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Abstract

Resource Theory is elaborated as a new, integrative theory of fathering. Though not a stand-alone grand theory, in a manner similar to developmental contextualism (Lerner, 2001), life course approaches (Hareven, 1996), or a heuristic model of fathering (Cabrera et al., 2007), A Resource Theory of Fathering organizes and explains how fathers experience and manage multiple, comprehensive components of fathering across levels and domains embedded within numerous personal, interpersonal and community contexts. Resource Theory incorporates cognitive, affective and behavioral components of the lived experiences of garnering and deploying fathering resources in intrapersonal, interpersonal, and contextual dimensions. It is able to integrate previous theories, such as attachment theory, ecological theories, Erikson’s psychosocial theory, fathering identity theory, information processing and life course approaches to explain diversity in common dependent measures of fathering, such as attachment, parenting styles, and the rapidly expanding father involvement literature. A Resource Theory of Fathering provides direction for future research and effective intervention and education strategies for fathers and their families.
A Resource Theory of Fathering

Introduction

Empirical Documentation of Diversity in Fathering

Contemporary empirical work on fathering has expanded rapidly to cover a broad range of contexts and components of fathers’ relationships with their children, utilizing father involvement as a centrally important construct. The resultant wealth of data has led to increased awareness of the range of variables that influence fathers’ and children’s intergenerational relationships and the developmental outcomes for both men (Palkovitz, 2002b) and their children (Flouri, 2005). Recent projects that have required us to compare involvement patterns of groups of fathers across various demographic and social address categories (Palkovitz, Dutton & Hull, in press) have caused us to pause and ask, “what do we really know about diversity in fathering and how it influences differential patterns of father-child relationships?”

Preliminary consideration of this question has yielded a rich listing of dimensions of diversity represented in the existing empirical literature in different ways and to different degrees (see Table 1). Though this listing is not intended to be exhaustive, and though it could arguably be rearranged and elaborated in different ways, it has caused us to consider the implications of the “feast” of empirical literature coupled with the simultaneous “famine” of theory, conceptualization, and measurement in fathering research. Tracing the beginning of contemporary fathering scholarship to the 1970’s, it is easy to chronicle the early paucity of father data, followed by nearly exponential
increases in the number of scholarly articles that focus on fathering at this time (see Figure 1).

**Fractionated Theoretical Understandings**

Though empirical studies of fathering have proliferated at a rapid rate, theorizing about fathering has exhibited a more modest scholarly pace (Adamsons & Palkovitz, in press). Currently, “there is no Grand, unifying theory of fathering to effectively guide research” (Roggman et al., 2002, p. 6). Though there are well-established and well-known theories of human development and of families (e.g. psychoanalytic, cognitive, behavioral, social learning, humanistic, contextual, systems, social exchange, functional-structuralism, feminism, identity, and attachment theories), they must be applied in piecemeal fashion toward whatever aspects of fathering researchers are interested in investigating. While it may not be possible to create a grand theory of fathering that adequately supersedes each of these well-established theoretical approaches to human development, fathering scholarship would greatly benefit from an organizing scheme that integrates them while simultaneously honoring the lived experiences of fathers in diverse settings.

In his classic book on the Nature of Scientific Revolutions, Thomas Kuhn (1962) has noted that pre-paradigm research is not efficient, focused or unified. Continuing to do fathering research in the absence of more over-arching conceptualization that links to theory will likely produce a fractionated literature that fails to capture the lived experiences of fathers. While a brief listing of dimensions of fathering diversity presents a daunting web of interacting factors, it is important to begin to conceptualize how they work together in a systematic manner. The primary goal of this paper is to advance a
Resource Theory of Fathering as a comprehensive integration of conceptualizations around observed dimensions of fathering diversity, and to facilitate understanding their influences on the lived experiences of fathers and their families.

