LOW-INCOME, MINORITY FATHERS' CONTROL STRATEGIES AND THEIR CHILDREN'S REGULATORY SKILLS

LOW-INCOME, MINORITY FATHERS' CONTROL STRATEGIES AND THEIR CHILDREN'S REGULATORY SKILLS

JENESSA L. MALIN, NATASHA J. CABRERA, ELIZABETH KARBERG, DANIELA ALDONEY, AND MEREDITH L. ROWE
University of Maryland, College Park

ABSTRACT: The current study explored the bidirectional association of children's individual characteristics, fathers' control strategies at 24 months, and children's regulatory skills at prekindergarten (pre-K). Using a sample of low-income, minority families with 2-year-olds from the Early Head Start Research and Evaluation Project ($n = 71$), we assessed the association between child gender and vocabulary skills, fathers' control strategies at 24 months (e.g., regulatory behavior and regulatory language), and children's sustained attention and emotion regulation at prekindergarten. There were three main findings. First, fathers overwhelmingly used commands (e.g., "Do that.") to promote compliance in their 24-month-old children. Second, children's vocabulary skills predicted fathers' regulatory behaviors during a father–child interaction whereas children's gender predicted fathers' regulatory language during an interaction. Third, controlling for maternal supportiveness, fathers' regulatory behaviors at 24 months predicted children's sustained attention at pre-K whereas fathers' regulatory language at 24 months predicted children's emotion regulation at pre-K. Our findings highlight the importance of examining paternal contributions to children's regulatory skills.

Abstracts translated in Spanish, French, German, and Japanese can be found on the abstract page of each article on Wiley Online Library at http://wileyonlinelibrary.com/journal/imhj.

* * *

Research over the last decade has consistently shown that fathers' contributions to child development are unique and independent from mothers' (Lamb & Lewis, 2010; Martin, Ryan, & Brooks-Gunn, 2010; Tamis-LeMonda, Shannon, Cabrera, & Lamb, 2004). In particular, the quality of father–child interactions has been linked to children's cognitive and social skills across developmental periods (Kochanska, Askan, Prisco, & Adams, 2008; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2004). A domain of child development that has received less attention in fatherhood research is children's self-regulation. This is an important area of research because children's regulatory skills during the early years are critical for school readiness and later school achievement (Blair & Diamond, 2008). Although children follow a clear pattern in their development of regulatory skills, individual differences appear from an early age (Calkins & Howse, 2004). Much literature has suggested that children's regulatory skills may be influenced by the strategies their parents, mostly mothers, use to promote compliance with their children (i.e., control strategies; Bindman, Hindman, Bowles, & Morrison, 2013; Kochanska & Askan, 1995; Sethi, Mischel, Aber, Shoda, & Rodriguez, 2000).

Although limited in scope, research also has shown that children's regulatory behaviors are influenced by the quality of father–child interactions (Kochanska et al., 2008; Owen et al., 2013; Peterson & Flanders, 2005; Vogel, Bradley, Raikes, Boliler, & Shears, 2006). A study of European American middle-class 2-year-olds and their mothers and fathers has found that highly cooperative father–child interactions directly predicted children's effortful control at 52 months; this was not the case for mothers (Kochanska et al., 2008). Similarly, Flanders et al. (2010) found that in a sample of middle-class fathers and their young children, when fathers were dominant during rough-and-tumble play interactions, children were rated higher on an emotion-regulation checklist than when fathers were low-dominant in play. We know of no study that has examined these associations among low-income fathers. Low-income families, in general, are at risk for low-quality parenting due to economic hardship; thus, it is plausible that parents' control strategies might be different from those of middle-class families. However, there also is tremendous variability among low-income fathers, with many engaging with children in high-quality interactions (Cabrera, Shannon, & Tamis-LeMonda, 2007). We add to this small body of research by examining whether low-income, minority fathers' control strategies during structured

Jenessa L. Malin, Natasha J. Cabrera, Elizbeth Karberg, Daniela Aldoney, and Meredith L. Rowe, Department of Human Development and Quantitative Methodology, University of Maryland, College Park. This research was supported by the National Institutes of Health (NICHD R03 HD066017) to Natasha J. Cabrera and Meredith L. Rowe and by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship (DGE 1322106) to Jenessa L. Malin.

Direct correspondence to: Jenessa L. Malin, 3304 Benjamin Building, College Park, MD 20742; e-mail: jlmalin@umd.edu.

View this article online at wileyonlinelibrary.com.
DOI: 10.1002/imhj.21467

interactions with their toddlers promote their children's regulatory skills. We focus on toddlerhood because it is a critical developmental period for children's regulatory and attentional control systems (Blair, 2006; Diamond, Barnett, Thomas, & Munro, 2007). We also examine whether children themselves influence fathers' control strategies. In particular, we focus on child gender and vocabulary skills because these have been identified as individual characteristics of children that influence parenting (Stansbury & Zimmermann, 1999; Tamis-LeMonda, Briggs, McClowry, & Snow, 2009). We use a sample of low-income, minority children and their fathers enrolled in the Early Head Start Research and Evaluation Project (EHSREP) to ask the following research questions:

RQ1: What types of control strategies do low-income, minority fathers use during interactions with their toddlers?
RQ2: Are fathers' control strategies associated with children's regulatory behaviors at prekindergarten (pre-K)?
RQ3: Are toddler's vocabulary skills and gender associated with fathers' use of control strategies?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

We draw from a bioecological model of human development which posits that children's proximal influences in the home environment, such as direct interactions that children have with their parents and other caregivers, influence children's development (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). Parents use a variety of control strategies, such as prohibitions (e.g., "Don't do that."), commands (e.g., "Go there."), modeling (i.e., demonstrate how to do something), and physical control (i.e., physically guide them through a situation) to help children comply with parental demands (Livas-Dlott et al., 2010). Over time, through the use of such control strategies, children learn to control their emotions, pay attention, and stay focused on tasks and thus move from externally regulated behavior to internally regulated behavior (Kopp, 1982).

