rejection of the father-role and rational and emotional assessment of oneself as a father and of one's child; (b) social assessment of the environment, based on accepted social stereotypes (within

the specific society) and the expected role fulfillment, and the demands required in order to maintain one's status. Social appraisal is the basis for the development of self-appraisal, as it is through social stereotypes that the ideal "I" is formed (Kon, 1978). The assessment component is integral, as it includes and influences all other components of the structure.

### Statistical Analyses

In order to assess training efficacy and to determine the influence of productive fatherhood, pre- and post-training data were statistically analyzed, both from the experimental and the control groups.

### Results

In the experimental group, the greatest dispersion was in the results of life concept orientations, indicating greater individual differences in the Purpose-in-Life Test. Results obtained using the 16PF and PARI questionnaires were the most homogenous, within the experimental and control group, which according to the PARI questionnaire, indicates the presence of specific behavior models. Analysis using Fisher's criteria (with significance level at .05) revealed that dispersion within both groups was insignificant, thus allowing the use of Student's *t* test to verify the hypotheses and perform correlation analysis.

Analysis of pre- and posttreatment differences in the results of the experimental and control groups by means of Student's *t* tests revealed no significant differences between the groups. As presented in Table 3, the comparison, using

Student's criterion for dependent samples, of the results of the experimental groups before and after training revealed significant differences in the following parameters: PARI scale Parental Obsession (11.4 and 12.5, pre- and post-training, respectively; 11.3 for the control group at both times), self-appraisal as a father (1.4 and 1, pre- and post-training, respectively; controls 1.3 at both times), attitude toward father's presence during childbirth—*joint childbirth*—(1.6 and 1.25, respectively; controls 1.6 at both times), assessment of positive changes in the attitudes of close persons after the birth of the child (1.2 and 1.75, pre- and post-training, respectively; unchanged in controls, 1.3), 3<sup>rd</sup> PIL scale Life Results (22.2 and 23.5 in the experimental groups, insignificant difference in controls 21.7 and 21.8 accordingly), general life conceptions according to PIL (90.6 and 102.5 pre- and post-training, respectively; in controls an insignificant difference: 90.1 and 90.2), as well as the following 16PF factors: a tendency to take risks (6 and 4.5, pre- and post-training, respectively; in controls, an insignificant difference: 5.2 and 5.23), F (restraint-expressiveness; 4.8 and 1, pre- and post-training, respectively; in controls an insignificant difference: 4.3 and 4.3), M (practicality-imagination; 5.2 and 6.75, pre- and post-training, respectively; in controls, an insignificant difference: 5.3 and 5.3), fulfillment of social norms (4.2 and 5.75, pre- and post-training, respectively; in controls an insignificant difference: 4.5 and 4.6), Q4 (conformism-nonconformism; 4 and 4.5, pre- and post-training, respectively; in controls, 4 and 4).

As shown in Table 3, after training, participants showed a decrease in the scores of scales such as the 16PF, in indices such as H (risk tendency) and F (restraint-expressiveness), as well as self-appraisal as a father and negative attitudes

Table 3

*Pre- and Post-Training Scores in Various Parameters, Indicating Assessment of Training Efficacy in the Experimental Group*

| Parameter (Source)   | Experimental Group ( <i>n</i> = 45) |               | Control Group ( <i>n</i> = 50) |      |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|------|
|  | Pre-training                        | Post-training | Pre                            | Post |
| 1 H- Risk tendency (16PF)  | 6                                   | 4.5           | 5.2                            | 5.23 |
| 2 F- Expressiveness (16PF)   | 4.8                                 | 1             | 4.3                            | 4.3  |
| 3 M- Imagination (16PF)  | 5.2                                 | 6.75          | 5.4                            | 5.3  |
| 4 G- Susceptibility to social norms (16PF)   | 4.2                                 | 5.75          | 4.5                            | 4.6  |
| 5 Q4 - Nonconformism (16PF)  | 4                                   | 4.5           | 4                              | 4    |
| 6 Parental obsession (PARI)  | 11.4                                | 12.5          | 11.3                           | 11.3 |
| 7 Self-assessment as a father (INTERVIEW)  | 1.4                                 | 1             | 1.3                            | 1.3  |
| 8 Attitude towards joint childbirth (PARI)   | 1.6                                 | 1.25          | 1.6                            | 1.6  |
| 9 Assessment of positive changes in attitudes of surrounding people following the birth of the child (INTERVIEW) | 1.2                                 | 1.75          | 1.3                            | 1.3  |
| 10 Life results (PIL)  | 22.2                                | 23.75         | 21.7                           | 21.8 |
| 11 General life conceptions (PIL)  | 90.6                                | 102.5         | 90.1                           | 90.2 |

*Note.* 16PF = 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire; PIL = Purpose in Life Test; PARI = Parental Attitude Research Instrument.

Pre- and post-training scores of the experimental group differ significantly at the level of  $p = .05$ .

Differences in pre-training scores in the experimental group and the control group were insignificant.