**Implications of Empirical Understandings of Diversity in Fathering**

The predominant way that diversity has been treated in fathering scholarship is to use demographic indicators of race, ethnicity, education, income, marriage and residential status to create distinct groups of fathers to compare against one another on some dimension of fathering behavior. However, at least in the US, many of the distinctions that may be correlates of race and ethnicity are subsumed or overshadowed by structural affordances of social class (Palkovitz, Dutton & Hull, in press). Simultaneously, we can easily observe great between-group differences and moderate within-group differences in various categories of fathering resources, and great variability in ways that fathers perceive and deploy resources.

**Social Class and Fathering Resources**

Various conceptualizations and measures of social class predict structural affordances that differentially position fathers to engage with their children. For example, on average, demographic data support that European American fathers are more likely to have higher incomes, higher educational attainment, higher marriage rates, and higher rates of co-residential status (Russell & Batalova, 2012), and therefore higher coparental support and access to children in comparison to African-American and Latino fathers. As has been documented elsewhere (Fagan & Palkovitz, 2011), accessibility is a necessary prerequisite to engagement. As such, differences in mean engagement patterns of European American fathers, in comparison to African American and Latino fathers, is
greater. Are we to believe that the observed differences are due to ethnicity or culture, or are they more likely the artifact of more or less proximal access to children and associated patterns of support or gatekeeping from the child’s mother?

When the pervasiveness of these conditions is viewed through another lens, a parsimonious explanation is simply, that in comparison to nonresidential fathers, coresidential fathers have a different set of fathering resources available to them. Such considerations lead to the realization that differential distributions of various kinds of personal, interpersonal and contextual resources are associated with observed differences in paternal engagement across groups of diverse fathers in the scholarly literature. Independent of social class, we tend to view these structural affordances as yielding diversity in fathering. Stated another way, diverse groups of men have differing challenges and hindrances (risks) to overcome if they are going to effectively 1) recognize and 2) deploy their fathering resources.

**Beyond Social Class: Diversity in Personal and Interpersonal Resources**

In reality, fathers of every race and ethnicity can be found across the entire range of SES strata (Palkovitz, Dutton & Hull, in press). Rather than comparing fathers of different social classes, it may be instructive to more carefully examine within-class diversity to nuance our understandings of differences in father involvement. Fathers have differential personal (developmental) resources, which have been described and explained as systems of interacting factors across bio-psycho-social-spiritual domains (Palkovitz, 2013). In addition, fathers’ interpersonal resources (e.g., relationship quality with their child’s mother, social capital and support networks) have been documented to
predict diversity in patterns of fathering (see, e.g., Fagan & Palkovitz, 2011; McHale 2009).

**The Lived Experience of Fathering**

Though ethnographies and other qualitatively based investigations have made significant inroads toward capturing the lived experiences of fathers with different social addresses (Palkovitz, Trask & Adamsons, in press; Roy, in press), no theories of fathering are developed enough to capture and explain diversity in lived experience of men across class boundaries. It is not merely the case that the theories applied to fathering are old, perhaps a greater limitation is that they are “borrowed” theories, originally designed to explain other components of development. Frequently, theoretical constructs utilized in fathering scholarship are thinly translated into behavioral measures that do not capture the cognitions and emotional components of fathering (Palkovitz, 1997; Hawkins & Palkovitz, 1999). Such truncated measures may be capable of capturing some significant behavioral differences across different groups of fathers, but they obscure the core meanings and processes of fathering that covary within and across class differences. A Resource Theory of Fathering can help to identify and understand within and across-group diversity in fathers’ patterns of valuing, garnering and deploying fathering resources to engage with their children in any context. Qualitative research has indicated that fathers are highly motivated to use their own resources to bring a more positive set of life opportunities, and developmental or relational facilitation to their children (Palkovitz, 2002). In other words, fathers frequently comprehend and articulate how both available and limited resources influence their ability to engage in fathering in the manner that they desire to. Though A Resource Theory of Fathering shares some
constructs with both Social Capital Theory and a general risk and resilience perspective, Resource Theory goes beyond their shared “inventory building” focus (i.e., how does one strengthen or promote protective factors, resilience processes, etc.) to bring a focus on the “implementation” processes - the executive functions required to assess, monitor, garner and deploy resources in personal, interpersonal and contextual domains. A Resource Theory of Fathering places the father centrally located within and connected to his personal, interpersonal and contextual resources and articulates connections between his lived experience, his resource management, and his ways of engaging as a father.

