Original Research

Paternal Involvement in Child- Rearing Activities: The Perspective of Adolescents in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Belay Tefera[*]

School of Psychology, Addis Ababa University, P.O. Box: 33617, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Abstract	Article Information
In recognition of the need to widen the scope of fatherhood scholarship, this article centered on examining paternal involvement but in a socio- cultural context and developmental stage that has headed little attention in previous research. An attempt was made to investigate the nature of paternal involvement (ways, desires and roles) among adolescent students in Addis Ababa. Rating- type (N= 554) and forced- choice (N= 360) questionnaires were administered to secondary school (grades 9-12) students (ages 14-19 years). Results generally indicated that paternal involvement was multidimensional in the sense that adolescents considered direct and indirect ways, acting and capacity building roles and caring and masculine-oriented desires of fathers' involvement with children. Significant differences and relationships were also documented between the two components of ways, roles, and desires. In fact, interactions between ways and roles, ways and desires, and roles and desires were all significant. Results were interpreted and implications were drawn against a backdrop of the respondents' developmental and socio- cultural backgrounds.	

INTRODUCTION

Paternal involvement has been a point of research as of 1950s (Bowlby, 1951; English, 1954; Parsons and Bales, 1955) through 1960s and 1970s (Kotelchuck, 1976; Nash, 1965; Pederson, 1976) to the present (Lewin-Bizan, 2012; Natasha, 2013; Pleck, 2007). While professionals used to exemplify fathers as emotionally distant secondary parents in the 1950s, a changed role of fathers was shown in the 1960s and 1970s. Instead of distant breadwinners, some men were now viewed as intimately involved in family life. This change was so substantial in the 1980s and 1990s that some family researchers had even earmarked an advent of a "new fatherhood ideal" (Furstenberg, 1988) that gradually became a common cultural practice in the west (Lewin-Bizan, 2012; Natasha, 2013). This "new fatherhood ideal" is characterized by those nurturing fathers who emotionally attune to their children (Coltrane, 1989; Pruett, 1987) effectively (Furstenberg, 1988; Lewin-Bizan, 2012; Natasha, 2013). In the words of Furstenberg (1988), "Today's father is…. as adept at changing diapers as changing tires". However, a bird's-eye- view of the burgeoning literature in the area suggests, first and foremost, that there is an exclusive reliance of previous research on experiences of "actual" parents with a paucity of interest in the "would-be" (or adolescents). Becoming a father, on the other hand, appears to be a lengthy and complex process of development and maturation that begins long before child bearing and actual parenting (Dimond, 1992).

Furthermore, previous research has made little efforts, if any, to explore paternal involvement in the context of collectivist oriented "developing" societies (Hofstede,

1980; Hui, 1988) having interdependence, collective survival, cooperation (White and Parham, 1990), and care (Ward, 1995) among community members. Such caring oriented African tradition (Ward, 1995) is deeply rooted in the value system of many African nations (White and Parham, 1990) of which Ethiopia is a case in point (Kortan, 1972; Habtamu, 1994).

The ethic of care may be ingrained in the cultural values of the Ethiopian society, but the specific types and ways of paternal care can't fall beyond the exigencies of the prevailing gender roles, expectations, attitudes and social positions of men and women in the country. Evidences indicate in this regard that, despite a number of encouraging developments in addressing gender-related concerns in Ethiopia, problems still persist in more recent days: traditional male and female power relationship (CSA and ICF International, 2012) even among university students (Tesfaye, 2006) reflecting men's domination over women in society; violence against girls in primary (Save the Children Denmark, 2008), secondary (2012; Emebet, 2003), and higher (Retta, 2003) education centers; gender bias in teaching materials and textbooks (Mulualem, 1998; JRM, 2006); serious underrepresentation of girls in higher education (MoE, 2013); lower participation of girls (Kassa 2006) even in the primary (Teshome, 2002) and secondary (Ager, 2002; Alemayehu, 2003) schools in some of the emerging regions and among pastoralist and semi- pastoralist groups (MoE, 2013; ESDP IV, 2011; MoE, 2013); gender disparity in academic performance (Nigatu, 2008) and also field of studies (Asresash, 2006; ESDP IV, 2011); feminization of teaching faculty at KG

Belay Tefera

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., Oct-Dec 2014, 3(4): 164-171

while progressive under representation of female teaching faculty from primary to higher education (Education abstract) and male teachers being more educated and qualified than female teachers (MoE, 2013); and women being under-represented in educational leadership and management positions at all levels (JMR, 2006; ESDP IV, 2011). According to the situation analysis conducted by MoE (ESDP IV, 2011), it was generally found that women's participation in education is still constrained by economic, socio-cultural, personal and school factors. The traditional division of labor at home constrains girls' success in education.

