

Published in final edited form as:

*J Adolesc Health*. 2014 February ; 54(2): 197–203. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.08.012.

## Family and Relationship Influences on Parenting Behaviors of Young Parents

Trace Kershaw<sup>1,2</sup>, Alexandria Murphy<sup>1,2</sup>, Jessica Lewis<sup>1,2</sup>, Anna Divney<sup>3</sup>, Tashuna Albritton<sup>1,2</sup>, Urania Magriples<sup>4</sup>, and Derrick Gordon<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT

<sup>2</sup>Yale Center for Interdisciplinary Research on AIDS, New Haven, CT

<sup>3</sup>City University of New York, Department of Public Health, New York, NY

<sup>4</sup>Yale School of Medicine, Department of Neonatal and Fetal Medicine, New Haven, CT

<sup>5</sup>Yale School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, The Consultation Center, New Haven, CT

### Abstract

**Purpose**—Assess the influence of relationship and family factors during pregnancy on parenting behavior 6 months postpartum among low-income young parents.

**Methods**—434 young expectant couples were recruited from obstetrics clinics during pregnancy and followed 6-months postpartum. Using a series of general estimating equations to control for the correlated nature of the data, we assessed the influence of relationship factors (e.g., relationship satisfaction, attachment) and family factors (e.g., family functioning, family history) during pregnancy on parenting (e.g., parenting involvement, time spent caregiving, parenting experiences, and parenting sense of competence) 6 months postpartum controlling for covariates.

**Results**—Relationship functioning related to parenting involvement, caregiving, parenting experiences, and parenting sense of competence. In addition, several family factors related to parenting. Mother involvement during childhood was related to more parenting involvement, parenting positive experiences, and parenting sense of competence. History of being spanked as a child related to less time spent caregiving and less positive life change from being a parent. Further, gender significantly moderated the associations between relationship and family factors and parenting behavior. Male' parenting behavior was more influenced by relationship and family factors than females.

**Conclusions**—This study suggests the importance of relationship and family contexts for parenting behaviors of young mothers and fathers, highlighting the potential utility of involving both young mothers and fathers in parenting programs, and developing interventions that focus on strengthening young parents' romantic relationships and that address negative parenting experienced during childhood.

© 2013 Society for Adolescent Medicine. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Contact Author: Trace Kershaw, Yale School of Public Health, Room 415, 60 College, New Haven, CT 06510, Trace.kershaw@yale.edu.

**Publisher's Disclaimer:** This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

## Keywords

Parenting; Interpersonal Relationships; Family Context

Children's behaviors are partially shaped by their early experiences and exposures, which exist primarily in the context of parent-child relationships<sup>1</sup>. Doherty and colleagues proposed the Ecosystem Model of parental involvement which suggests that parenting is shaped by a combination of the family context while growing up (e.g., relationship with parents as a child; problems in the household as a child) and current interpersonal relationships with romantic partners<sup>2</sup>. We used the Ecosystem Model as the guiding framework of our study by exploring a wide range of family context and relationship factors that might relate to parenting.

Young parents who had positive experiences while growing up and who have strong current relationships with their parents may be more committed to becoming parents and have more confidence in their ability to be good parents, leading to increased commitment and parenting involvement<sup>3</sup>. Parental involvement may also be associated with the environment fostered by one's own parents<sup>4</sup>. For example, a history of family dysfunction has been associated with negative parenting behaviors<sup>4</sup>, suggesting that negative aspects of parenting is passed on from parent to child<sup>5,6</sup>. Similarly, just as family environment can shape parental behavior, parents' relationship with one another may also play a role. Satisfaction with the relationship between the father and mother of the baby is associated with more effective parenting<sup>7</sup>, and positive parenting and family outcomes<sup>8</sup>.

Men and women may differ in their involvement and ability as parents. Mothers tend to be more attentive and comforting to a young child's needs compared to fathers<sup>9</sup>. Young mothers and fathers can vary in their perceptions of how competent they are as parents<sup>10</sup> which may impact actual parenting behaviors (e.g., nurturing, spending time with their child)<sup>11-13</sup>. In addition, poor family context (e.g., neglect, bad childhood) and a poor relationship between parents has been linked to poor parenting for both males and females<sup>14-17</sup>. However, few studies have directly compared whether family context and relationship factors differentially relate to parenting for males and females. Historical expectations and role norms around parenting may lead to differential impact of family and relationship factors for males and females. Gender norms around responsibility and caregiving may make females less susceptible to external influences of parenting and caregiving than males<sup>2</sup>. Thus, it is beneficial to explore parenting of both young mothers and fathers.