There were no significant pre-post differences in the scores of the control group.

towards joint childbirth. The scores of a tendency to meet social norms and the indices of the 3<sup>rd</sup> PIL scale Life Results all increased, indicating satisfaction with self-realization, assessment of the elapsed life stage, perception of one's productivity and sensitivity, and furthermore, general life conception, social standard, and practicality are evidence of increased responsibility.

The decrease in the index of self-appraisal as a father, according to the opinions of the participants themselves, revealed in post-training discussions, is the result of the discovery of novel perspectives of interaction with the child during training. Of interest are the results of the participants' assessment of their attitudes towards joint childbirth: if, prior to training, up to 94% of participants had negative attitudes towards this idea, explaining in their responses that it "involved the female body" and "they would only be in the way," after training, 75% of participants considered such a practice to be possible or beneficial to the child. An increase in indices of the PIL scales "life results" and general life conception are important indices of the enhancement of male personality development within this age-period.

As shown in Table 3, there was an increase in the scores of the PARI questionnaire "parental obsession" scale, which indicates parents' involvement in the life of the child, and occasionally even excess concern with the child's problems. This increase may be due to increased attention to the child's problems during training.

Rank correlations were used to define the direction of this dependence—in the present case, the experience of training with various parameters. The results of correlation analysis presented in Table 4 show that after training, parameters differentiating "fathers" from "non-fathers" changed.

In general, it can be concluded that the results of statistical analysis correspond to results obtained during the first phase of research.

In addition to statistical analysis, qualitative analysis of the results of the questionnaires and of post-training

discussions was carried out. This analysis showed that, prior to training, 60% of difficulties associated with the birth of the child were related to material problems. After training, this percentage decreased to 30% because other factors, among them "responsibility" (12%) and "contact" (9%), were included in the context of difficulty. Before training, 75% of men responded "material provision" to the question "what can a father give his child?" After training, in responses to this question were more diverse, and included terms such as "caring," "masculine upbringing," "experience transference," and "transference of behavior models in various situations."

A prominent result of training was that, according to the participants themselves, during the training period, 86% changed their attitudes towards their child (children) in terms of greater intimacy.

Thus, these results correspond to prior data that indicate that the most significant differences between fathers and men without children is in the variables of life conception and the fulfillment of social norms. In other words, as a result of training aimed at increasing fatherhood generativeness, the most significant changes were in personality parameters that differentiate fathers from non-fathers in the studied age-period, such as self-control, observance of social norms and behavior rules, risks, suspiciousness, tolerance, responsibility (Evseenkova & Portnova, 2003b, 2004). These parameters change in the same direction, which indicates that fatherhood, in particular, caused these changes. According to our theoretical methodological conception, these changes may be used as reliable criteria for male personality development during the period of adulthood examined.

## Discussion

Thus, productively involved fatherhood not only enhances harmonious personality development of the child of such an "involved" father (see, for example Furstenberg & Cherlin,

Table 4  
*Rank Correlations between Test Parameters and Training Results*

| Parameter (Source)   | Correlation coefficient $r$ ( $p = .05$ ) |
|--|---|
| H - Risk tendency (16PF)   | -.54                                      |
| F - Expressiveness (16PF)  | -.42                                      |
| M - Imagination (16PF)   | .75                                       |
| G - Susceptibility to social norms (16PF)  | .43                                       |
| Q4 - Nonconformism (16PF)  | .45                                       |
| Parental obsession (PARI)  | .40                                       |
| Self-assessment as a father (INTERVIEW)  | .58                                       |
| Attitude towards joint childbirth (INTERVIEW)  | -.50                                      |
| Assessment of positive changes in attitudes of surrounding people following the birth of the child (INTERVIEW) | .77                                       |
| Life results (PIL)   | .52                                       |
| General life conceptions (PIL)   | .43                                       |

*Note.* 16PF = 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire; PIL = Purpose in Life Test; PARI = Parental Attitude Research Instrument.

1991; Ihinger-Tallman, Pasley, & Buehler, 1995; Ilyin, 2002; Fthenakis, 1988; Boss et al., 1993), but, as shown in the present study, it also influences the father's own personality development towards greater maturity, both in social and personality aspects. In the light of the present study, further research is required of various aspects and problems, both theoretical (assimilation mechanisms, internalization of fatherhood functions, etc.) and applied (implementation of the obtained results to prepare and improve the qualifications of practicing psychologists working with families, and the development of correctional programs, as well as programs for children who are growing up without their fathers). This can be accomplished only with large-scale, longitudinal (two or more generations) or cross-cultural studies, which would permit timely recognition and solution of various problems in the father-child interrelationship, and would reveal important determinants of the phenomenon of fatherhood, the social significance of which cannot be overrated.