Rather more serious concern of previous research is lack of sensitivity to the multifaceted nature of paternal involvement (i.e., goals, ways and tasks) perpetuating in the final analysis the essentialist position of sex role polarization. In fact, some other researchers have attempted to view paternal involvement as a multidimensional construct with three dimensions of father involvement: 'accessibility', 'responsibility' and 'engagement' (Lamb cited in Keun, 2008; Lamb *et al.* in Natasha, 2013; Pleck, 2007). This concept of multi-dimensionality is, however, implicitly non-multidimensional. Firstly, because the three dimensions take a developmental overtone, it is expected that at a certain point in time a father is likely to fall under one of the three categories. Secondly, the dimensions are patterned in one direction in the sense that paternal involvement is viewed in terms of the level of direct father-child relationship established to nurture for children (e.g. Furstenberg, 1988; Lamb et al, 1987; Pleck, 2007). To the extent that fathers commit themselves to such a relationship, they are considered involved and caring; to the extent that they are not, they are considered detached, inaccessible, and less responsible to their children. Such approaches can undeniable help understanding how fathers are growing along the desirable direction. However, it does not depict the nature of paternal involvement in a wider sense, as it is known in many cultures today… what about other possible ways fathers can be involved? Other kinds of tasks fathers can accomplish in rearing up children? Other kinds of roles father assume while interacting with children? There are, for instance, some evidences suggesting (1) that caring does not necessarily require direct involvement (Kyte, 1996), (2) that the "new fatherhood ideals" still reflect a form of "reconstructed hegemonic masculinity" (Segal, 1993) implying, among other things, that direct paternal involvement can be used for reasons other than caring (e.g. for promoting masculine desires), (3) that fathers are psychologically present despite their frequent absence at home (Ishii- Kuntz, 1993; Catherine, 2000; Denise, 2007), (4) that fathers do have their own distinct ways of caring and the quality of father- child relationship should not be evaluated using mother- child interaction as a template (Day and Mackey, 1986), and (5) that such distinct ways of caring may involve fathers' development of indirect commitments to their children that are contingent upon the father- mother relationship (Furstenberg, 1991).

In the light of the above arguments, there is, therefore, a need for investigating the Ethiopian adolescents' views of paternal involvement in a rather wider context raising the following questions:
- Do Ethiopian adolescents view direct, indirect or both ways of paternal involvement with children? Direct involvement implying father's personal (face-to-face) engagement with children and indirect involvement implying a relationship which fathers maintain with children through the mother
- Are fathers perceived to engage in caring (e.g. nurturance, independence training) or masculinity (e.g. gender socialization, disciplining)?
- Are fathers rated to be actors (i.e., practice caring, act out their sense of masculinity…) or capacity builders (e.g. empower children to care for their own needs, develop in them a sense of independence and gender- appropriate behaviors…)?
- How do ways, motives and roles interact one another: Are there differences in the perceived ways of paternal involvement for caring and masculine oriented tasks? Are fathers perceived as an actor or a capacity builder when directly and indirectly involved? Are fathers viewed to display the role of an actor or capacity builder with respect to caring and masculine oriented tasks?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants: Cognizant of the importance of exploring the previous issues against a background that offers (1) a fair representation of the major values ingrained in cultures across the country, and (2) a variety of role models for fatherhood identity development, this research was conducted in Addis Ababa. Addis Ababa appears a meeting ground if not "melting-pot" of diversities. One can find in Addis Ababa quite a spectrum of basic values that still run across the various nationalities (Kortan, 1972; Habtamu, 1994). Accordingly, the first group of subjects (those who filled in the rating- type questionnaire) consisted of 554 randomly selected unwed adolescents from three secondary schools in Addis Ababa (grades 9-12) with ages 14 to 19 years (mean= 16.4). About 55% were boys and 44% were girls. Another group of students (N= 360) were selected from three other secondary schools to fill in the forced- choice questionnaire.

Rating-type Questionnaire: consisted of tasks in one column and criteria of responding in another. Tasks were assembled defining parent- child interaction in a perspective that is a bit different from the previous ones. Previous approaches focused on parents' behaviors and child outcomes: e.g. Warmth- hostility and permissiveness- restrictiveness (Becker, 1964), parental styles of disciplinary practices (Baumrind, 1973) and parent responsiveness- demandingness (Maccoby and Martin, 1983). Such classification schemes fail to involve the basic issues undergirding construction of the instruments of the present research: Gender-structured paternal motives and activities in child rearing. Because gender is a primary axes around which inter- personal communication is organized, it is assumed that fathers' involvement takes "instrumental" and "expressive" gender orientations (Parsons, 1955) respectively referring to those masculine (*i.e. decision making, leadership, competitiveness…*) and caring-oriented feminine (*kindness, concern for inter-personal harmony and orientations toward caring for others*) gender roles and motives which are integrated in individuals as bipolar opposites (Bem, 1977). Furthermore, it is assumed that in the course of involvement with children, fathers are to act out the instrumental- expressive orientations (i.e. *the role of an actor*) or/and empower children to act out these orientations (i.e. *the role of a capacity builder*). Fathers' involvement as an actor focuses on immediate needs and

Belay Tefera

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., Oct-Dec 2014, 3(4): 164-171

their involvement as a capacity builder focuses on remote/future needs of children.