This study adds to the literature by using the Ecosystem Model to assess how family context while growing up and relationship between parents relate to parenting. Few studies have incorporated a wide range of possible family and relationship factors and parenting outcomes. Further, much of the literature on parenting has focused on small samples of white, middle-income, married couples, despite the fact that much of the disparities of family health outcomes are among young low-income minority parents<sup>18-20</sup>. The aims of this study are to: 1) assess the associations of relationship and family factors during pregnancy with parenting (e.g., parenting involvement, time spent caregiving, parenting experiences, and parenting sense of competence) 6 months postpartum, and 2) assess whether males and females differ on the relationship and family factors related to parenting.

## METHODS

### Study sample and procedures

Data for this study come from a longitudinal study of pregnant and postpartum young females and their partners. Between July 2007 and February 2011, 296 pregnant adolescents and their male partners (592 total participants) were recruited from obstetrics and gynecology clinics and from an ultrasound clinic in four university-affiliated hospitals in Connecticut. Potential participants were screened and, if eligible, research staff explained the study in detail. If the baby's father was not present at the time of screening, research staff asked for permission to contact the father to explain the study.

Inclusion criteria included: (a) the female partner is in the second or third trimester of pregnancy at time of baseline interview; (b) females: age 14–21 years; males: age at least 14 years, at time of the interview; (c) both members of the couple report being in a romantic relationship with each other; (d) both report being the biological parents of the unborn baby; (e) both agree to participate in the study and (f) both are able to speak English or Spanish. Because this was a longitudinal study, we used an initial run-in period as part of eligibility criteria where participants were deemed ineligible if they could not be re-contacted after screening and before their estimated due date.

The couples separately completed structured interviews via audio computer-assisted self-interviews (ACASI). Participation was voluntary and confidential. All procedures were approved by the Yale University Human Investigation Committee and by Institutional Review Boards at study clinics. Participants were reimbursed \$25 each for each assessment.

Of 413 eligible couples, 296 (72.2%) couples enrolled in the study. Couples who agreed to participate were of greater gestational age ( $p = .03$ ). Participation did not vary by any other pre-screened demographic characteristic (all  $p > .05$ ).

Participants were interviewed in their 3rd trimester of pregnancy ( $M = 29$  weeks gestation) and at 6-months postpartum. Participants were followed and assessed regardless of relationship status and whether their partner dropped out of the study. The retention rate at the 6-month postpartum assessment was 73% (434/592). Therefore, our final sample size for these analyses was 434. We compared the 434 included in the analyses with the 158 that were missing. Results showed that those included in the analyses ( $n = 434$ ) did not differ from those not included in the analyses ( $n = 158$ ) on any demographics or key study variables with the exception of race ( $p < .05$ ). Results showed that individuals included in the analyses were more likely to be Hispanic and were less likely to be white than those not included in the analyses.

### Measures

**Outcomes**—All outcomes were measured at 6-months postpartum.

*Parenting involvement* was measured using 7-items adapted from the Fragile Families Study<sup>21</sup>. Items assessed the number of days in a given week (0–7) that individuals engaged in activities with their children (e.g., playing, holding, reading to, showing affection). Results showed good internal consistency for males ( $\alpha = 0.78$ ) and females ( $\alpha = 0.68$ ). *Time spent caregiving* was assessed by an item that asked what percentage of the time the person took care of the baby. *Parenting experiences* were assessed using two 8-point Likert subscales from What Being the Parent of a New Baby is Like (WPL-R)<sup>22</sup>. The subscales include the 11-item *positive parenting experiences scale*, which asks questions about how satisfying it is to be a parent, and the 4-item *positive parenting life change*, which assesses the degree to which becoming a parent has positively impacted the individual's life.

Example items include “How connected with your baby do you feel” for the *positive parenting experiences* scale and “How much has your life changed for the better since your baby” for the *positive parenting life change* scale. Results showed good internal consistency for *positive parenting experiences* for males ( $\alpha = 0.84$ ) and females ( $\alpha = .71$ ) and for *positive parenting life change* for males ( $\alpha = 0.80$ ) and females ( $\alpha = .71$ ). *Parenting sense of competence* was evaluated using the 17-item Parenting Sense of Competence Scale <sup>23</sup> that was modified for low-income adolescents and young adults <sup>24</sup>. The 5-point Likert items addressed whether participants felt capable as a parent. Example items include “What you do has an effect on your baby” and “The problems of having a baby are easy to solve.” Results showed good internal consistency for males ( $\alpha = 0.75$ ) and females ( $\alpha = .79$ ).

**Predictors**—All predictors and covariates were assessed during pregnancy, except the family history variables that were assessed 6-months postpartum due to assessment time constraints. However, given that the family history variables were retrospective measures assessing experiences that occurred during childhood, the temporal nature of our predictors and outcomes still holds.