A Focus on Fathering: Typical Fathering Dependent Variables

When fathering resources are deployed or shared in positive (developmentally appropriate, well-timed, affectively warm) ways, then we recognize it as “good fathering” (Palkovitz, 2002a). It is simply another way to look at facilitating developmental outcomes (Palkovitz, 2002b), promoting wellbeing (Biglan et al., 2012), increasing life opportunities (Costanza et al., 2007), positive development (Silbereisen & Lerner, 2007), increasing quality of life (Costanza et al., 2007), initiating or maintaining positive developmental cascades (Matsen, 2001), overcoming risk (Lerner & Ohannessian, 1999) or being resilient (Rutter, 1987). Viewing these understandings and literatures that have been piecemeal through the organizing construct of Fathering Resource Theory gives explanatory and predictive power to the existing empirical database.

Resource Management: The Executive Functions of Fathering

Though American fathers often place an emphasis on economic provision, perhaps this is not the most important focus (Christiansen & Palkovitz, 2001). Certainly, material resources bring affordances that are lacking without them, but other theories
(attachment, social learning, etc.) each identify resources that matter in bringing positive developmental outcomes to children. Therefore, if fathers in diverse contexts can be brought to understand and value the developmentally facilitative power of the resources they have, and if they can be educated to deploy those resources to garner more fathering resources through positive developmental cascades (e.g., social capital, etc) (Matsen, 2001), then men across diverse social class and educational attainment categories can make significant gains in their ability to father “for life” (Palkovitz, in preparation).

**Bringing It All Together: A Resource Theory of Fathering**

Given length limitations for this paper, in this preliminary presentation of A Resource Theory of Fathering, it is not possible to fully elaborate each of the features of the theory in detail. Consequently, we have chosen to present brief bulleted lists covering the 1) central assumptions of the theory, 2) notable or distinguishing features of the theory, 3) elaborated focus on integral components of the theory, 4) implications for future research and theoretical development, 5) some ties to other theories or data bases, 6) applied perspectives, and 7) limitations of A Resource Theory of Fathering.

**Central assumptions of a Resource Theory of Fathering.**

A resource approach to explaining diversity of fathering is an overarching organizing construct that integrates across levels of analysis and previous theories and empirical findings (see Figure 2). Some basic assumptions of Resource Theory are:

- That all fathers possess some positive resources, and all fathers could benefit from garnering and deploying resources in a developmentally facilitative manner.

- Fathers who deploy or invest in personal, interpersonal and contextual resources yield positive developmental cascades (Matsen, 2001) from a systems perspective.
(Lerner, 2002, Palkovitz, 2013). The developmental gains may be realized in their own personal development (Palkovitz, 2002b), positive fathering and associated child development gains (Palkovitz, 2002a), or in benefits to the contexts in which fathers live or work, including interpersonal relationships and communities (Palkovitz, 2002b).

- For fathers, employing resources in facilitating your own and others’ (and especially your children’s) development becomes intrinsically rewarding, so you continue to stimulate positive developmental cascades (success breeds success).

- Fathers with an awareness and an understanding of Resource Theory constructs are better positioned to agentically make developmentally facilitative contributions to their children’s development, to their own well-being, and within their interpersonal and contextual settings.

- Existing theories of human development (e.g. Erikson’s theory, attachment theory) and interpersonal relationships (e.g., family systems theory, structural functionalism) are useful to explain and predict specific components of fathers’ personal development as men and fathers (Palkovitz, 2002b), but fail to centrally honor or position fathers’ lived experiences.