Within a bioecological framework, children contribute to their own development by eliciting different behaviors or responses from their parents (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). A growing body of research has suggested that children's gender might be particularly influential in eliciting certain control strategies from their caregivers (Stansbury & Zimmermann, 1999). A study of Israeli fathers and their 2-year-olds found that fathers exhibited more warm control strategies with their daughters than with their sons (Feldman & Klein, 2003), suggesting boys may elicit different control strategies from their fathers than girls. Children's language skills have also been linked to differential parenting (Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2009). For example, a study of mothers and their preschool aged children found that children with lower verbal comprehension had mothers who used more unexplained compliance demands with their toddlers (Stansbury & Zimmermann, 1999). Additional findings have suggested that children's early language skills are linked with their regulatory skill development (Vallotton & Ayoub, 2011).

REGULATORY SKILLS OF LOW-INCOME TODDLERS

The development of self-regulation, the ability to regulate our own arousal, emotion, and behavior, is one of the major achievements of early childhood (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). It is during this period that children transition from being primarily regulated by external sources (e.g., parents) to increasingly being able to self-regulate their emotions, behaviors, and cognition (Calkins & Fox, 2002). Self-regulation enables children to voluntarily control their attention and emotional arousal to meet a desire goal (Blair, 2010; Blair & Ursache, 2011). Although there is much inconsistency in the field regarding the conceptualization and measurement of self-regulation, there is agreement that it is composed of interrelated top-down processes referred to as *executive functioning* (i.e., working memory, inhibitory control, and cognitive flexibility) and bottom-up components (i.e., automatic, less effortful processes associated with stress physiology and emotional arousal; Blair & Ursache, 2011).

As a broad construct, self-regulation underlies many of the social and cognitive processes associated with positive school adjustment and academic achievement (Blair, 2002; Hughes & Ensor, 2007). Studies have shown that differences in self-regulatory skills, broadly speaking, may account for a substantial portion of the income-achievement gap (Blair & Diamond, 2008; Howse, Calkins, Anastopoulos, Keane, & Shelton 2003). Mounting evidence has shown that children from low-SES families are at risk for low self-regulatory skills (Blair et al., 2011; Evans & English, 2002; Gershoff, 2003). Although studies have established a correlational link between SES and children's regulatory behaviors, there is less information on the sources of variability among low-income children's regulatory behaviors (Blair & Diamond, 2008; Evans & Rosenbaum, 2008). Understanding variability in this group is important because children's regulatory skills may promote resilience among children growing up in low-SES environments and may even protect them from the harmful effects of poverty on cognitive capacities (Buckner, Mezzacappa, & Beardslee, 2003; Evans & Fuller-Rowell, 2013; Li-Grining, 2007).

FATHERS' CONTROL STRATEGIES: LINKS TO REGULATORY SKILLS

Parents use a variety of control strategies in efforts to promote compliance among their children, and these strategies have been linked with children's later regulatory skills (Feldman & Klein, 2003). The literature on parental control, primarily conducted with mothers, has suggested that some control strategies (e.g., limit setting) are positively associated with children's outcomes whereas other control strategies (e.g., coerciveness or power assertion) are negatively associated with children's outcomes (Karreman, van Tuijl, van Aken, & Dekovic, 2006). Moreover, the literature has identified various forms of regulatory language (e.g., commands) and regulatory behaviors (e.g., modeling) that parents use with their children to teach children to regulate themselves (Kochanska & Askan, 2006; Kopp, 1982).

Research on how fathers promote their children's regulatory skills has been limited. Most studies have not specifically examined the types of strategies that fathers use to help their toddlers regulate their emotions or pay attention. Instead, studies have looked at broad or global measures of father involvement, such as residential status or intrusiveness, and have reported associations with higher levels of self-regulation or socioemotional development (e.g., Stevenson & Crnic, 2013; Vogel et al., 2006). In a study of father–child interactions in an ethnic-minority sample, Owen et al. (2013) measured father–child interaction quality and found that sensitive and stimulating fathering was a unique contributor to children's emerging response-inhibition skills. Similarly, a study of middle-class, two-parent families found that positive and cooperative father–child play interactions were linked to children's effortful control at 52 months (Kochanska et al., 2008). Others have examined how fathers help children regulate their impulses in the context of play, specifically rough-and-tumble play (RTP), which is characterized by aggressive behaviors that also are playful such as wrestling, jumping, and tumbling (Flanders, Leo, Paquette, Pihl, & Séguin, 2009; Paquette, 2004; Peterson & Flanders, 2005). These studies have found that during play, fathers are able to help children regulate their impulses and create boundaries (Flanders et al., 2009; Paquette, 2004; Peterson & Flanders, 2005).

We add to this growing literature by examining the specific strategies that fathers use to help toddlers comply with requests during everyday interactions. We expect that father who use more control strategies will have children with higher emotion-regulation and sustained-attention skills.

FATHERS' USE OF CONTROL STRATEGIES: VARIATION BY CHILDREN'S CHARACTERISTICS

Research has shown that girls demonstrate higher levels of self-regulation than do boys as early as the first year of life and throughout toddlerhood (Raikes, Robinson, Bradley, Raikes, & Ayoub, 2007; Weinberg, Tronick, Cohn, & Olson, 1999). While it is difficult to determine direction of causality, studies also have shown that parents differentially socialize their boys and girls. For example, on average, fathers exhibit more control with their daughters than with their sons (Chen, Liu, & Li, 2000; Feldman & Klein, 2003). Based on these findings, we examine whether child gender is associated with fathers' control strategies. We expect that fathers will use more control strategies with their daughters than with their sons.

Children's language skills also have been linked to parenting behaviors. Children who are able to understand and produce more language to understand what is required of them and to express their feelings may be more likely to elicit verbal control strategies from their parents than may children who are not as skillful (Vallotton & Ayoub, 2011). We therefore expect that children with more limited vocabulary skills will have fathers who employ more control strategies.

CURRENT STUDY

The current study seeks to extend the limited literature on how fathers contribute to their children's regulatory skills by examining the associations among children's individual characteristics (i.e., gender, vocabulary skills), fathers' control strategies with their 24-month-old children, and children's self-regulatory skills at pre-K. In particular, we focus on children's emotion-regulation and sustained-attention skills because they are most predictive of children's later academic achievement (Blair & Diamond, 2008; Duncan et al., 2007). Based on the bioecological framework that children develop through direct interactions with their parents, we hypothesize that fathers' control strategies will be associated with children's regulatory skills. We also hypothesize that fathers will use more control strategies with their daughters than their sons and with children with less advanced vocabulary skills than children with more advanced vocabulary skills.