**Relationship Factors**—Relationship factors refer to constructs related to the relationship between the mother and father of the baby. *Couple relationship functioning* between the mother and father of the baby was measured using the 32-item Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) <sup>25</sup> during pregnancy. Example items include “Do you ever regret being with your partner” and “How often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?” Reliability for this measure was very good for males and females (both  $\alpha = 0.92$ ). *Partner attachment* measured levels of partner attachment avoidance and anxiety toward romantic partners using the 36-item Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (ECRI) <sup>26</sup> measured with a 7-point Likert scale. The partner attachment avoidance and anxiety scales each consisted of a sum of 18 items. Example items include “I prefer not to show my partner how I feel deep down” for partner attachment avoidance, and “I worry my partner will leave me” for partner attachment anxiety. Reliability was good for avoidance subscales for males and females (both  $\alpha = 0.86$ ), and for anxiety subscales for males ( $\alpha = 0.86$ ) and females ( $\alpha = 0.91$ ).

**Family Factors**—Family factors refer to current relationships with the family of origin (e.g., mother, father, siblings). Current *family functioning* was assessed using a 12-item scale adapted from the Family Functioning Scale (FFS) <sup>27</sup> measured with a 7-point scale during pregnancy. Example items include “The members of my family fight with each other” and “I feel loved by my family.” Reliability for this measure was very good for males ( $\alpha = 0.78$ ) and females ( $\alpha = 0.82$ ). We also measured the participant’s *parental response to pregnancy* by asking participants how their parents reacted to finding out about the pregnancy. Responses ranged on a 7-point scale from 1=“very unhappy” to 7=“very happy.”

**Family History**—Family history variables refer to the participants’ family of origin home environment during childhood. *Participants’ mother and father involvement* during childhood were assessed with two separate scales (one for the mother and one for father of the participants) that were adapted from the Fatherhood Scale <sup>28</sup> that asked about the level of involvement of each parent of the participants (e.g., provided for us, hugged me) during their childhood. Items ranged from 1 to 5 with higher scores indicating more involvement. Internal consistency was excellent ( $\alpha = 0.97$  for both scales for both males and females). *Troubled household* was created if participants responded positively to any of the four questions about their household when growing up: the participant ran away at least once, lived with someone who went to prison, lived with someone who was a drug user, lived with someone who was a problem drinker. *Family mobility* was assessed by asking participants

the number of times they moved during their childhood. *Frequency of being spanked* was assessed by asking how often they were spanked during their childhood, with scores ranging from 0=“never” to 4=“weekly or more.”

**Individual Factors—***Pregnancy wantedness* was assessed by asking female participants “in this current pregnancy, did you want to get pregnant?” and male participants “in this current pregnancy, did you want her to get pregnant?” using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1=“definitely no” to 5=“definitely yes”

**Covariates—**We assessed whether the individual was living with the father/mother of the baby, whether the individual was living with their parents, the participant’s age in years, race (African-American, Hispanic, White/Other), whether the participant had previous children, income, whether they were working, and their gender.

## Data analysis

Frequencies and means were conducted to describe the sample. Generalized estimating equations is a method similar to multi-level modeling in that it corrects for clustered and correlated data and is appropriate for dyadic data, and therefore was used as our central analytic technique<sup>29,30</sup>. GEE has been used in partner-level analyses<sup>31</sup>, and romantic partner dyadic analyses<sup>30,32</sup>. We chose GEE over other approaches to dyadic data (e.g., multi-level modeling) for several reasons. First, several of our variables (e.g., parenting positive experiences, parenting positive life change) were skewed violating assumptions of normality needed for multi-level modeling. GEE is robust to violations of normality making it more appropriate for our data<sup>30</sup>. Second, a core group of our primary predictors (e.g., the family history variables) were asked at the Time 2 assessment resulting in missing data for some of the members of the dyads on our core predictors. GEE is more flexible than multilevel modeling in the handling of missing data when within cluster numbers are small<sup>30</sup>. Predictor variables which achieved statistical significance of  $p < 0.10$  in unadjusted analyses were included in the multivariable models.

We assessed for possible collinearity and found that collinearity diagnostics were in the acceptable range (e.g., VIF range: 1.08–1.68), indicating that collinearity was not a problem. Backward selection was used to eliminate non-significant predictor variables (but not covariates) using a criteria of  $p > .05$  for exclusion. To assess whether gender moderated any of the predictors, a gender x predictor interaction term controlling for covariates was conducted one at a time including all covariates, significant predictors, and predictors involved in the interaction. Further, all variables involved in the interaction were centered prior to creation of interaction terms. Significant interactions were included in the final model. Simple effects were conducted to assess the nature of a significant interaction. All analyses used SPSS 17.0.