**Notable features of A Resource Theory of Fathering.**

- A Resource Theory of Fathering is based solidly in systems thinking (Lerner, 2002), and includes the interactive and transactional nature of interactions and exchanges both within and across levels of interaction (Matsen, 2001, Palkovitz, 2013). In order to adequately include and signify the multiple dimensions and
contexts of fathering, we have represented Resource Theory of Fathering in a three dimensional rendering (see figure 3).

- The theory positions fathers in the center of the model (see figure 4), and situates fathers with multiple connections to every major factor researched/conceptualized to date. Therefore, A Resource Theory has the potential to be truly integrative and comprehensive.

- Resource Theory interfaces and utilizes a contemporary and growing risk and resilience framework (Lerner & Ohannessian, 1999) and provides a clear path forward for men to consider ways in which they can facilitate the development and life opportunities of their children.

- Central to a Resource Theory of Fathering is the idea that making a positive change or investment into one developmental domain or system creates positive ripple effects or developmental cascades (Matsen, 2001) into linked systems (Lerner, 2002, Palkovitz, 2013).

- In the 3-d rendering, the connections are not two-way arrows, they are more like "pipes" or "conduits." They are conduits because resources flow back and forth from one node on the model to others. The interior of the conduits can be thought of as being different shapes (triangle or hexagonal, etc.) to represent different kinds of flow between the different nodes or constrict and expand at different times. Resources change, vary, are more abundant, or less apparent depending on how closed off or open the conduits are between different areas.

- The resources shift and flow dynamically. They change over time. Time, especially age, can be considered a resource as well. The longer you’ve been a
father, maybe the more sense Resource Theory makes sense to you… The more emotionally mature you are due to age or experience, the better you are able to manage and deploy resources. At times, your job (a contextual resource associated with interpersonal resources) is more in line with your emotional well-being (personal), for example, and you’re, therefore, able to make more of both arenas and the resources you draw from them.

**Elaborated focus on integral components of the theory.**

- The primary goal of the model is to give fathers, researchers, and interventionists an understanding of major components that influence men’s experiences and relationships as dads. Bringing a clear representation of the central components and their systemic interactions (for better or for worse- i.e., in facilitating or hindering relational quality and well-being), the model has practical utility for fathers themselves, for researchers and for practitioners who work to facilitate family relationships and well-being.

- It is noteworthy that we chose to locate a father’s lived experience of being a dad is centrally in the overall model (see figures 3 & 4), as this is the place in which fathers perceive and integrate the affect, behavior and cognitions of fathering and their connections to changing levels of variables on the resource triangle. Thus, the Lived Experience node (LE) has the sub designation of capital a, b and c (ABC) in order to represent the simultaneous interdependence of fathers’ affect behavior and cognition in his lived experience.

- The vertical axis of this figure represents central aspects of the father (see figure 4)- At the base of the figure are the executive functions that a father uses to
perceive, monitor, evaluate and deploy resources. RM is thus used to designate resource management. In most existing conceptualizations and studies of resource management, primarily stemming from information processing approaches to development, the executive functions of perception, monitoring, and evaluation are primarily linked to cognitive domains, with secondary roles played in behavioral and affective domains.

- The pinnacle of the fathering axis, also located at the top of the model (the tip of the iceberg, if you will), represents the various factors that researchers tend to focus on when studying fathering- fathering as a dependent variable. Recent reviews have covered various conceptualizations and operationalizations of gauging a father’s relationship with a target child. Though there are myriad ways to conceive and measure paternal relationships, most fall into some way to gauge Father Involvement (FI). Variations within this point of the model include features such as different levels and patterns of paternal involvement, fathers’ attachment relationships with their children, and parenting styles. Thus, the emphasis of the top of the fathering axis has been behavioral with cognitions and affect playing secondary and tertiary roles in conceptualization and measurement of fathering involvement (Bac).