Combining motives (masculinity and caring) and roles (acting and capacity building), paternal tasks in child rearing are generally classified, for the present purpose, into four domains:

1. Caring- Acting (i.e., Nurturance): Caring for children's immediate needs- e.g. bathing, feeding, changing diapers, comforting, relaxing, cuddling…
2. Caring- Capacity building (i.e. Independence training): Caring for less immediate needs to enable children develops self- care skills, social skills, intellectual abilities…
3. Masculinity- Acting (i.e. Disciplining): fathers act out their own masculine desires on children- control, punish, and warn them on wrong deeds or undesirable behaviors; command, order and make them observe parental wills; assist them under extreme problem conditions; show a sense of seriousness and strictness…
4. Masculinity- capacity building (i.e., Masculine- gender socialization): encourage acts, teach skills, and develop interests about bravery, strength, power, success, wining…

Some early findings lend direct and indirect support to the existence of each of these new domains in father-child interaction, thus partly validating the classification:

1. Nurturance: "Doing things" like feeding and bathing the children is consistent with most men's external orientation to the world; showing care by doing things for others is a traditional male value (Levant, 1991). [See also literature on the "new fatherhood ideal", e.g. Furstenberg, 1988; Pleack, 1983].
2. Independence training: Father absent boy's score lower in school achievement tests, and are deficient in general intelligence (Shinn, 1978).
3. Gender Socialization: Fathers play a uniquely important role in the sex- typing process (Johnson, 1977). Boys from father- absent homes engage in more feminine play and develop feminine interest patterns, are less aggressive, more dependent, and engage in fewer contact sports (Burten, 1972). It needs to be stressed here that because boys seem more affected by father absence than girls (e.g. Biller, 1981), Paternal tasks or activities sampled from these domains were framed in terms of masculine gender socialization of boys.
4. Disciplining: Masculine boys have fathers who are, among others, powerful, dominant over their wives in making family decisions and control rewards and punishments available to the boys (Hetherington, 1967).

It is assumed that fathers do participate in all the four domains rather simultaneously in different ways and at different capacities. Five items were taken from each of the four domains and hence a total of 20 items (activities) were included in the rating- type questionnaire. Each activity was rated on a five point scale (5= very high…. 1= very low) vis-à-vis how much should fathers 'accomplish it themselves' (i.e., direct paternal involvement with children) and 'make mothers accomplish the task' (i.e. indirect paternal involvement)?

A large pool of items were originally set up, subjected to experts' judgment, tried out in the field with small groups, and then better items were selected for inclusion in the final version. There are a total of four direct and another four indirect involvement scales. The reliability indices of the pilot-test ranged from a Chronbach alpha of 0.5600 to 0.7800.

Forced-choice Questionnaire: The second questionnaire consisted of forced- choice items constructed from same content areas the rating- type items were constructed. It has four sections. While each of the first three parts deal with each of the three aspects of paternal involvement, the last part considers the combination of all the three aspects. Moreover, while pairs in the first three parts are composed of concrete or specific activities per se, the last part is composed of rather general/ domain- based pairs. Below is a description of these parts of the questionnaire.

Par I (specific ways of involvement) presents 15 specific pairs of direct versus indirect ways of paternal activities with children; 5 pairs being considered in each of the following three areas:
1. Nurturing infants directly versus indirectly (nurturance I).
2. Nurturing (caring) grownup children directly versus indirectly (nurturance II).
3. Disciplining and masculine gender socialization directly versus indirectly.

Respondents are to select the component of a pair, which they think fathers should accomplish.

Part II (specific desires) has 10 specific pairs of caring versus masculine desires of parental involvement: 5 pairs on acting caring versus masculinity, and another 5 on independence training versus gender socialization. Respondents are to compare the components of each pair and select the one which they think fathers should accomplish. Part III (specific- roles) consists of 10 specific pairs of roles (acting versus capacity building) of which one component of a pair has to be considered as an answer. There are five pairs on acting versus independence training for caring and another five on acting masculinity (disciplining) versus building masculinity (i.e. masculine gender socialization). Part IV begins with a description of the four domains of tasks (plus one more derived from splitting nurturance into two: caring for kids and caring for grownup children) in terms of the specific activities involved. After having understood the descriptions, respondents are then to proceed on to the questions that immediately follow. The five domains are now presented in pairs (a total of 5x2=10 pairs) so that respondents can select the one which they believe (1) fathers should accomplish, and (2) fathers should make mothers accomplish.

RESULTS

In an attempt to determine adolescents' views regarding direct and indirect paternal involvement for caring and promoting masculinity through acting and empowering others, percentages (of ratings) and means were calculated. Because the rating was made on a five point scale (5= very high….1= very low) with respect to five items in each domain; the maximum, the minimum, and the average possible (or expected) scores an individual can earn in each sub- scale are respectively 5x5 (25), 5x1(=5), and 5x3 (=15).