## RESULTS

Table 1 describes the sample by gender. The majority of participants were African-American (44%) or Hispanic (41%), with 15% White or some other race/ethnicity. Average age was 18.7 (SD=1.6) for women and 21.0 (SD=3.6) for men. Sixty percent of participants were living with the father/mother during the prenatal period and 52% were living with their parents. We compared parenting outcomes at 6 months postpartum between men and women (Table 2). Women had significantly higher *parenting involvement*, *time spent caregiving*, *positive parenting experiences*, and higher *parenting sense of competence* than men (all  $p < .05$ ).



Next, we conducted a series of unadjusted (Table 3) and adjusted (Table 4) multivariable general estimating equations. More *parental involvement* at 6-months postpartum was related to higher couple relationship satisfaction during pregnancy, mother involvement during childhood, and being female. More *time spent caregiving* at 6-months postpartum was related to less partner attachment avoidance, less frequency of being spanked as a child, living with the father/mother of the baby, not working, and being female.

More *positive parenting life change* at 6-months postpartum was related to more couple relationship satisfaction during pregnancy, less frequency of being spanked as a child, and being Black compared to white/other. More *positive parenting experience* at 6-months postpartum was related to higher couple relationship satisfaction during pregnancy, mother involvement during childhood, and being female.

More *parenting sense of competence* at 6-months postpartum was related to higher couple relationship satisfaction during pregnancy, less partner avoidance and anxiety attachment, mother involvement during childhood, being Black compared to Latino, and being female.

Next, we looked at possible gender interactions. There was one significant interaction for *parenting involvement*. There was a gender by pregnancy wantedness interaction ( $B=.159$ ,  $SE=.067$ ,  $Wald=5.64$ ,  $p=.027$ ). Simple effects show that for males, more pregnancy wantedness relates to more *involvement* ( $B=.122$ ,  $SE=.063$ ,  $p=.048$ ), whereas there is no relationship between pregnancy wantedness and *parenting involvement* for females ( $B=-.037$ ,  $SE=.030$ ,  $p=.212$ ).

For time spent caregiving, there was one significant interaction. There was a significant gender by couple relationship satisfaction interaction ( $B=.432$ ,  $SE=.164$ ,  $Wald=6.95$ ,  $p=.008$ ). For males, more couple relationship satisfaction relates to more *time spent as caregiver* ( $B=.405$ ,  $SE=.109$ ,  $p=.001$ ), whereas there is no couple relationship between relationship satisfaction and *time spent caregiving* for females ( $B=-.026$ ,  $SE=.103$ ,  $p=.802$ ).

For *positive parenting life change*, there was one significant interaction, gender by family functioning ( $B=.027$ ,  $SE=.010$ ,  $Wald=7.21$ ,  $p=.002$ ). For males, there was no relationship between family functioning and *positive parenting life change* ( $B=.009$ ,  $SE=.007$ ,  $p=.244$ ). However, for females, the better the family functioning during pregnancy, the more *positive parenting life change* at 6-months postpartum ( $B=.035$ ,  $SE=.007$ ,  $p=.001$ ).

For *positive parenting experience*, there were two significant interactions. There was a significant gender by partner avoidant attachment interaction ( $B=-.008$ ,  $SE=.004$ ,  $Wald=4.22$ ,  $p=.040$ ). For males ( $B=-.013$ ,  $SE=.003$ ,  $p=.001$ ) and females ( $B=-.005$ ,  $SE=.002$ ,  $p=.020$ ), more partner avoidant attachment during pregnancy relates to less *positive parenting experience* 6 months postpartum, but the relationship is significantly stronger for males. There was a gender by troubled household interaction ( $B=-.228$ ,  $SE=.113$ ,  $Wald=4.09$ ,  $p=.043$ ). For males, having a troubled household while growing up relates to a less *positive parenting experience* at 6-months postpartum ( $B=-.233$ ,  $SE=.099$ ,  $p=.018$ ), whereas there is no relationship between troubled household and *positive parenting experience* for females ( $B=-.005$ ,  $SE=.060$ ,  $p=.935$ ).

For parenting sense of competence, there was a significant interaction for gender by father involvement during childhood ( $B=-1.70$ ,  $SE=.553$ ,  $Wald=9.40$ ,  $p=.002$ ). For females, more father involvement during childhood relates to better *parenting sense of competence* ( $B=.919$ ,  $SE=.374$ ,  $p=.014$ ), whereas there is no relationship between father involvement during childhood and *parenting sense of competence* for males ( $B=-.778$ ,  $SE=.412$ ,  $p=.059$ ).

## DISCUSSION

This study shows the importance of relationship and family contexts for parenting. Both relationship and family factors significantly influenced parenting behaviors of young low-income parents 6 months postpartum above and beyond covariates<sup>11</sup>. Couple relationship functioning during pregnancy was associated with all five parenting outcomes for men and four of the five parenting outcomes for women. Our results extend previous findings regarding the link between relationship quality and positive parenting and child outcomes for older middle class populations to younger low-income minority populations<sup>8,33</sup>. These results highlight the need for programs that help young mothers and fathers improve their relationships. Currently, clinicians rarely assess a young pregnant woman's romantic relationship during prenatal visits<sup>34</sup>. Integrating relationship strengthening interventions within programs aimed at improving postnatal health, and parental functioning may help to lower the risk of a wide variety of negative family health and social outcomes. For example, the Young Parenthood Program is a couple counseling intervention that found improved relationships between young parents, as well as more positive parenting<sup>35</sup>.