- The “Fathering Resource Triangle” (see figure 5) represents factors typically included in empirical work on fathering. The literature is filled with studies linking men’s personal development (resources) to contexts of fathering and to social networks. It is known that substantive (relatively permanent and functionally significant) changes in any one of those factors is associated with
changes in fathering behavior over time. It is further known that persistent patterns of father engagement and styles influence relationships with spouses/partners and children, and have developmental consequences for all participants in the relationships.

- Notably, the factors within the Father’s Personal Resources comprise a system that interacts to shape the father himself. The Personal Resources are comprised of all of the various features that shape a person’s own abilities and experiences—typically covered in courses of Human Development. Contemporary textbooks typically present a “bio-psycho-social” framework for understanding ontogenetic development. In our model, we locate the social components in interpersonal resources.

**Implications for Future Research and Theoretical Development**

- An added benefit of a Resource Theory of Fathering is that it will encourage fathers, researchers and practitioners to consider what resources individual fathers possess and provide beyond material support.

- A Resource Theory of Fathering is the only fathering framework we are aware of to incorporate information processing in a central role. The executive functions of monitoring, evaluating, planning, etc. are central to the way fathers experience and engage in fathering.

- A Resource Theory of Fathering is situated to honor qualitative as well as quantitative research traditions and particularly suited for mixed methods.
A Resource Theory of Fathering presents a clear representation of areas and interactions between areas that require further conceptualization, research, integration in empirical literature, and in practical lives of fathers.

A vast and rapidly expanding literature exists to document relationships between levels and styles of father engagement and fathers’ situated contexts, personal resources and interpersonal resources. Because of the rapidly expanding quantity and scope of the empirical literature, we have represented the connections between the nodes on the Fathering Resource Triangle in green (see figure 6).

The qualitative literature on fathering is expanding to document men’s lived experiences as fathers, and how it interfaces with personal and interpersonal resources, and contexts of fathering to influence levels and styles of engagement, but still lags behind quantitatively based publications. Partly because of the relative paucity of qualitative data and partly because some researchers and some journal editors tend to devalue qualitative research, we have chosen to represent the connections between the father’s lived experience and various nodes on the resource triangle as gray (see figures 3 and 6). As fathering scholars, we highly value the “gray areas” linking fathers’ lived experience to the resources they have and those that they perceive as lacking.

In terms of research literature on fathering, what is largely lacking is an empirical base that links men’s executive functions with the remaining components of the model. However, systems models of development, family systems theory, and anecdotal and clinical interventions combined with theories of information processing and social cognition point to the importance of integrating fathers’
executive functions into this model. At this point, because of the essential void in
the empirical literature specifically linking executive functions of resource
management to other aspects of fathering, we have chosen to represent those
linkages in black (see figure 3 and 6). When considering the existing empirical
literature base (see figure 6), what is not currently well-researched is transparent.

• Many of the nodes on the level below Fathering Involvement have been used as
independent variables in predicting father involvement, attachment and parenting
styles. The father’s lived experience of being a dad is far less represented in the
empirical literature. It is probably more at home in the clinician’s office, where
men discuss the perceived challenges and shortcomings of their fathering
situations.

• Unique to our theory is the construct of the executive functions Resource
Management of fathers. We believe that this feature is key to bringing a new
understanding of all of the other components of fathering. While all of the
components of fathering are clearly interlinked, transactionally interacting, and
systemically interfaced, it is the resource management function upon which the
entire structure hinges or balances.

• A Resource Theory of Fathering addresses the paucity of data on fathers’ affect
and cognitions and honors the importance of affective, behavioral and cognitive
components of fathering in men’s lived experience. It is our continuing
assessment that much greater focus needs to be devoted to affective and cognitive
components of fathering in future research.

• A Resource Theory of Fathering honors the lived experience of men in families.
• The theory is potentially expandable to interface with Mothers, Children, Peers, co-workers, etc.