METHOD

Data Source

This study utilized data from the Father Involvement with Toddlers Substudy (FITS) of the Early Head Start Research and Evaluation Project (EHSREP), a randomized and controlled evaluation of the Early Head Start (EHS) program in the United States (Love et al., 2005). EHS is a federal program that provides services for low-income (i.e., at or below the federal poverty level) families with infants and toddlers (Administration for Children and Families, 2002). Families in the EHSREP were recruited from 17 EHS sites participating in the evaluation. Fathers participating in the FITS were recruited from 12 of the 17 EHSREP sites in the substudy (for additional information on the FITS recruitment and study characteristics, see Boller et al., 2006). On average, fathers participating in FITS were more likely to be employed and have higher levels of education than were fathers who did not participate in the FITS (for more detailed analysis of selection bias, see Cabrera et al., 2004, and Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2004). Because we were interested in understanding how fathers encourage compliance from their toddlers, we selected a random subsample of children enrolled in the EHSREP who had a resident father, demographic and father–child interaction data from the 24-month wave, and emotion regulation and sustained-attention assessment data at pre-K. Our sample was drawn from sites serving mostly Latino and African American families. Participants in the final analytic sample ($n = 71$) represent two-parent, low-income, minority families where fathers (i.e., biological) or father figures (i.e., nonbiological) resided with their children from the child's birth to pre-K (Boller et al., 2006).

Participants

Participants were 71 resident fathers or father figures, biological mothers, and their toddlers. The sample was comprised of 35 African American and 36 Latino fathers. Nearly 82% of families ($n = 58$) identified English as the primary home language, and

TABLE 1. *Descriptive Statistics (N = 71)*

Variable	*n*	%	*M* (*SD*)
Child Gender			
Male	31	43.7	
Female	41	56.3	
Child Age Time 1 (months)	64	100	27.89 (2.83)
Mother Years of School	71	100	11.89 (1.81)
Father Years of School	71	100	12.10 (2.41)
Child Ethnicity			
African American	36	56.3	
Latino	28	43.8	
Father Relationship to Child			
Biological Father	54	76.1	
Nonbiological Father	17	23.9	
Household Language			
English	58	81.7	
Spanish	13	18.3	
MacArthur Communicative Development Inventory	71	100	59.34 (19.57)
Maternal Supportiveness	71	100	3.75 (1.05)
Paternal Supportiveness	71	100	3.95 (.89)
Emotion Regulation	71	100	93.55 (6.56)
Sustained Attention	71	100	11.20 (3.21)

18.3% ($n = 13$) identified Spanish as the primary home language. Mothers and fathers ranged in years of education from 6 to 17 ($M = 11.88$, $SD = 1.82$) and from 4 to 20 ($M = 12.10$, $SD = 2.41$), respectively. Approximately half of the children (56.3%) were female and ranged in age from 23 to 35 ($M = 27.88$, $SD = 2.83$) months. There were no differences in all study measures between families with fathers ($n = 54$) or families with father figures ($n = 17$). Means and standard deviations for all demographic variables are presented in Table 1.

Procedure

Data collection for the EHSREP included child assessments, mother interviews, and home visits during which videotaped observations of mother–child interactions were obtained. For families participating in the FITS, father interviews and videotaped observations of father–child interactions also were obtained. All components of the FITS, and the EHSREP more broadly, were completed in the family's primary language. Data-collection waves occurred when the child was 14 months, 24 months, 36 months, at pre-K (i.e., the spring prior to kindergarten entry), and in the spring of the child's 6th year of formal schooling (i.e., Grade 5 for most children). This study utilizes demographic data from the 24-month mother and father interviews, publicly available global ratings of maternal and paternal supportiveness from the 24-month mother–child and father–child interactions (e.g., Administration for Children and Families, 2002), our own coding of fathers' control strategies from the 24-month father–child interactions, maternal report of child vocabulary skills at 24 months, and the children's pre-K assessments. The father–child interactions included 10 min of semistructured play and shared book reading. Fathers were given three bags; the first contained a book entitled *The Very Busy Spider* by Eric Carle (1984), and the second two bags contained toys. The contents of all three bags were designed to be age appropriate and stimulate talk and play between parent and child. Data collectors instructed fathers to sit with their child on a mat, ignore the camera, and act as they naturally would while interacting with their children. They were directed to share the contents of the three bags with their child for 10 min; to start with Bag 1, move on to Bag 2, and finish with Bag 3. Fathers were allowed to divide up the 10 min as they liked. These videotapes were subsequently transcribed at the utterance unit level using the CHAT conventions of Child Language Data Exchange System (CHILDES; MacWhinney, 2000). The native language of the transcriber matched the primary language used by fathers throughout the interaction. After transcription, a second individual verified each transcript for accuracy and ran the transcript through an automatic "check". Next, two individuals separately coded the transcripts for fathers' control strategies (described later), and automatic analyses tabulated counts of each type of strategy evidenced in the transcripts. In the spring prior to kindergarten entry ($M = 60.15$, $SD = 2.51$), trained EHSREP data collectors assessed the child for sustained-attention and emotion-regulation skills.

Measures

Fathers' control strategies. A coding scheme was adapted from the work of Livas-Dlott et al. (2010) to assess observationally the various control strategies employed by fathers while interacting with their children. We coded for 12 types of control strategies: negotiation or compromise (e.g., letting the child do something with conditions); modeling (e.g., father demonstrates how to hold the book); physical support (e.g., father holds child's hand, and together they cut the toy pizza); permitting misbehavior (e.g., father does not follow through after a command has been given); physical discipline (e.g., father enforces a command with physical action); praise compliance (e.g., father bestows positive feedback on child for his or her compliance); shame/guilt (e.g., father verbally demeans or puts down a child to curb particular behavior); threat/consequence (e.g., reference to an authority or a negative consequence); commands (e.g., spoken directive); indirect command (e.g., spoken directive without infinitive); prohibitions (e.g., forbidding child); and indirect prohibitions (e.g., forbidding without infinitive). Intercoder reliabilities were established following standard methods. The kappa coefficient was .89. We next computed a ratio that divided the sum of each type of control strategy by the total number of control strategies employed by each father.