Table 1: Descriptive statistical values (N=554)

Description	Variable	Percentage of cases with scores lying:				Min	Max.	Mean	SD
		15-14 (low- very low)	15-19 (average)	20-25 (high- very high)	< 15 in both variables				
Caring- Acting	Nurturance-Direct	8.2	38.4	53.4	2.27	5	25	19.3	3.7
	Nurturance-Indirect	8.0	28.4	63.9		5	25	20.0	3.7
Caring- Capacity building	Independence Training- Direct	6.8	23.4	61.5	3.41	7	25	20.7	3.8
	Independence Training- Indirect	6.5	27.6	67.0		5	25	20.2	4.0
Masculinity- Capacity building	Gender socialization- Direct	7.4	30.4	63.1	2.56	5	25	20.3	3.7
	Gender socialization- Indirect	9.9	35.6	56.2		5	25	19.4	4.1
Masculinity- Acting	Disciplining- Direct	15.9	43.2	41.8	9.09	5	25	17.9	4.1
	Disciplining- Indirect	13.6	43.2	43.2		5	25	17.8	4.4

Table 1 depicts the proportion of cases at different score intervals along with the means and standard deviations. It can be noted on this table that almost more than 85% of the respondents are with scores as high as 15 (expected average) to 25 (maximum possible score) on each of the sub- scales. Of this proportion, more than 53% are even with the scores lying over 19 (high to very high) in the first six sub– scales. As a result, the mean average rating scores are seen lying over 19. The means are in fact a little lower in the last two sub- scales, for it is nearly 42% that have scores over 19.

On the other hand, the proportion of cases with score 14 or less on both direct and indirect involvement of each domain is as small as 3.5% or even lower in some cases; although, as in the previous case, it is a little different in disciplining. This may implicate that fathers are viewed to be preferably involved both directly and indirectly in masculine and caring oriented tasks both as an actor and a capacity builder. Is this perhaps because that the two components of ways, roles and desires are just different sides of the same coin? The inter-correlation matrix on Table 2 in fact depicts that the correlation between ways, roles, and desires are all significant and positive. This is a little wonder because adolescents are unlikely to view fathers engaging in a disjointed patch of tasks. However, the fact that the two components of each of the three factors are correlated does not necessarily imply that they have comparable means in the level of paternal engagement with respect to ways, desires and roles.

A repeated or with-in subjects ANOVA was conducted to determine these differences (see Table 3). The test showed that there are in general significant differences between ways of involvement ($F_{1, 554}$= 4.54, $P<0.034$), roles ($F_{1, 554}$=145.75, $P<0.000$), and desires ($F_{1, 554}$=88.48, $P<0 .000$). See also the specific matched t-tests on Table 2.

Mean responses to the forced- choice questionnaire summarized on Table 4 do not only corroborate but also help to specify the direction of the findings above: that fathers should involve more directly (mean =11.25) than indirectly (mean = 3.72) (see part I = 15 items), as a capacity builder (mean=6.32) than an actor (mean = 3.68) (see part II = 10 items) and for caring (mean= 6.46) than promoting masculinity (mean = 3.68) (see part III = 10 items). Note that the sum of the component means of each part equals the number of its items.

Keeping in view the means displayed on Table 1 and the specific paired t- tests on Table 2, the above interaction effects can be interpreted as below.

Fathers should involve both directly and indirectly but more as a capacity builder than an actor. Although fathers were rated to preferably engage slightly more directly than indirectly as a capacity builder, the two ways of involvement are comparable with respect to the role of an actor. Responses from the forced- choice questionnaire (Table 4), on the other hand, partly support and partly qualify the "equality" status of the two ways of involvement. In a situation where one has to contend with "either this-or-that" phenomena, fathers were preferred to engage as capacity builders than actors in direct involvement. They were, however, assigned to a role of an actor in indirect involvement.

Table 2: Paired t- test of means (Left) and correlations (right)

Variables	Code	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	V6	V7	V8	
Nurturance- Direct	V1	//	0.4210	0.4800	0.3744	0.2503	0.2364	0.1032	0.1225	
Nurturance- Indirect	V2	-3.9	//	0.3880	0.5787	0.3215	0.3466	0.2123	0.2902	Correlations
Independence Training- Direct	V3	-8.8	-4.33	//	0.5151	0.5400	0.3595	0.1675	0.0948	
Independence Training- Indirect	V4	-4.8	-1.47	3.32	//	0.3965	0.5255	0.1755**	0.3129	
Gender socialization-Direct	V5	-4.9	-1.52	3.18*	-.32	//	-0.5420	0.3523	0.1898	
Gender socialization-Indirect	V6	-.19	3.24	7.23	4.98	5.61	//	0.2371	0.4535	
Disciplining-Direct	V7	6.4	9.95	13.10	10.39	12.46	5.23	//	0.6486	
Disciplining-Indirect	V8	6.7	10.53	12.50	11.35	11.11	5.63	5.63	//	
							Paired t- tests	* $P<.002$, ** $P<.000$		

Table 3: Repeated measures ANOVA (Ways by desires by roles)

Sources of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Means squares	F	Sig. F
Residual	6728.66	554	12.15	4.54	0.034
Ways	55.15	1	55.15		
Residual	7983.57	554	14.4	145.78	0.000
Roles	2100.85	1	2100.85		
Residual	10430.68	554	18.83	88.48	0.000
Desires	1665.94	1	1665.94		
Residual	2825.73	554	5.10	53.29	0.000
Ways by roles	271.83	1	271.83		
Residual	3925.05	554	7.08	11.60	0.001
Ways by desires	82.21	1	82.21		
Residual	5241.70	554	9.46	38.17	0.000
Roles by desires	361.11	1	361.11		
Residual	2391.71	554	4.32	2.85	0.092
Ways by roles by desires	12.32	2	12.32		