**Ties to Other Theories or Data Bases**

• Resource Theory links to existing data bases and theories in myriad ways. For example, secure attachments between fathers and their children would be a primary developmental asset for both fathers and children. Positive coparental relationships or other forms of social capital would be important examples of positive interpersonal resources.

• Fathers are frequently portrayed as problem solvers. Information processing constructs of executive functions such as monitoring, strategizing, evaluating, and implementing various processes are pivotal or central in Resource Theory. However, at this point in time, it is virtually unexplored how fathers use cognitive processes in order to monitor, garner and deploy resources.

• The Search Institute’s list of 40 of developmental assets represents many categories of resources that we believe to be important to fathers. While resources and assets may be viewed to be very comparable, we chose to keep the unique terminology to focus on fathers’ executive functions in garnering, assessing and deploying resources.

• Truly, entire papers could be written linking Resource Theory to theoretical constructs in the established literature. For instance, attachment, structural functionalism, family systems theory, the literature on situated fathers and the resources associated with rural versus urban residence, military fathers.
**Applied Understandings**

- Fathering education and support around Resource Theory approaches promises to enhance father-child relationships in non-technical, practical and effective interventions that will be self-maintaining and increase father and child well-being over time.

- Resource Theory will resonate with men, who, traditionally have been socialized to have a major focus on the provider role (Christiansen & Palkovitz, 2001).

- Because men are often regarded to be agentic and focused on accomplishing what they can do, A Resource Theory of Fathering may be embraced by everyday fathers as they are motivated to engage in things that matter and to do something truly positive and meaningful for their children.

- The theory can help to provide broadened perspectives on resources to expand beyond material resources. This shift may help men to consider garnering personal, interpersonal and contextual resources and to deploy them in ways that can catalyze positive developmental cascades (Matsen, 2001) throughout various components of their personal, interpersonal, family and community systems (Lerner, 2002).

- Most clearly, Resource Theory can assist men in thinking about the various investments they make into different systems and aspects of their children’s lives.

- Because of its potential translatability and accessibility to general populations of fathers, a Resource Theory of Fathering may instill hope in fathers who have experienced challenges in economic providing or in other roles as fathers.
• Therefore, a Resource Theory of Fathering has the potential to inspire men to do 
what they can instead of focusing on what they are unable to do. A Resource 
Theory of Fathering may facilitate fathers’ understanding that positive investment 
into different parts of a system synergistically builds capacity. This can lead to 
hope and motivation for all fathers to invest in what Palkovitz (in preparation) has 
characterized as “Fathering for Life.”

Limitations of A Resource Theory of Fathering

• Each of the points on this visual representation of the major components of 
Resource Theory are, admittedly, artificially categorized, and thus, separated. 
That is, Personal Resources necessarily influence and interact with Interpersonal 
Resources in ways that defy pure separation. However, a factor analysis of 
dimensions would likely place the father’s personality and even his interpersonal 
relationship style into his personal resource sphere, while the coparental 
relationship, relationship quality with the child’s mother, and relational 
satisfaction may be more appropriately located within the interpersonal sphere.

• Though it is possible to envision the pattern, the juxtaposition, or the 
interconnections of the model in different arrangements, the one posited affords a 
clear and limited set of factors that are key in influencing fathers’ relationships.

• This is a father-centered model that focuses on the experiences, cognitions, and 
behaviors of fathers with their children, partners, and contexts. Those who are 
focused on child wellbeing or marital or coparental satisfaction will undoubtedly 
be able to utilize this model in order to isolate and study fathers’ engagement in
their focused area of interest, but it is also true that the model is best suited to gain more comprehensive understanding of fathering than any aspect of fathering.

Conclusions

This proposal represents a preliminary articulation of the major tenants of Fathering Resource Theory. We see great potential for this integrative theory to advance fathering research to more fully link affective, behavioral and cognitive components of fathering. It was not our intention in this paper to provide a full, or even a rich, set of linkages between Resource Theory and these various existing frameworks. We know that the connections are too numerous and will require significant scholarship, thought and empirical research.