Children's pre-K regulatory skills: Emotion regulation and sustained attention. Children completed a series of protocol-defined tasks using the Leiter International Performance Scale, Revised (Roid & Miller, 1997). This scale was developed to assess cross-cultural intellectual function in children with limited verbal abilities and includes two subtests that measure important aspects of children's self-regulation, control of attention, and emotion

regulation. Sustained attention was assessed using a task in which children were asked to find and cross out pictures with a determined target. Higher sustained-attention scores indicated greater numbers of correct answers with fewer errors and reflect focused attention and greater vigilance. Emotion regulation was assessed by trained EHSREP assessors. At the end of the child assessment, these assessors rated children's energy and feelings, mood and regulation, and sensory reactivity. Individual items were rated on a scale of 0 (*rarely/never occurred*; i.e., less than roughly 10% of the time) to 3 (*usually/always occurred*; i.e., more than 90% of the time). These subscales were combined and scaled to form a measure of emotion regulation. Higher emotion-regulation scores indicated greater levels of energy, lack of anxiety, positive emotion, appropriate self-regulation, and indistractability.

Children's vocabulary skills. Children's vocabulary skills were assessed at the 24-month data-collection wave using the productive vocabulary component of the MacArthur Communicative Development Inventory (Fenson et al., 1994, 2000). Mothers were provided with a list of 100 vocabulary words and reported the words that they had heard their child say aloud. A sum score of words was then created to represent the total number of words of 100 in the child's productive vocabulary.

Maternal and paternal supportiveness. Trained teams of EHSREP researchers coded the semistructured mother–child and father–child reading and play interactions for sensitivity (i.e., responsiveness and adjustment to the child's cues), cognitive stimulation (i.e., scaffolding of child's activities and contingent verbal responding to child's engagement attempts), and positive regard (i.e., verbal and physical warmth toward child) on a scale of 1 (*low incidence of behavior*) to 7 (*high incidence of behavior*). All coders were trained to an 85% agreement criterion level (i.e., within 1 point on the scale). This level of reliability was maintained for at least 15% of the videotaped observations (Brady-Smith, O'Brian, Berlin, & Ware, 1999; Love et al., 2005). A composite score of maternal supportiveness and paternal supportiveness was created that averaged the sensitivity, cognitive stimulation, and positive-regard scores.

Demographic variables. Demographic variables included father's biological relationship to the focal child, child's age at the time of the father–child interaction, mothers' and fathers' average years of schooling, child's gender, and the primary home language of the child.

RESULTS

Analytic Plan

All variables had no missing data and were normally distributed. To address our research questions, we first conducted descriptive analyses of the control strategies that fathers used with their 24-month-old children. Next, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis to explore the underlying factor structure of the various control strategies. We then examined bivariate correlations to determine associations between our variables of interest (i.e., demographic variables, children's individual characteristics, maternal and paternal supportiveness, compliance factors, children's emotion regulation, and children's sustained attention). Next, we conducted two sets of multiple regression analyses to determine (a) how fathers' types of control strategies (i.e., regulatory language and regulatory behaviors) predict children's sustained attention and emotion regulation, controlling for maternal supportiveness; and (b) how children's individual characteristics (i.e., gender, vocabulary skills) predict fathers' type of control strategies, controlling for child age.

Fathers' Control Strategies

Our first research question sought to describe the control strategies that fathers used with their 24-month-old children. Approximately 30% of fathers' utterances were classified as verbal compliance strategies. Overwhelmingly, commands accounted for the majority of fathers' control strategies. Direct commands were the most common strategy and accounted for nearly 60% of all control strategies ($M = 45.07$, $SD = 25.67$) while indirect commands accounted for nearly 22% of control strategies ($M = 16.24$, $SD = 10.79$). Next, fathers' prohibitions accounted for just over 6% of control strategies ($M = 4.94$, $SD = 5.35$), fathers' modeling accounted for nearly 4% of control strategies ($M = 2.49$, $SD = 2.19$), fathers' physical support accounted for nearly 3% of control strategies ($M = 2.01$, $SD = 2.72$), and fathers' physical discipline accounted for nearly 2% of control strategies ($M = 1.37$, $SD = 2.13$). The remaining strategies that we coded for (i.e., permitting misbehavior, shame/guilt, threat/consequence and negotiation/compromise) were observed in less than 50% of the father–child interactions. As a result, we did not include these strategies in further analyses.

Factor Analysis

Next, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis using principal axis factoring and varimax rotation to explore the dimensionality of the various types of control strategies. The goal of the analysis was to identify a small number of underlying latent factors representing associations among the control strategies. The overall Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .62, indicating that the factor analysis was appropriate for our data. Examination of the scree plot and eigenvalues greater than 1 suggested that two factors should be retained. These two factors accounted for approximately 37 and 19% of the variance, respectively. To aid in the interpretation of the factor solution, we examined which strategies had high loadings (>.4) on each factor (for loadings of all strategies on each of the two factors, see Table 2). Factor 1 had high loadings for physical discipline, physical support, and modeling. Factor 2 had high loadings for direct commands, indirect commands, and prohibitions. We labeled these factors as *fathers' regulatory behavior* (Factor 1) and *fathers' regulatory language* (Factor 2).