Family history also related to parenting but family context during childhood was more important than current family functioning, which is consistent with previous literature<sup>14,36</sup>. The most important family history variable was the participant's mother's involvement during childhood. This held for both females and males. This is consistent with several studies that showed that mother involvement and affection during childhood influences positive parenting<sup>36</sup>. Further, being spanked as a child was linked to less positive parenting behaviors. These results support research of the impact of negative childhood experiences on adult functioning<sup>37</sup>, and emphasize the importance of creating a nurturing parenting environment and the long-term effects that the early childhood experience has on subsequent generations<sup>38</sup>.

In addition to the overall effects, there were several differences between males and females. Females had significantly better parenting outcomes than males, which supports previous studies<sup>9-11</sup>. In addition, moderation analyses showed that relationship and family factors had stronger associations for males compared to females. This may be partially explained by differences in cultural norms of parenting between males and females. Socially, females may be expected to be caregivers for children and therefore less influenced by other factors, whereas males are more engaged under optimal conditions (e.g., in a happy and healthy relationship)<sup>2,39,40</sup>. Another interesting gender difference was that for females, paternal involvement during their childhood was associated with more parenting sense of competence, whereas for males it was not. This finding was surprising given past studies have shown that males attitudes toward parenting are heavily influenced by their perceptions of their father's competence<sup>14</sup>.

Despite the strengths of our study, there are several limitations that we should note. First, the sample may have limited generalizability given that it includes couples who are pregnant and who have chosen to continue the pregnancy and relationship. Second, we may not have included all potential predictors and covariates in the model which may mask some of the posited relationships. Third, the lack of associations of some of the family and relationship factors on parenting for females may be due to ceiling effects given that females scored high on several of the outcome variables. Finally, we included self-report measures instead of objective measures of parenting. However, we used validated and reliable measures, increasing the meaningfulness of our results.

Children of young parents are at high risk for a host of negative outcomes, as are their parents. It is critical to engage young mothers and young fathers early in parenting to

provide additional intervention and support<sup>39</sup>. Interventions that focus on strengthening young parents' romantic relationships may provide benefits to both the parents and the child<sup>35</sup>. Further, programs that address any negative parenting young parents may have experienced during childhood can help prevent the continuation of destructive intergenerational patterns. The presence of partners can ameliorate both past experiences and current stressors for young parents if they have strong relationships. Even if a romantic relationship does not survive ultimately, having a relationship with a strong foundation may lead to better co-parenting and continued parenting engagement. Families are best served when members can count on one another for consistent support. Strengthening the romantic relationships of young parents provides the best chance that parents can help support one another in a positive parenting role, and that both can support their child in his or her development.

## Acknowledgments

Supported by a grant to Dr. Trace Kershaw from the National Institutes of Mental Health (1R01MH075685). Additional support from the Center for Interdisciplinary Research on AIDS (5P30MH062294).

## References

1. O'Connor, T.; Scott, S. Parenting and outcomes for children. Kings College London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation; 2007.
2. Doherty WJ, Kouneski EF, Erickson MF. Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual framework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1998; 60:277–292.
3. Cox MJ, Paley B. Understanding families as systems. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 2003; 12:193–196.
4. Bert SC, Guner BM, Lanzi RG. The influence of maternal history of abuse on parenting knowledge and behavior. *Family Relations*. 2009; 58:176–187. [PubMed: 21695065]
5. Sipsma H, Brooks Biello K, Cole-Lewis H, Kershaw T. Like father, like son: The intergenerational cycle of adolescent fatherhood. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2010; 100:517–525. [PubMed: 20075312]
6. Meade CS, Kershaw TS, Ickovics JR. The intergenerational cycle of teenage motherhood: An ecological approach. *Health Psychology*. 2008; 27:419–429. [PubMed: 18642999]
7. Rueger SY, Katz RL, Risser HJ, Lovejoy MC. Relations between parental affect and parenting behaviors: A meta-analytic review. *Parenting Science and Practice*. 2011; 11:1–33.
8. Carlson MJ, McLanahan SS. Strengthening unmarried families: Could enhancing couple relationships also improve parenting? *Social Service Review*. 2006; 80:297–321.
9. Rhoads, SE. Taking Sex Differences Seriously. Encounter Books; 2005.
10. Easterbrooks MA, Chaudhuri JH, Bartlett JD, Copeman A. Resilience in parenting among young mothers: Family and ecological risks and opportunities. *Children and Youth Services Review* Jan. 2011; 33:42–50.
11. Biehle SN, Mickelson KD. Personal and co-parent predictors of parenting efficacy across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 2011; 30:985–1010.
12. Liu CC, Chen YC, Yeh YP, Hsieh YS. Effects of maternal confidence and competence on maternal parenting stress in newborn care. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2012; 68:908–918. [PubMed: 21790741]
13. Barry AA, Smith JZ, Deutsch FM, Perry-Jenkins M. Fathers' involvement in child care and perceptions of parenting skill over the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Family Issues* Nov. 2011; 32:1500–1521.
14. Beaton JM, Doherty WJ. Fathers' family of origin relationships and attitudes about father involvement from pregnancy through first year postpartum. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers*. 2007; 5:236–245.