While we are optimistic regarding the potential of Resource Theory to integrate and utilize existing frameworks to more fully capture and explain fathers’ lived experiences and their situations in life, we offer this paper for your consideration and discussion in order to solicit your assessment of the potential benefits and challenges Resource Theory of Fathering offers to the current literature, to fathering scholars and practitioners, and to fathers themselves.
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### Table 1
Dimensions of Diversity in Fathering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Personal Resources</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interpersonal Resources</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contexts of Fathering</strong></th>
<th><strong>Patterns of Fathering</strong></th>
<th><strong>Resource Management</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td>Relationship Quality with Mother</td>
<td>Residential Status to Child</td>
<td>Father Involvement</td>
<td>Time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income/Wealth</td>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>Societal Values</td>
<td>o Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Age of Children</td>
<td>Gender Roles</td>
<td>o Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Children from other Relationship</td>
<td>Residential Status</td>
<td>o Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Sensitivity to Interpersonal Signal</td>
<td>Relational Status</td>
<td>o Secure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Goodness of Fit with Children</td>
<td>o Single</td>
<td>o Insecure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>Social Support Network</td>
<td>o Cohabitng</td>
<td>Parenting Style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>Relationship with Children</td>
<td>o Engaged</td>
<td>o Authoritative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Identity</td>
<td>Children from other Relationship</td>
<td>o Married</td>
<td>o Authoritarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Sensitivity to Interpersonal Signal</td>
<td>o Separated</td>
<td>o Permissive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Goodness of Fit with Children</td>
<td>o Divorced</td>
<td>o Disengaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperament</td>
<td>Social Support Network</td>
<td>o Re-partnered</td>
<td>Caregiving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Relationship with Children</td>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>Shared Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Style and Strategy</td>
<td>Relationship with Neighbors</td>
<td>Parenting Status</td>
<td>Role Enactment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration Record</td>
<td>Extended Family</td>
<td>o Step</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance use/abuse</td>
<td>In-Laws</td>
<td>o Biological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution Style</td>
<td>Work Colleagues</td>
<td>o Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship History with Own Parents</td>
<td>o Adoptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Guardian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timing of Parenthood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role Subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Protector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Provider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Moral Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Number of Scholarly Fathering Publications
Figure 2: A conceptual map of a Resource Theory of Fathering

**Father Involvement**
Fathering as a Dependent Variable: Father Involvement, Attachment, Parenting Styles, etc.

**Personal Resources**
Bio-Psycho-Social-Spiritual Systems

**Lived Experience**
Affect, Behavior, Cognition

**Interpersonal Resources**
Relationship Quality with Child's Mother, Co-Parenting, Social Capital, Social Support, etc.

**Contextual Resources**
Culture, Roles, Work, Neighborhoods, Social Class, etc.

**Resource Management**
Executive functions of garnering and deploying resources
Figure 3: A Three Dimensional Rendering of A Resource Theory of Fathering

FI = Father Involvement
LE = Lived Experience
RM = Resource Management
PR = Personal Resources
IPR = Interpersonal Resources
CR = Contextual Resources
A* = Affect
B* = Behavior
C* = Cognitions

* Upper case denotes primary functionality and lower case denotes secondary functionality
Figure 4: The Fathering Axis. A Resource Theory of Fathering situates the father as embedded in, and both influencing and reciprocally influenced by a range of personal, interpersonal and contextual resources.
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**Figure 5: The Resource Triangle**
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Figure 6: Current Empirical Literature Base

Green Conduits represent well-researched and documented relationships
Gray Conduits represent less well-researched (primarily qualitative) research base
Blue Conduits represent connections within the Fathering Axis
The Transparent conduits and node represent yet to be documented relationships
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B* = Behavior
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