TABLE 2. *Rotated Factor Loadings and Communalities From Exploratory Factor Analysis of Control Strategies (N = 71)*

	Verbal Strategies	Behavioral Strategies	Communality
Direct Directives	.29	.73	.61
Indirect Directives	.12	.48	.24
Prohibitions	.26	.43	.26
Physical Discipline	.63	.16	.43
Physical Support	.64	.01	.41
Modeling	.49	.11	.25
Negotiation/Compromise	−.15	.50	.27

Bivariate Correlations

Bivariate correlations among study variables are presented in Table 3. Bivariate correlations showed that children's vocabulary skills were negatively associated with fathers' regulatory behaviors, $r = -.30$, $p = .021$, and children's gender (female = 1) was negatively associated with fathers' regulatory language, $r = -.29$, $p = .004$. Fathers' regulatory language was positively associated with children's emotion regulation, $r = .36$, $p = .003$, and fathers' regulatory behavior was associated with children's sustained attention, $r = .36$, $p = .003$. Control variables (i.e., child is African American, home language is English, paternal supportiveness, paternal education, maternal education, and father is biological father) were not significantly associated with fathers' regulatory language, regulatory behavior, children's emotion regulation, or sustained attention and thus were not included in the multiple regression analyses. Maternal supportiveness was significantly negatively correlated with children's age whereas paternal supportiveness was positively associated with children's age. Maternal education was positively correlated with English home language and paternal education. As a result, we used maternal supportiveness and children's age as control variables in subsequent analyses.

TABLE 4. *Multiple Regression Model Predicting Children's Emotion Regulation (N = 71)*

	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	*SE*	*β*	*B*	*SE*	*β*
Children's Age	.04	.33	.01	.32	.32	.12
Child Is Female	−.46	1.86	−.03	.82	1.81	.05
Children's Language Skills	.01	.05	.03	.05	.05	.12
Maternal Support	2.28	.88	.31*	1.67	.85	.22
Regulatory Language				3.29	1.18	.36*
Regulatory Behavior				.91	1.09	.10

Note. Model 1: $R^2 = .10$, $F(4, 67) = 1.82$, $p = .135$; Model 2: $R^2 = .23$, $F(6, 65) = 3.29$, $p = .007$.
*$p < .05$.

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Children's Regulatory Skills

To address our main research question, we conducted two stepwise multiple regression analyses to determine if fathers' behavioral and regulatory language predicted (a) children's emotion regulation and (b) children's sustained attention after controlling for maternal supportiveness, children's gender, age, and vocabulary skills. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 4 and 5. Of our control variables, only maternal supportiveness significantly predicted children's emotion regulation, $\beta = .31$, $t(65) = 2.58$, $p = .012$, and this model accounted for nearly 10% of the variance. When we added fathers' regulatory behavior and language to the model, we found that fathers' regulatory language significantly predicted children's emotion regulation, $\beta = .36$, $t(63) = 2.79$, $p = .007$, over and above maternal supportiveness. Overall, the full model accounted for 23% of the variance in children's emotion regulation. In our second regression predicting children's sustained attention, maternal supportiveness was the only control variable that significantly predicted children's sustained attention,

TABLE 3. *Bivariate Intercorrelations*

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.
1. Child Age	1													
2. MacArthur Communicative Development Inventory	.07	1												
3. Female	.09	.12	1											
4. African American	−.33**	−.15	.00	1										
5. English Language	−.08	.13	−.02	.47**	1									
6. Paternal Supportiveness	.28*	.01	.18	−.06	−.10	1								
7. Paternal Education	.06	.06	−.10	−.20	.02	.20	1							
8. Biological Father	−.07	.06	−.08	−.30**	−.21	.11	.06	1						
9. Maternal Supportiveness	−.28*	.21	.23*	.03	.08	−.09	.04	−.07	1					
10. Maternal Education	.07	−.03	−.02	−.15	.30**	.12	.25*	.11	.16	1				
11. Behaviors	−.21	−.30*	.01	.19	−.17	−.15	−.03	−.24*	.08	−.05	1			
12. Language	−.12	−.16	−.29**	.14	−.08	−.21	−.13	−.18	−.20	−.11	.37**	1		
13. Emotion Regulation	.02	.10	−.03	.20	.00	.06	.05	−.01	−.09	−.08	.17	.36**	1	
14. Attention	−.01	.01	−.03	.13	−.15	.13	.13	.01	.02	.14	.36**	.12	.25*	1

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$

TABLE 5. *Multiple Regression Model Predicting Children's Sustained Attention (N = 71)*

	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	*SE*	*β*	*B*	*SE*	*β*
Children's Age	.08	.14	.07	.16	.13	.14
Child Is Female	−.20	.78	−.03	−.34.	.74	−.05
Children's Language Skills	−.01	.02	−.06	.02	.02	.10
Maternal Support	.83	.40	.25*	.92	.37	.28*
Regulatory Language				.03	.48	.01
Regulatory Behavior				1.62	.45	.46*

Note. Model 1: $R^2 = .06$, $F(4, 67) = 1.10$, $p = .364$; Model 2: $R^2 = .24$, $F(6, 65) = 3.39$, $p = .006$.
*$p < .05$.

TABLE 6. *Multiple Regression Model Predicting Fathers' Regulatory Behavior (N = 71)*

	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	*SE*	*β*	*B*	*SE*	*β*
Children's Age	−.06	.03	−2.1	−.06	.03	−.19
Child Is Female				−.07	.19	.73
Children's Vocabulary Skills				−.01	.01	−.29*

Note. Model 1: $R^2 = .04$, $F(1, 70) = 3.53$, $p = .064$; Model 2: $R^2 = .13$, $F(3, 68) = 3.52$, $p = .019$.
*$p < .05$.

$\beta = .25$, $t(65) = 2.04$, $p = .045$, and this control model accounted for just over 6% of the variance. When we added fathers' regulatory behavior and language to the model, we found that fathers' regulatory behavior significantly predicted children's sustained attention, $\beta = .275$, $t(63) = 2.47$, $p = .016$, above maternal supportiveness. Overall, the full model accounted for just over 24% of the variance in children's sustained attention.

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Fathers' Control Strategies

To address our third research question, we conducted two stepwise multiple regression analyses to determine if children's gender and vocabulary skills predicted fathers' use of regulatory behavior and regulatory language, controlling for children's age. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 6 and 7. Children's age did not predict fathers' use of regulatory behaviors, $p > .05$, and accounted for just over 4% of the variance in fathers' regulatory behavior. When we added children's vocabulary skills and gender to the regression model, we found that children with more advanced vocabulary skills had fathers who used fewer regulatory behaviors, $\beta = .29$, $t(3) = -2.61$, $p = .011$. Gender was not significantly associated with fathers' regulatory behavior, $p > .05$. This model accounted for just over 12% of the variance in fathers' regulatory behavior, $p = .019$. Children's age also did not predict fathers' use of verbal compliance strategies, $p > .05$, and accounted for just over 4% of the variance in fathers' regulatory language. When we added children's vocabulary skills and gender to the regression model, we found that male children had fathers who used more regulatory language, $\beta = -.28$, $t(3) = -2.58$, $p = .012$. Children's vocabulary skills were not significantly associated with fathers' use of regulatory language, $p > .05$. This model accounted for nearly 12% of the variance in fathers' regulatory behavior, $p = .028$. Additional post hoc analyses investigating whether gender and vocabulary skills moderated the association between fathers' control strategies and children's regulatory skills were not significant.