15. Lee C-YS, Doherty WJ. Marital satisfaction and father involvement during the transition to parenthood. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers*. 2007; 5:75–96.
16. Neppl TK, Conger RD, Scaramella LV, Ontai LL. Intergenerational continuity in parenting behavior: Mediating pathways and child effects. *Developmental psychology*. 2009; 45:1241. [PubMed: 19702389]
17. Rogers SJ, White LK. Satisfaction with parenting: The role of marital happiness, family structure, and parents' gender. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1998; 60:293–308.
18. Bunting L, CM. Research Review: Teenage Pregnancy and parenthood: The role of fathers. *Child & Family Social Work*. 2004; 9:295–303.
19. Carlson MJ, McLanahan SS, Brooks-Gunn J. Coparenting and nonresident fathers' involvement with young children after a nonmarital birth. *Demography*. 2008; 45:461–488. [PubMed: 18613490]
20. Gavin LE, Black MM, Minor S, Abel Y, Papas MA, MEB. Young, disadvantaged fathers' involvement with their infants: An ecological perspective. 2002; 31:266–276.
21. Carlson M, McLanahan S, England P. Union formation in fragile families. *Demography*. 2004; 41:237–261. [PubMed: 15209039]
22. Pridham KF, Chang AS. What being the parent of a new baby is like: revision of an instrument. *Research on Nursing Health*. 1989; 12:323–329.
23. Gibaud-Wallston, LW. Development and utility of the parenting sense of competence scale. American Psychological Association Meeting; 1978; Toronto, Canada.
24. Holub CK, Kershaw TS, Ethier KA, Lewis JB, Milan S, Ickovics JR. Prenatal and parenting stress on adolescent maternal adjustment: identifying a high-risk subgroup. *Maternal Child Health Journal* Mar. 2007; 11:153–159.
25. Spanier GB. Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scale for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*. 1976; 38:15–28.
26. Brennan, KA.; Clark, CL.; Shaver, PR. Self-report measurement of adult romantic attachment: An integrative overview. In: Simpson, JA., editor. *Attachment theory and close relationships*. New York: Guilford Press; 1998. p. 46-76.
27. Tavittian ML, Lubiner J, Green L, Grebstein LC, Velicer WF. Dimensions of family functioning. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality* May. 1987; 2:191–204.
28. Dick GL. The fatherhood scale. *Research on Social Work Practice*. 2004; 14:80–92.
29. Diez-Roux AV. Multilevel analysis in public health research. *Annual review of public health*. 2000; 21:171–192.
30. Zorn CJ. Generalized estimating equation models for correlated data: A review with applications. *American Journal of Political Science*. 2001:470–490.
31. Katz BP, Fortenberry JD, Zimet GD, Blythe MJ, Orr DP. Partner-specific relationship characteristics and condom use among young people with sexually transmitted diseases. *Journal of Sex Research*. 2000; 37:69–75.
32. Loeys T, Molenberghs G. Modeling actor and partner effects in dyadic data when outcomes are categorical. *Psychological Methods*. 2013 Epub ahead of print.
33. Simons RL, Johnson C, Beaman J, Conger RD, Whitbeck LB. Parents and peer group as mediators of the effect of community structure on adolescent problem behavior. *Am J Community Psychology* Feb. 1996; 24:145–171.
34. Kershaw TS, Lewis J, Westdahl C, et al. Using clinical classification trees to identify individuals at risk of STDs during pregnancy. *Perspectives of Sexual and Reproductive Health*. 2007; 39:141–148.
35. Florsheim P, Burrow-Sánchez JJ, Minami T, McArthur L, Heavin S, Hudak C. Young parenthood program: Supporting positive paternal engagement through coparenting counseling. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2012; 102:1886–1892. [PubMed: 22897540]
36. Bouchard G. Intergenerational transmission and transition to fatherhood: A mediated-moderation model of paternal engagement. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2012; 26:747–755. [PubMed: 22823004]