Table 4: Mean and standard deviation of responses to the forced- choice questionnaire (part I, II and III) (N=360)

Parts or components	Sub- part or sub components		Number of items	Mean		Standard deviation
				Direct involvement	Indirect involvement	
Part I: Specific-ways of involvement	1	Nurturance I	5	3.312	1.688	1.465
	2	Nurturance II	5	3.983	1.017	1.273
	Total	Nurturance I	10	7.295	2.705	2.382
	3	Masculinity	5	3.980	1.050	1.261
		Overall total	15	11.275	3.755	3.233
Part II: Specific- desires	Desires		10	Caring = 6.460 Masculinity = 3.540		2.117
Part III: Specific- roles	Roles		10	Acting = 3.689 Capacity building = 6.310		2.084

Interactions are definitely significant (see Table 3): ways by roles ($F_{1, 554}$ = 53.29, $P<0.000$), ways by desires ($F_{1, 554}$ =11.60, $P<0.000$), and roles by desires ($F_{1, 554}$ = 38.17, $P<0.000$); not of course ways by roles by desires ($F_{1, 554}$ =2.85, $P<0.092$).

Table 5: Percentage of cases selecting each pair of domain in a pair presentation of domains (part IV)

Pairs			Ratio of responses in percent*	
			Direct involvement	Indirect involvement
First- half	Second half	Pair code	Which one should fathers accomplish?	Which one should fathers accomplish?
Nurturance I (Caring for infants) with:	Nurturance II	A	45%: 53%	81%: 10%
	Independence Training	b	23%: 76%	76%: 16%
	Gender socialization	c	38%: 61%	78%: 16%
	Disciplining	d	36%: 60%	75%: 14%
Nurturance II (Caring for grown up children) with:	Independence Training	E	18%: 80%	57%: 30%
	Gender socialization	f	19%: 81%	76%: 28%
	Disciplining	g	44%: 53%	71%: 18%
Independence Training with:	Gender socialization	H	29%:71%	79%: 12%
	Disciplining	I	29%: 71%	64%: 24%
Gender social with:	Disciplining	J	53%:46%	35%: 78%
Total remark	Role wise: Actor to capacity builder (b, c, e, f, I, j)		In each of the pairs, fathers are preferred to be involved as capacity builders	But fathers are preferred to assume the actor role
	Goal wise: Caring to masculinity (c, d, f, g, h, i)		In each pair masculinity pairs are selected	Caring pairs are selected
The two percentage ratios in each column sum up 100% when there are no missing responses				

With respect to ways by desires, paternal involvement was shown to be both direct and indirect for caring than masculinity. In fact masculinity was sought to be pursued a little more directly than indirectly. When "masculinity-caring" pairs were presented as forced- choices (see Table 5), far more respondents, however, assigned masculine than caring oriented pairs of domains to direct involvement. With respect to indirect involvement, the proportion is more for caring rather than masculine oriented pairs. Despite the slight contradictory finding here, this is evidenced in the two questionnaires: that both masculinity and caring can be pursued through direct involvement. In fact little faith is put on the forced-choice questionnaire not only because it is not pilot- tested but also that the pairs, particularly in Part IV, are perhaps difficult to be understood as they are broad. Note that domains of tasks were used as pairs. "Roles by desires" is another important significant interaction. It appears that fathers were preferred more to be capacity builders than actors both in caring and masculinity. Yet they were shown to be actors more in caring that masculinity. Finally, it has to be stressed here than an attempt was made to see sex and age differences in adolescents' views. But not difference was found between the two sexes and the various age groups and hence the data were combined and treated alike.

Belay Tefera

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., Oct-Dec 2014, 3(4): 164-171

DISCUSSIONS

The present findings generally suggest that paternal involvement can't be put into a simplistic unitary dimension. Direct and indirect ways of paternal involvement are not just opposite ends of a single continuum whereby engagement in one precludes another. "Scaling" paternal involvement along a single dimension of "fathers' direct engagement in caring" and thereby categorically assign fathers to a status of uninvolved secondary parents, as it was in the 1950's (see earlier citations), or involved nurturing fathers, as it has been the case in the 1980's and 1990's, is not found viable at least from the perspective of those who are intending to become fathers. Adolescents' responses reflect possibilities of rather a complex pattern of interaction of (direct and indirect) ways, (acting and capacity building), roles and (caring and masculine oriented) desires of paternal involvement in child rearing activities.