TABLE 7. *Multiple Regression Model Predicting Fathers' Regulatory Language (N = 71)*

	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	*SE*	*β*	*B*	*SE*	*β*
Children's Age	−.03	.03	−1.1	−.03	.03	−.09
Child Is Female				−.51	.20	−.28*
Children's Vocabulary Skills				−.01	.01	−.12

Note. Model 1: $R^2 = .01$, $F(1, 70) = 1.06$, $p = .307$; Model 2. $R^2 = .12$, $F(3, 68) = 3.20$, $p = .028$.
*$p < .05$.

DISCUSSION

The primary goal of this study was to explore how father–toddler interactions contribute to children's regulatory skills by examining the associations among children's individual characteristics, fathers' control strategies, and children's emotion-regulation and sustained-attention skills. Overall, we found support for our hypotheses.

The first goal of this study was to describe the control strategies that low-income fathers used with their children. We found that fathers' verbal commands or regulatory language accounted for the considerable majority of all of fathers' control strategies. Fathers also commonly utilized behavioral control strategies such as prohibitions, modeling, physical support, and physical discipline to promote compliance with their children. Strategies such as shaming the child or negotiating with the child were rarely used by the fathers in our sample. These findings are consistent with those of Livas-Dlott et al. (2010), who found that mothers primarily used direct verbal commands to promote compliance with their toddlers. Additional research should be conducted to explore whether mothers and fathers differentially utilize control strategies with their toddlers.

We also examined the conceptual coherence underlying fathers' control strategies and found that fathers' strategies can be conceptualized into two factors: regulatory language (i.e., directives and prohibitions) and regulatory behavior (i.e., modeling, physical support, physical discipline), which contrasts with

the common positive control and negative control classifications in the parenting literature (e.g., Karreman et al., 2006). Our finding suggests that conceptualizing fathers' control strategies into regulatory language and regulatory behaviors might be a better way to link these behaviors to children's outcomes (Ispa et al., 2004; Smetana & Daddis, 2002). Because paternal supportiveness and children's regulatory skills were not significantly correlated, it is possible that control strategies represent a unique construct from paternal supportiveness. Future research should continue to explore how best to conceptualize and measure fathers' control strategies.

Our finding that fathers of boys used more regulatory language than did fathers of girls does not support existing research conducted with international middle-class samples that fathers use higher levels of control (i.e., verbal) with female children than with male children (Chen et al., 2000; Feldman & Klein, 2003). We need further studies that explore how fathers' socialization strategies with their sons and daughters vary across cultural and socioeconomic contexts.

Another noteworthy finding is that fathers used more regulatory behaviors with their children who had less advanced vocabulary skills. It is possible that children with limited vocabulary may not respond readily to regulatory language, and thus fathers may be more inclined to use regulatory behaviors that are easier to understand. This supports previous findings linking children's vocabulary skills to their regulatory skills (Vallotton & Ayoub, 2011) and highlights the fact that both cognitive and socioemotional skills should be considered together to get a complete picture of children's early development. Consistent with a bioecological model of human development, these findings lend additional support to the view that children influence the way that they are parented. Future research should include mutuality coding to account for the reciprocal relationship between parent and child.

Finally, we found that *fathers' regulatory behaviors* predicted children's sustained attention whereas *fathers' regulatory language* predicted children's emotion regulation. These findings were evident while controlling for maternal supportiveness. Note that our findings are consistent with research conducted with middle-class European American samples (e.g., Kochanska, Coy, & Murray, 2001), indicating that the link between fathers and children's regulatory skills in low-income and minority populations may be similar that for to middle-class and European American populations. It was not possible in our study to control for maternal control strategies; thus, we cannot ascertain whether father's control strategies uniquely explain the variance in children's regulatory behaviors. Examining mothers' and fathers' control strategies would be a good direction for future research. Overall, our finding suggest that promoting quality father–child interactions may help low-income children, who are at risk for dysregulation, to develop strong self-regulatory skills. Further research should focus on better understanding the mechanism by which fathers promote their children's regulatory skills and *both* mothers and fathers to understand unique, additive, and multiplicative impacts on children's regulatory skills.

Also note that fathers' regulatory language and behaviors were each associated with a unique dimension of children's regulatory skills. While this differential association was not originally hypothesized, it corresponds with existing theoretical models of the development of emotion regulation and sustained attention. On one hand, using regulatory language (e.g., commands, prohibitions) may teach children to use language to regulate their own emotions (Cole, Armstrong, & Pemberton, 2010). On the other hand, using behaviors (e.g., modeling, physical support) may help children to redirect their attention from what they are doing to what their fathers want them to do, encouraging joint and sustained attention. Future research should consider using an event-based coding scheme to investigate if parents' use of regulatory behaviors co-occurs with children's attention. In addition, research should test these differential pathways to children's sustained attention and emotion regulation with mothers.

A few limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings of this study. First, this study focused on a small convenience sample of low-income, minority fathers and their children, and thus its generalizability is limited. Second, although we controlled for maternal supportiveness, we did not control for mothers' compliance strategies, which would have allowed us to parse out the effects of maternal compliance strategies on children's regulatory behaviors.

Despite these limitations, this study offers important insights into how low-income, minority fathers contribute to their children's regulatory skills. As with middle-class fathers, low-income fathers' use of regulatory and verbal language is important to help children learn to sustain attention, critical for task completion and learning, and regulate their emotions. This is particularly important for low-income children who may have difficulty regulating their behaviors (Blair & Diamond, 2008; Evans & Fuller-Rowell, 2013). Our findings also demonstrate the importance of separately examining maternal and paternal contributions to better understand the unique contributions of each parent to children's regulatory behaviors. Last, these findings suggest that father–child interactions may be an important point of intervention to promote children's regulatory skills among low-income, minority families.