37. Gershoff ET. More harm than good: A summary of scientific research on the intended and unintended effects of corporal punishment on children. *Law and Contemporary Problems*. 2010; 73:31–56.
38. Framo, JL. *Family of origin therapy*. New York: Brunner/Mazel; 1992.
39. Doherty WJ, Erickson MF, LaRossa R. An intervention to increase father involvement and skills with infants during the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2006; 20:438. [PubMed: 16938002]
40. Katz-Wise SL, Priess HA, Hyde JS. Gender-role attitudes and behavior across the transition to parenthood. *Developmental psychology*. 2010; 46(1):18. [PubMed: 20053003]

### Implications and Contributions

Good relationship functioning between parents during pregnancy and a strong family context during childhood was associated with better parenting behavior for young mothers and fathers. There may be a need for programs that focus on strengthening young parents' romantic relationships and that address negative parenting experienced during childhood.

**Table 1**

## Description of the Sample

	<b>Males N=206</b>	<b>Females N=228</b>
Living with Father/Mother of the Baby	61%	59%
Living with Parents	48%	56%
Age	M=21.0 (SD=3.6)	M=18.7 (SD=1.6)
Race		
Black	48%	39%
Hispanic	39%	42%
White/Other	13%	19%
Previous Children	26%	21%
Income	M=17,226 (SD=21,085)	M=12,837 (SD=13,497)
Currently Working	61%	40%
<b>Partner Factors</b>		
Couple Relationship Satisfaction	M=113.90 (SD=21.41)	M=115.82 (SD=19.98)
Partner Attachment Avoidance	M=48.70 (SD=16.87)	M=46.33 (SD=15.94)
Partner Attachment Anxiety	M=55.89 (SD=18.98)	M=62.09 (SD=21.95)
<b>Family Factors</b>		
Family Functioning	M=60.50 (SD=11.96)	M=61.47 (SD=12.20)
Parental Response to Pregnancy	M=5.13 (SD=1.97)	M=4.72 (SD=2.05)
<b>Family History Factors</b>		
Mother Involvement	M=2.97 (SD=1.19)	M=2.83 (SD=1.22)
Father Involvement	M=1.46 (SD=1.33)	M=1.46 (SD=1.38)
Troubled Household	57.1%	60.0%
Family Mobility	M=5.02 (SD=4.78)	M=4.72 (SD=2.05)
Frequency of Being Spanked	M=1.76 (SD=1.41)	M=1.55 (SD=1.33)
<b>Individual Factors</b>		
Pregnancy Wantedness	M=2.38 (SD=1.27)	M=2.19 (SD=1.39)

**Table 2**

Differences on Parenting Outcomes between Males and Females

	Range	Males N=206	Females N=228	p
Parenting Involvement	0–7	5.53 (1.15)	6.37 (.73)	<.001
Time Spent Caregiving	0–100	40.10 (36.57)	81.05 (29.93)	<.001
Positive Parenting Life Change	1–9	7.88 (1.32)	7.86 (1.21)	.861
Positive Parenting Experiences	1–9	8.41 (.76)	8.68 (.41)	<.001
Parenting Sense of Competence	17–85	68.51 (7.40)	70.88 (7.25)	<.001

Table 3

Unadjusted Associations of Relationship and Family Factors on Parenting Outcomes

	Parenting Involvement			Time Spent Caregiving			Parenting Positive Life Change			Parenting Positive Experiences			Parenting Sense of Competence		
	B	SE	p	B	SE	p	B	SE	p	B	SE	p	B	SE	p
<b>Relationship Factors</b>															
Couple Relationship Satisfaction	.010	.002	.001	.217	.086	.011	.015	.003	.001	.009	.001	.001	.110	.017	.001
Partner Attachment Avoidance	-.006	.003	.042	-.309	.117	.008	-.103	.004	.001	-.009	.002	.001	-.135	.024	.001
Partner Attachment Anxiety	.001	.003	.742	.038	.093	.681	-.013	.003	.001	-.004	.001	.004	-.099	.019	.001
<b>Family Factors</b>															
Family Functioning	.011	.004	.004	.196	.162	.227	.025	.005	.001	.010	.002	.000	.125	.031	.001
Parental Response to Pregnancy	-.015	.027	.582	1.91	.851	.025	.066	.031	.035	-.002	.014	.904	.105	.193	.586
<b>Family History Factors</b>															
Mother Involvement	.089	.044	.044	1.82	1.60	.255	.167	.060	.006	.103	.032	.002	1.19	.215	.001
Father Involvement	.046	.038	.218	1.89	1.50	.206	.105	.045	.020	.018	.020	.373	.079	.293	.787
Troubled Household	-.030	.040	.460	-1.07	1.47	.465	-.226	.059	.001	-.056	.029	.055	.039	.314	.902
Family Mobility	.005	.001	.604	-.546	.417	.191	-.013	.014	.377	-.003	.006	.651	.022	.095	.817
Frequency of Being Spanked	-.106	.038	.006	-4.16	1.30	.001	-.235	.049	.001	-.080	.025	.002	-.408	.282	.148
<b>Individual Factors</b>															
Pregnancy Wantedness	.042	.039	.280	.773	1.30	.553	.071	.046	.121	.025	.021	.232	.170	.307	.580
<b>Covariates</b>															
Living with Father/Mother of the Baby	.330	.097	.001	7.20	3.26	.027	.150	.131	.253	.091	.066	.163	-1.19	.766	.120
Living with Parents	-.049	.099	.619	1.99	3.88	.608	-.073	.125	.559	.013	.062	.836	.602	.704	.392
Age	-.035	.017	.034	-2.40	.524	.001	.021	.019	.287	-.012	.011	.295	-.136	.122	.265
Race															
Black	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Latino	.027	.107	.803	-5.56	3.66	.129	.166	.137	.229	.004	.065	.946	-1.90	.799	.017
White/Other	.196	.120	.100	2.56	4.31	.552	-.398	.195	.041	-.071	.091	.437	-.005	.924	.996
Previous Children	-.057	.132	.663	-3.91	4.45	.380	-.025	.155	.872	.028	.089	.755	.350	1.03	.734
Income	.001	.001	.410	.001	.001	.070	.001	.001	.140	.001	.001	.121	.001	.001	.437