A case in point is adolescents' views that direct paternal involvement is neither the only avenue (because paternal caring is possible without direct physical involvement) nor the guardian of caring (see also Kyte, 1996) because fathers could possibly practice masculine-oriented desires in the name of caring. They tend to believe that fathers should also care through indirect involvement (Ishii- Kuntz 1993) and when directly involved they should, on top of caring, emphasize masculine-oriented desires possibly making the so called "new fatherhood ideals" reflect a form of "reconstructed hegemonic masculinity" (Segal, 1993). The former suggests that fathers can offer paternal care being physical absent thus implying that fathers' psychological presence despite their frequent absence at home (Ishii-Kuntz, 1993) is not only because of the symbolic effects associated to fathers over the years, or mothers' efforts to threaten (discipline) children soliciting paternal authority, or caring the family through provision (material or non material) but there is possibly a kind of 'caring' that is not visible. An extreme situation may be the case of a young father met during the pilot study strongly arguing in favour of caring for kids by not 'caring' (through distancing). Counting on his own psychological trauma at the sudden or untimely death (I wonder if there is an appropriate time for death) of a very affectionate and nurturing father, this young father reported that he is intentionally distancing himself to save his son from an emotional meltdown in the face of paternal loss.

This may be considered a simple 'sweet lemon' rationalization for emotional in- expressiveness. It may also be labeled as a polite but extreme form of male chauvinism. It, however, can at the same time be a form of fathers' distinct ways of caring (Day and Mackey, 1986) which for some previous researchers may involve fathers' development of indirect commitments to their children that are contingent upon the father-mother relationship (Furstenberg, 1991, P.137) and it should not be evaluated using mother-child interaction as a standard (Day and Mackey, 1986). Still important is the finding that no matter how and why fathers are involved with children, such involvement should emphasize capacity building over and above that of acting. Is this perhaps what some researchers (e.g. Day and Mackey, 1986) say fathers' distinct type of caring that should not be compared with maternal care and mother- child interaction? It can follow from this that the tendency of previous research to rely on

mother-child interaction (observable conduct of caring) as a template to measure father-child interaction may hardly allow to fully understand how fathers think of, feel about, and act on paternal caring. It appears that generalization about fathers' internal feelings as 'emotionally distant' or 'intimate' based on observable behaviors of father-child interaction (i.e. the amount of time and energy fathers devote to establish and sustain physical contacts with children) may erroneously suggest, for instance, that a father who toils day- in day- out to sustain his kids is 'emotionally distant' and perhaps irresponsible because he is not observed physically staying with them. Neither is the father described as 'emotionally intimate' despite his deliberate efforts to distance himself or suppress his feelings to protect his kids from separation anxiety expected to occur during paternal absence.

Campbell's (1993) idea may help understanding the apparent contradiction seen between the ideas of fatherhood researchers and that of the present respondents. Contrasting respondents' real attributes and theoreticians' perception of these attributes, Campbell (1993) once argued that just because an external observer regards certain facts, problems, and phenomena as belonging to the same field, it by no means follows that the learner treats these facts, problems, and phenomena as belonging to the same domain. In the same way, researchers may view paternal involvement in terms of fathers' direct commitment to nurture for children but respondents suggest that paternal caring is possible without direct physical involvement, on the one hand, and that direct involvement may not necessarily be for caring. Hence, changing fathers to a more involved fatherhood is only viable to the extent that we are able to see things the way they see including understanding their misunderstandings.

This being the case, then adolescents' views are suggestive of different kinds of paternal caring, on the one hand, and the danger that goals other than caring (inculcation and practice of masculine intentions) can be pursued through direct involvement on the other hand. At any rate, four different possible such taxonomies are registered in this research showing at least adolescents' notion of paternal involvement and issues of caring: caring through attachment, caring through detachment, masculine endeavors through attachment and masculine endeavors through detachment. In fact more rigorous investigations are needed to examine the nature, structure, symbolization and organization of these four dimensions of paternal involvement both in subjectivities and practices.

In general, for some cultural, developmental, historical, or perhaps other reasons, construction of notions of fatherhood is not polarized (unitary or reducible to two extremes of a single scale) in paternal involvement. Neither are both composed of dualistic components. The components are not still unrelated packs of two cards as it was fashionable in the 1970s. They are instead interactive and independent components.

These findings can possibly be stretched to explain why fathers' active participation in child- rearing activities has been reported to be slow to change (Lamb et al., 1985). Fathers may believe, for instance, that they are involved and caring but in reality researchers may say they are not. On the other hand, if fathers are made to change towards more and more direct involvement

Belay Tefera

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., Oct–Dec 2014, 3(4): 164–171

without rectifying such a mentality, then the chances are there for them to consume the whole interactional zone expanding the horizon of masculinity vertically and horizontally.

In fact, adolescents view fathers to be involved more directly than indirectly for caring than masculine desires. This is in fact a remarkable move towards involved fatherhood ensuing from a constellation of factors. First, growing as a man in a collectivist society may involve construction of masculinity in terms of caring for others. Success may mean not winning the stronger but helping the weak to be stronger. An individual who develops in an intricate help system is more likely, in due course, to structure one's life patterns along caring for others- child care being one of the various ramifications. In fact, caring for others doing things like feeding and bathing the children is consistent with men's external orientation and this is a traditional male value (Levant, 1991). Second, the large family size so common in Ethiopia is believed to have given an ample opportunity for children to develop themselves through caring for one another. Three, from the developmental perspective, adolescence is a stage of transcendence form traditional sex- role attitudes (Kohlberg and Ullian, 1974; Rebecca, Hefner and Oleshansky, 1976). Empowered by formal operational thinking, adolescents can transcend the social conventions and think in terms of possibilities and fairness. Fourth, the prevalence of traditional sex- role stereotypes and sex- typed fathers may in themselves fuel a second thought in the course of identity development during adolescence. Instead of modeling themselves after the culturally defined paternal roles, they may, through negative modeling, try hard to disown what their fathers own and vice-versa- a kind of contra-cultural identity development? This in particular seems the case when existing beliefs, values and attitudes are seriously questioned in different forums by consciousness raising groups. Perhaps a case in Ethiopia?