REFERENCES

Administration for Children and Families. (2002). Making a difference in the lives of infants and toddlers and their families: The impacts of Early Head Start. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Bindman, S.W., Hindman, A.H., Bowles, R.P., & Morrison, F.J. (2013). The contributions of parental management language to self-regulation in preschool children. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 28(3), 529–539.

Blair, C. (2002). School readiness: Integrating cognition and emotion in a neurobiological conceptualization of child functioning at school entry. American Psychologist, 57(2), 111–127.

Blair, C. (2006). How similar are fluid cognition and general intelligence? A developmental neuroscience perspective on fluid cognition as an

aspect of human cognitive ability. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 29(2), 109–125.

Blair, C. (2010). Stress and the development of self-regulation in context. Child Development Perspectives, 4(3), 181–188.

Blair, C., & Diamond, A. (2008). Biological processes in prevention and intervention: The promotion of self-regulation as a means of preventing school failure. Development and Psychopathology, 20(3), 899–911.

Blair, C., & Ursache, A. (2011). A bidirectional model of executive functions and self-regulation. In K.D. Vohs & R.F. Baumeister (Eds.), Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications (2nd ed., pp. 300–320). New York: Guilford Press.

Blair, C., Raver, C.C., Granger, D., Mills-Koonce, R., Hibel, L., & The Family Life Project Investigators. (2011). Allostasis and allostatic load in the context of poverty in early childhood. Development and Psychopathology, 23(3), 845–857.

Boller, K., Bradley, R., Cabrera, N., Raikes, H., Pan, B., Shears, J., & Roggman, L. (2006). The Early Head Start father studies: Design, data collection, and summary of father presence in the lives of infants and toddlers. Parenting, 6(2–3), 117–143.

Brady-Smith, C., O-Brien, C., Berlin, L., & Ware, A. (1999). 24-Month Child–Parent Interaction Rating Scales for the Three-Bag Assessment. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P.A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In W. Damon & R.M. Lerner (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology, Vol. 1: Theoretical models of human development (6th ed., pp. 793–828). New York: Wiley.

Buckner, J.C., Mezzacappa, E., & Beardslee, W.R. (2003). Characteristics of resilient youths living in poverty: The role of self-regulatory processes. Developmental Psychopathology, 15(1), 139–162.

Cabrera, N.J., Moore, K., Bronte-TinkewWest, J., Halle, T., West, J., Brooks-Gunn, J. et al. (2004). The DADS Initiative: Measuring father involvement in large scale surveys. In R. Day (Ed.), Measuring father involvement (pp. 417–452). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cabrera, N., Shannon, J., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. (2007). Fathers' influence on their children's cognitive and emotional development: From toddlers to pre-K. Applied Developmental Science, 11(4), 208–213.

Calkins, S., & Fox, N. (2002). Self-regulatory processes in early personality development: A multilevel approach to the study of childhood social withdrawal and aggression. Development and Psychopathology, 14, 477–498.

Calkins, S.D., & Howse, R.B. (2004). Individual differences in self-regulation: Implications for childhood adjustment. In P. Philipport & R.S. Feldman (Eds.), The regulation of emotion (pp. 307–332). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Carle, E. (1984). The very busy spider. New York: Philomel Books.

Chen, X., Liu, M., & Li, D. (2000). Parental warmth, control and indulgence and their relations to adjustment in Chinese children: A longitudinal study. Journal of Family Psychology, 14(3), 401–419.

Cole, P.M., Armstrong, L.M., & Pemberton, C.K. (2010). The role of language in the development of emotion regulation. In S. Calkins & M. Bell (Eds.), Child development at the intersection of emotion and cognition: Human brain development (pp. 59–77). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Diamond, A., Barnett, W.S., Thomas, J., & Munro, S. (2007). Preschool program improves cognitive control. Science, 318(5855), 1387–1388.

Duncan, G.J., Dowsett, C.J., Claessens, A., Magnuson, K., Huston, A.C., Klebanov, P. et al. (2007). School readiness and later achievement. Developmental Psychology, 43, 1428–1446.

Evans, G., & Rosenbaum, J. (2008). Self-regulation and the income-achievement gap. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 23(4), 504–514.

Evans, G.W., & English, K. (2002). The environment of poverty: Multiple stressor exposure, psychophysiological stress, and socioemotional adjustment. Child Development, 73(4), 1238–1248.

Evans, G.W., & Fuller-Rowell, T.E. (2013). Childhood poverty, chronic stress, and young adult working memory: The protective role of self-regulatory capacity. Developmental Science, 16(5), 688–696.

Feldman, R., & Klein, P.S. (2003). Toddlers' self-regulated compliance to mothers, caregivers, and fathers: Implications for theories of socialization. Developmental Psychology, 39(4), 680–692.

Fenson, L., Dale, P.A., Reznick, J.S., Bates, E., Thal, D., & Pethick, S.J. (1994). Variability in early communicative development. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 59(5), 1–173, discussion 174–185.

Fenson, L., Pethick, S., Renda, C., Cox, J.L., Dale, P.S., & Reznick, J.S. (2000). Short form versions of the MacArthur Communicative Development Inventories. Applied Psycholinguistics, 21, 95–115.

Flanders, J.L., Leo, V., Paquette, D., Pihl, R.O., & Séguin, J.R. (2009). Rough-and-tumble play and the regulation of aggression: An observational study of father-child play dyads. Aggressive Behavior, 35(4), 285–295.

Flanders, J.L., Simard, M., Paquette, D., Parent, S., Vitaro, F., Pihl, R.O., & Séguin, J.R. (2010). Rough-and-tumble play and the development of physical aggression and emotion regulation: A five-year follow-up study. Journal of Family Violence, 25(4), 357–367.

Gershoff, E.T. (2003). Low income and hardship among America's kindergartners (Living at the Edge Research Brief No. 3). New York: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health.