	Parenting Involvement			Time Spent Caregiving			Parenting Positive Life Change			Parenting Positive Experiences			Parenting Sense of Competence		
	B	SE	p	B	SE	p	B	SE	p	B	SE	p	B	SE	p
Currently Working	-.224	.064	.001	-15.80	2.14	.001	.032	.080	.688	-.022	.040	.491	-.134	.424	.751
Gender	.870	.102	.000	39.13	3.62	.001	.016	.131	.901	.299	.062	.001	2.22	.693	.001

Table 4

Final Multivariable Models Predicting Parenting Outcomes

	Parenting Involvement			Time Spent Caregiving			Parenting Positive Life Change			Parenting Positive Experiences			Parenting Sense of Competence		
	B	SE	p	B	SE	p	B	SE	p	B	SE	p	B	SE	p
<b>Relationship Factors</b>															
Couple Relationship Satisfaction	.007	.002	.002	---	---	---	.012	.003	.001	.009	.001	.001	.069	.020	.001
Partner Attachment Avoidance	---	---	---	-.191	.086	.027	---	---	---	---	---	---	-.052	.026	.049
Partner Attachment Anxiety	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-.066	.020	.001
<b>Family Factors</b>															
Family Functioning	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Parental Response to Pregnancy	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Family History Factors</b>															
Mother Involvement	.084	.037	.038	---	---	---	---	---	---	.078	.030	.011	.960	.315	.002
Father Involvement	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Troubled Household	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Family Mobility	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Frequency of Spanking	---	---	---	-3.35	1.07	.002	-.213	.050	.001	---	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Individual Factors</b>															
Pregnancy Wantedness	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Covariates</b>															
Living with FOB/MOB	.174	.103	.091	5.94	3.00	.048	.139	.143	.330	.082	.075	.271	-1.32	.802	.100
Living with Parents	-.038	.100	.702	-3.25	3.45	.347	-.075	.141	.597	.004	.062	.949	.091	.738	.902
Age	.032	.018	.093	.577	.539	.285	.036	.023	.107	.010	.010	.351	.095	.132	.474
Race	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Black	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Latino	.075	.110	.581	-6.59	3.53	.062	-.012	.126	.926	-.038	.062	.541	-1.92	.779	.014
White/Other	.065	.125	.537	-6.84	4.18	.102	-.616	.185	.001	-.167	.087	.054	.120	.988	.903
Previous Children	-.038	.123	.755	-4.57	3.84	.233	-.081	.135	.546	.016	.073	.822	.294	.855	.731
Income	.001	.001	.860	.001	.001	.811	.001	.001	.102	.001	.001	.054	.001	.001	.430
Currently Working	-.108	.064	.091	-10.73	2.07	.001	-.005	.087	.957	.033	.043	.433	.660	.401	.100

	Parenting Involvement			Time Spent Caregiving			Parenting Positive Life Change			Parenting Positive Experiences			Parenting Sense of Competence		
	B	SE	p	B	SE	p	B	SE	p	B	SE	p	B	SE	p
Gender	<b>.847</b>	<b>.114</b>	<b>.001</b>	<b>35.85</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>.001</b>	.110	.135	.417	<b>.363</b>	<b>.067</b>	<b>.001</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>.722</b>	<b>.001</b>

Note: Significant effects ( $p < .05$ ) are in bold