The current views of Ethiopian adolescents on paternal involvement should in general be seen against a backdrop of these socio- cultural and developmental forces. And in fact how far the "liberated would- be" father of today turns into a "nurturing actual father" of tomorrow remains to be examined. That is, whether the same organization works in discourse and embodiment has to be addressed in future research employing the post structural model of fatherhood theorizing. This model does not only offer better freedom of expression of practices as a wagon of fatherhood subjectivity but also helps recording how the basic fatherhood subjectivities considered in this research are symbolized in context. This in turn may optimize the influence of environmental factors ostensibly found to have negligible effect in the present research.

CONCLUSIONS

A synoptic view of the data and analyses conducted above suggest that paternal involvement has direct and indirect ways, caring and masculine oriented desires, and acting and capacity building roles, that there is indeed a strong and positive correlation between the two components of ways, desires, and roles, that although there is a significant relationship, there is at one and same time a significant difference between them, and that interactions between ways and roles, ways and desires, and desires and roles are still significant.

REFERENCES

Ager Eshetu (2002). Factors Affecting Participation of Females in Secondary Schools in Gambella Region. A Thesis Presented to the School of Graduate Studies of Addis Ababa University.

Alemayehu Bogale (2003). Girls' Participation and Performance in Secondary Schools of SNNPR. M.A Thesis Presented to the School of Graduate Studies of Addis Ababa University.

Asresash Demissie, (2006). Education and Sciences. Official *Journal of Education Faculty RPC* 1(2).

Baumrind, D. (1973). The Development of instrumental competence through socialization. In A.D. Pick (Ed.), Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology (Vl.7). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Becker, W.C. (1964). Consequences of Different kinds of parental discipline. In M.L. Hoffman and L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vl.1). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bem, S.L. (1977). On the Utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical psychology* 45:196-205.

Biller, H. (1981). Father absence, divorce, and personality development. In M. Lamb (Ed.) The role of the father in child development (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Bowlby, J. (1951). Maternal care and mental health. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Burton, R.V. (1972). Cross- sex identity in Barbados. *Developmental Psychology* 13: 537-538.

Campbell, R.L. (1993). Commentary: Epistemological problems for neo-Piagetians. Monographs of the society for research in child development, Serial No. 234: 58(5-6).

Catherine, S. and Tamis-LeMonda (2008). Handbook of Father Involvement: Multi-disciplinary perspectives, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, London

CSA and ICF International (2012). Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey 2011, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Coltrane, S. (1989). Household labour and the routine production of gender. *Social Problem* 36: 473-490.

Day, R., and Mackey, W. (1986). The role image of the American father: An examination of a media myth. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 17: 371-388.

Denise, H. (2007). Father Involvement in Parenting Young Children: A Content Analysis of Parent Education Programs in BC, A Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of in the area of Early Childhood Education Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Victoria.

Dimond, M. (1992). Creativity needs in becoming a father. Los Angeles: The Men's Studies Press.

Emebet Mulugeta (2003). Problems encountered and coping strategies employed by female students in Addis Ababa High Schools: *The Ethiopian Journal of Education, Addis Ababa,Ethiopia* XXIII (2).

English, O.S. (1954). The psychological role of the father in the family. Social case work, pp. 323-329.

ESDP IV (2011). Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV) for 2010/2011 – 2014/2015 or 2003 EC – 2007 EC. Ministry of Education, Ethiopia.

Furstenberg, F.F., Jr. (1988). Good dads- bad dads: Two faces of fatherhood. In A.J. Cherlin (E.d.), The Changing American Family and Public Policy (pp.193-218). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Furstenberg, F.F. Jr. (1991). Fathering in the inner city: Paternal participation and public policy. In W. Marsiglio (Ed.), Fatherhood: Contemporary theory, research and social policy. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Habtamu Wondimu (1994). The basic values of Ethiopian workers, teachers and students: A search for some psychological correlates of under development. The 12th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies. In H.G. Marcus (Ed.), New trends on Ethiopian studies (Vl.II). The Red Sea Press.

Hetherington, E. (1967). The effect of familial variables on sex- typing, on parent- child similarity, and on imitation in children . In J .P. Hill (Ed.), Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology (Vl.1). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.

Hui, C.H. (1988). Measurement of individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Research in Personality* 22: 17-36.

Ishii- Kuntz, M. (1993). Japanese fathers: Work demands and family roles. In: J. C. Hood (Ed.), Men, work and family (pp. 45-67). Newbury Park , CA: SAGE.