Howse, R.B., Calkins, S.D., Anastopoulos, A.D., Keane, S.P., & Shelton, T.L. (2003). Regulatory contributors to children's kindergarden achievement. Early Education and Development, 14(1), 101–119.

Hughes, C., & Ensor, R. (2007). Executive function and theory of mind: Predictive relations from ages 2 to 4. Developmental Psychology, 43(6), 1447–1459.

Ispa, J., Fine, M.A., Halgunseth, L.C., Harper, S., Robinson, J., Boyce, L. et al. (2004). Maternal intrusiveness, maternal warmth, and mother–toddler relationship outcomes: Variations across low-income ethnic and acculturation groups. Child Development, 75(2), 1613–1631.

Karreman, A., van Tuijl, C., van Aken, M.A., & Dekovic, M. (2006). Parenting and self-regulation in preschoolers: A meta-analysis. Infant and Child Development, 15, 562–579.

Kochanska, G., & Aksan, N. (1995). Mother-child mutually positive affect, the quality of child compliance to requests, prohibitions, and maternal control as correlates of early internalization. Child Development, 66, 236–254.

Kochanska, G., & Aksan, N. (2006). Children's conscience and self-regulation. Journal of Personality, 74(6), 1587–1617.

Kochanska, G., Aksan, N., Prisco, T.R., & Adams, E.E. (2008). Mother–child and father–child mutually responsive orientation in the first two years and children's outcomes at preschool age: Mechanisms of influence. Child Development, 79(1), 30–44.

Kochanska, G., Coy, K.C., & Murray, K.T. (2001). The development of self-regulation in the first four years of life. Child Development, 72(4), 1091–1111.

Kopp, C.B. (1982). Antecedents of self regulation: A developmental perspective. Developmental Psychology, 18(2), 199–214.

Lamb, M.E., & Lewis, C. (2010). The development and significance of father–child relationships in two parent families. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The role of the father in child development (5th ed., pp. 94–153). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Li-Grining, C.P. (2007). Effortful control among low-income preschoolers in three cities: Stability, change, and individual differences. Developmental Psychology, 43(1), 208–221.

Livas-Dlott, A., Fuller, B., Stein, G.L., Bridges, M., Mangual Figueroa, A., & Mireles, L. (2010). Commands, competence, and cariño: Maternal socialization practices in Mexican American families. Developmental Psychology, 46(3), 566–578.

Love, J., Kisker, E.E., Ross, C., Raikes, H., Constantine, J., Boller, K. et al. (2005). The effectiveness of Early Head Start for 3-year-old children and their parents: Lessons for policy and programs. Developmental Psychology, 41(6), 885–901.

MacWhinney, B. (2000). The CHILDES project: Tools for analyzing talk. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Martin, A., Ryan, R.M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2010). When fathers' supportiveness matters most: Maternal and paternal parenting and children's school readiness. Journal of Family Psychology, 24(2), 145–155.

Owen, M.T., Caughy, M.O.B., Hurst, J.R., Amos, M., Hasanizadeh, N., & Mata-Otero, A.M. (2013). Unique contributions of fathering to emerging self-regulation in low-income ethnic minority preschoolers Early Child Development and Care, 183(3–4), 464–482.

Paquette, D. (2004). Theorizing the father-child relationship: Mechanisms and developmental outcomes. Human Development, 47(1), 193–219.

Peterson, J.B., & Flanders, J.L. (2005). Play and the regulation of aggression. In R.E. Tremblay, W.H. Hartup, & J. Archer (Eds.), Developmental origins of aggression (pp. 133–157). New York: Guilford Press.

Raikes, H., Robinson, J., Bradley, R., Raikes, H., & Ayoub, C. (2007). Developmental trends in self-regulation among low-income toddlers. Social Development, 16(1), 128–149.

Roid, G.H., & Miller, L.J. (1997). Leiter International Performance Scale–Revised: Examiner's manual. In G.H. Roid & L.J. Miller (Eds.), Leiter International Performance Scale–Revised. Wood Dale, IL: Stoelting.

Peterson, J., & Flanders, J. (2005). Play and the regulation of aggression. In R. Tremblay, W. Hartup, & J. Archer (Eds.), Developmental origins of aggression (pp. 133–157). New York: Guilford Press.

Sethi, A., Mischel, W., Aber, J.L., Shoda, Y., & Rodriguez, M.L. (2000). The role of strategic attention deployment in development of self-regulation: Predicting preschoolers' delay of gratification from mother–toddler interactions. Developmental Psychology, 36(6), 767–777.

Shonkoff, J., & Phillips, D. (Eds.). (2000). From neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood development. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Smetana, J.G., & Daddis, C. (2002). Domain-specific antecedents of psychological control and parental monitoring: The role of parenting beliefs and practices. Child Development, 73(2), 563–580.

Stansbury, K., & Zimmermann, L.K. (1999). Relations among language skills, maternal socialization of emotion regulation, and child behavior problems. Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 30(2), 121–142.

Stevenson, M., & Crnic, K. (2013). Intrusive fathering, children's self-regulation and social skills: A mediation analysis. Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 57(6), 500–512.

Tamis-LeMonda, C., Shannon, J., Cabrera, N., & Lamb, M. (2004). Fathers' and mothers' play with their 2- and 3-year-olds: Contributions to language and cognitive development. Child Development, 75(6), 1806–1820.

Tamis-LeMonda, C.S., Briggs, R.D., McClowry, S.G., & Snow, D. (2009). Maternal control and sensitivity, child gender and maternal education in relation to children's behavioral outcomes in African American families. Applied Developmental Psychology, 30(3), 321–331.

Vallotton, C.D., & Ayoub, C.A. (2011). Use your words: The role of language in the development of toddlers' self-regulation. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 26(2), 169–181.

Vogel, C.A., Bradley, R.H., Raikes, H.H., Boliler, K., & Shears, J.K. (2006). Relation between father connectedness and child outcomes. Parenting: Science and Practice, 6(2–3), 189–209.

Weinberg, M.K., Tronick, E.Z., Cohn, J.F., & Olson, K.L. (1999). Gender differences in emotional expressivity and self-regulation during early infancy. Developmental Psychology, 35(1), 175–188.