### References

- Abramova, G.S. (1998). *Vozrastnaya psikhologiya* [Age-specific psychology]. Moscow: Izdatel'skii tsentr "Akademiya."
- Ananyev, B.G. (2002). *Chelovek kak predmet poznaniya* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) [Man as subject of perception]. St. Petersburg: Piter.
- Bocharov, V.V. (1999). *Antropologiya vosrasta* [Anthropology of age]. Moscow: Progress.
- Boss, P.G., Doherty, W.J., LaRossa, R., Schumm, W.R., & Steinmetz, S.K. (Eds.). (1993). *Family theories and methods: A contextual approach*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Burlachuck L.F., & Morozov S. M. (1999). *Slovar-spravotchnik po psichodiagnostike* [Reference book of psychodiagnostics]. Saint-Petersburg: Piter.
- Cattell, R.B., Saunder, D.R., & Stice, G. (1994). 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (5th ed.). Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Test (Russian translation: Batarshev, A.V. *Mnogofaktorniy lichnostniy oprosnik Kettella: prakticheskoye rukovodstvo* [Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire: Practical guide]. Moscow: Sfera, 2002).
- Crumbaugh, J.C., & Maholick, L.T. (1969). Manual of instructions for the Purpose in Life test. Saratoga, CA: Viktor Frankl Institute for Logotherapy (Russian translation: Leontiev, D.A. *Test smyslozhiznennykh orientatsiy* [The Purpose-in-Life Test]. Moscow, Smisl, 1992.)
- Erikson, E.H. (1982). *The life cycle completed*. New York: Norton.
- Evseenkova, Yu.V., & Portnova, A.G. (2003a). Strukturniy analiz akmeologicheskogo fenomena otsovstva [Structural analysis of the acmeologic phenomenon of fatherhood]. *Psikhologiya zrelosti i stareniya* [The psychology of maturity and aging], 4, 35-52.
- Evseenkova Yu.V., & Portnova, A.G. (2003b). Systema otnosheniy v diade otez-rebenok kak factor razvitiya lichnosti [The system of the relationship within the father-child dyad as a factor of personality development]. *Semeinaya psikhoterapiya i semeinaya terapiya* [Family psychotherapy and family therapy], 4, 30-48.
- Evseenkova Yu.V., & Portnova, A.G. (2004). Otsovstvo kak strukturno-dinamicheskii fenomen [Fatherhood as a structural dynamic phenomenon]. In *Sibirskaya psikhologiya segodnya* (pp. 104-110) [Siberian psychology today]. Kemerovo: Kuzbassizdat.
- Filippova, G.G. (2002). *Psikhologiya materinstva* [The psychology of motherhood]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo instituta psikhoterapii.
- Frankl, V. (1963). *Man's search for meaning. An introduction to Logotherapy*. Beacon Press, Boston. (Russian translation: Tchelovek v poiskakh smysla Moscow: Progress, 1990.)
- Freud, S. (1933). *New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis*. (Vol. 21). London: Hogarth.
- Fromm, E. (1942). *The fear of freedom*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Russian translation: Begstvo ot svobody Moscow: Progress, 1990.)
- Fthenakis, W.E. (1985). *Väter, Band I, Zur Psychologie der Vater-Kind-Beziehung* [Fathers. Vol. I. On father-child relationship psychology]. Munich, Germany: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Fthenakis, W.E. (1988). *Väter, Band II, Zur Vater-Kind-Beziehung in verschiedenen Familien-Strukturen* [Fathers. Vol. I. On father-child relationship psychology in various family structures]. Munich, Germany: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Furstenberg, F.S., & Cherlin, A.J. (1991). *Divided families: What happens to children when parents part*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ihinger-Tallman, M., Pasley, K., & Buehler, C. (1995). Developing a middle-range theory of father involvement postdivorce. In W. Marsiglio (Ed.), *Fatherhood: Contemporary theory, research, and social policy*, (pp. 57-77). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ilyin, E.P. (2002). *Differentsial'naya psikhofiziologiya muzhchiny i zhenshchiny* [Differential psychophysiology of men and women]. St. Petersburg: Piter.
- Kon, I.S. (1978). Otkrytiye "Ya" [The discovery of "I"]. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Kon, I.S. (1988). *Rebyenok i obshchestvo: istoriko-etnograficheskaya perspektiva* [The child and society: Historical ethnographic perspectives]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Polivanova, K.N. (2000). *Psikhologiya vozrastnykh krizisov* [Age-specific crisis psychology]. Moscow: Izdatel'skii tsentr "Akademiya."
- Popova, P. (1989). *Sovremenyi muzhchina v zerkale semeinoy zhizni* [Contemporary man in the mirror of family life]. Moscow: Mysl'.
- Rean, A.A. (2000). Akmeologiya lichnosti [The acmeology of personality]. *Psikhologicheskii zhurnal*, 3, 88-95.
- Schaefer, E.S. & Bell, R.Q. (1958). Development of a parental attitude research instrument. *Child Development*, 29, 339-361 (Russian translation: Ilyin, E.P. *Differentsial'naya psikhofiziologiya muzhchiny i zhenshchiny* [Differential psychophysiology of men and women]. St. Petersburg: Piter, 2002.)
- Vygotsky L.C. (1984). *Sobraniye sochinenii* [Vol. 4 of a 6-volume essay collection]. Moscow: Pedagogika.

Received October 28, 2005

Revision received June 28, 2006

Accepted January 17, 2007