Johnson, M. (1977). Fathers, Mothers, and sex- typing. In: E. Hetherington and R. Pavkec (Eds.), Contemporary reading in child Psychology. New York: McGraw- Hill .

JRM, Joint Review Mission (2006). Education Sector Development Programme III (1998 -2002 E.C), Ethiopia.

Kassa Shurka, (2006). Factors Affecting Females' Participation in Education: the Case of Tocha Woreda in SNNPR. M.A Thesis Presented to the School of Graduate Studies of Addis Ababa University.

Keun, K. (2008), The Impact of Father's Involvement and Parenting Styles on Their Children's Social Competence: A study of Korean Fathers in the United States.

Kohlberg, L. and Ullian, D.Z. (1974). Stages in the development of psychosexual concepts and attitudes. In R.C. Friedman , R.M . Richart, and R.L, Vande Wiele (Eds.), Sex differences in behavior (pp. 209-231). Huntington: Robert F. Krieger Publishing.

Kortan, D.C. (1972). Planned change in a traditional society: Psychological Problems of modernization in Ethiopia: New York: Praeger.

Kotelchuck, M. (1976). The infant's relationship to the father: Experimental evidence. In M.E. Lamb (Ed). The role of the father in child development. New York: Wiley.

Kyte, R. (1996). Moral reasoning as perception: A reading of Carol Gilligan. *Hypatia* 11(3): 97-113.

Lamb, M .E., Pleack, J.H ., and Levine, J.A. (1985). The role of the father in child development: The effect of increased paternal involvement. In: B.B. Lahey and A.E. Kazdin (Eds.), Advances in clinical child psychology (pp. 229-266). New York: Plenum.

Lamb, M .E., Pleack, J.H ., Charnov, E.L., and Levine, J .A. (1987). A bio-social perspective on paternal behavior and involvement. In J.B. Lancaster (Ed.) Parenting across the life- span: Bio- social dimensions (pp. 111-142). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Levant, J.A. (1991). The invisible dilemma: Working fathers in corporate America. Testimony at the hearing. Babies and Briefcases: Creating a family- friendly workplace for fathers. U.S. House of Representatives, Select Committee on Children, youth, and Families.

Lewin-Bizan, S. (2012). Prompting Responsible Fatherhood. The White house, Washington D.C.

Maccoby, E. and Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent- child interaction. In E.M. Hetherington (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Socialization, personality, and social development (Vl.4). New York: Wiley.

MoE (2013). Education statistics Annual Abstract for 2005 E.C. EMIS, Planning and Resource Mobilization Directorate, Ministry of Education, Addis Ababa.

Mulualem Tesema. (1998). Gender Bias Analysis of Primary School Textbooks of Amhara Region. Addis Ababa University. (Unpublished Master Thesis).

Nash, J. (1965). The father in contemporary culture and current psychological literature. *Child Development* 36: 261-297.

Natasha, J., Catherine, S., Tamis, L. (2013). Handbook of Father Involvement: multidisciplinary perspectives, 2nded. New York.

Nigatu Debella, 2008. Gender Disparity in Academic Performance: the case of Assosa Senior Secondary School and Precollege of Benishangul Gumuz Region, Ethiopia. M.SC Thesis Presented to the School of Graduate Studies of Haramaya University.

Parsons, T. and Bales, R.F. (1955). Family, Socialization, and interaction process. Glencoe IL: The Free Press.

Parsons, T. (1955). Family structure and the socialization of the child. In: T. Parsons and R.F. Bales (Eds.), Family socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, III: Press.

Pederson, F. (1976). Does research on children reared in father- absent families yield information on father influences? The Family Coordinator, 25, 459-464.

Pleck, J. H. (2007). Why could father involvement benefit children? Theoretical perspective. *Applied Development Science* 11(4): 196-202.

Rebeca, M., Hefner, R., Oleshansky, B. (1976). A model of sex- role transcendence. *Journal of Social Issues* 32(3): 197-206.

Retta, G. (2003). Sexual harassment in higher educations in Ethiopia. School of Social work. Addis Ababa University.

Save the Children Denmark (2008). Study on Violence against Girls in Primary Schools and its Impacts on Girls' Education in Ethiopia, Ministry of Education and Ministry of Women Affairs, Ethiopia.

Segal, L. (1993). Changing men: Masculinities in the context. *Theory and society* 22: 625-642.

Shinn, M. (1978). Father absence and children's cognitive development. *Psychological Bulletin* 85: 295-324.

Tesfaye Semela (2006). Higher Education Expansion and the Gender question in Ethiopia: A Case Study of Women in Public University. *Ethiopian Journal Higher Education* 3:1.

Teshome Nekatibeb (2002). Low Participation of Female Students in Primary Education: A Case of Dropouts from the Amhara and Oromia Regional States in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: UNESCO International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa.

Ward, J.V. (1995). Cultivating a morality of care in African American adolescents: A culture- based model of violence prevention. *Harvard Education Review* 65(2):175-187.

White, J. and Parham, T. (1990). The Psychology of Blacks: An African American perspective (2nd ed.) Engleood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice- Hall.