

Concern about fathers is not new but they do appear to have achieved a high level of visibility in recent years. This is, of course, linked to ongoing concern about changing 'family' patterns and the consequences for children, women, and men. Current discussions about what is happening can be likened to operating within an 'ideological war zone' ([MacLeod 2000](#)). It appears that virtually everyone has their views on what is happening, what should happen, and who is being harmed by what. All these firmly held and often highly oppositional views are presented with supporting research evidence, which can lead to a sense of utter confusion. This is of course highly troubling, especially for those at the sharp end of working with families.

As [Lamb \(1997\)](#) notes, there have been major advances in research on fathers in the last 20 years, and here too battle lines appear to have been firmly drawn around the desirability or otherwise of what is happening to fathers and men generally. This is especially apparent in the US (see [Daniels 1998](#)), although this concern is not exclusive to there (see, for example, [Williams 1998](#) on debates in the UK). In these circumstances, it is the author's view that it would be unwise either to try and summarize all of the research which is being carried out, or to advance an authoritative position in relation to what is happening to fathers and the consequences or otherwise for children's welfare. The aim of the review is therefore more modest, in that it seeks to alert readers of *Child and Family Social Work* to the findings of *some* of the key research based publications which have emerged in the last few years that have looked at the following: (i) the role of fathers in children's development; (ii) some of the findings in relation to domestic violence and fathers; and (iii) the issues which appear to arise for child care professionals when engaging fathers.

The aim of this review is therefore to stimulate debate within the pages of *Child and Family Social Work* about the issues relating to fathers.

In order to situate the discussion, a broad overview of the demographic picture in relation to fathers in the UK today will be provided next.

THE DEMOGRAPHIC PICTURE

 

A brief word about terminology is in order here. A range of developments in recent decades has meant that the term 'father' is no longer straightforward. Technological developments, for example, have made it possible for women to choose to have children without the ongoing involvement of a male partner. Many biological fathers do not live with their children, or are fathering children who are not biologically theirs. The terms 'social father' and 'father figure' have come into usage to capture the latter phenomenon.

Recent research in the UK on 'changing' family patterns appears to support a picture that encompasses both change and continuity. The Family Policy Studies Centre (FPSC) produced a well-publicized report which brought together the latest statistics and research ([FPSC 2000](#)). It summarized what it called 'key family facts'. Eighty per cent of

dependent children still live in a family with two parents, and 90% of those parents are married. More than 8 in 10 fathers live with all their biological children, and more than 7 in 10 are doing so within their first family. However, it would appear that just over two in five marriages will ultimately end in divorce and if present divorce rates continue, it is estimated that 28% of children will experience the divorce of their parents before they reach 16. The fastest-growing group of lone parents is single, never-married mothers, with the proportion doubling since the mid-1980s from 24% to 42%. Overall, in 1971, there were just over half a million lone parents bringing up one million dependent children, but by the mid-1990s their number had increased to 1.6 million lone parents with 2.8 million children.

In terms of the concerns of this article it does appear, however, that the majority of children continue to live in situations involving both birthparents, and there are not significant numbers of absent fathers, father figures, or lone fathers in the general population at this point in time in the UK.

This picture changes when one turns to examine the composition of those families who come into the child protection process. [Ryan \(2000\)](#) was commissioned by the Department of Health to look at the information contained on fathers in families in the studies disseminated through *Child Protection: Messages from Research* ([Department of Health 1995](#)). The original researchers involved in the 20 studies comprising this project were not asked specifically to look at what these research studies had to say about fathers. However, according to Ryan, the studies did contain sufficient information on fathers to draw out some important themes. In relation to the demographic picture the following is of interest:

- At the time of initial enquiry only 38% of children were living with both birthparents – a much lower proportion than the national average.
- 31% lived with a lone mother whereas the national average is 19%.
- 28% in reconstituted families – the national average is 8%.
- The number of lone fathers corresponded to national patterns. ([Ryan 2000](#))

Fathers' involvement in households fluctuated. More fathers were living at home at the start of inquiries than later, which is perhaps predictable.

Early on in the process of the child protection enquiry, a number of fathers leave for a variety of reasons, so that immediately after the initial child protection conference the number of children living with both parents has fallen to 26%... By later stages in the process, many of those remaining men had left. ([Ryan 2000](#), p. 23)

She notes the finding of Gibbons *et al.* that 17% of the 144 children followed up 10 years after their names were added to the child protection register were living with the same two parents as at the time of registration. Seventy-five per cent were still living with one

of their original carers, but a fifth of fathers had left the household and many had been replaced by a new man (Gibbons *et al.*'s figures, quoted in [Ryan 2000](#)).

According to Ryan, the overall message here is that the structure of families involved in the child protection process *at any stage* is different from the overall socio-demographic picture in that fewer children live with both their own parents and more live with lone mothers or in reconstituted families. Another key finding was that there were high levels of unemployment and poverty, with 57% of the families lacking a wage earner. Again this contrasts with general findings in which fathers of dependent children have the highest employment rates. According to [Clarke \(1997\)](#) in her analysis of the findings of the British Household Panel Survey, 85% of fathers of dependent children were employed compared with 71% of fathers whose children were all over 18, and 68.5% of men who were not parents (p. 19).

The picture that emerges from Ryan's analysis indicates a considerable number of absent fathers, and the need for children to come to terms with that and negotiate relationships with father figures. This also occurs in contexts where high levels of domestic violence and partner conflict appeared to be evident. These figures were not compared by Ryan with national averages, but would appear to be significant in themselves. She noted that in 27% of cases domestic violence was found to be a feature at the start of inquiries. Higher levels were recorded at subsequent stages, and there were high levels of conflict between partners in 35% of the sample. Moreover, a small but significant number of fathers had a criminal record or experienced mental or physical health problems, were substance misusers, or had experienced abuse in their own childhood. Thus it is reasonable to conclude that many of the fathers involved in cases where there are concerns about children's welfare may have significant psychological difficulties of their own, be unable to access the breadwinner role, and have difficult/violent relationships with their partners.

The significance of these findings become starkly apparent when located in the context of broader research on the role of fathers in children's development.

THE ROLE OF FATHERS IN CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENT

 

The classic text in this area was the first edition of *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, edited by Michael Lamb in 1976. Subsequent editions followed in 1981 and 1997. This review looks at the findings of the latest edition. As Lamb notes in his introduction, the first and second editions contained introductory chapters in which he attempted to provide inclusive reviews of the primary and secondary literature. He notes in 1997 that this is no longer possible as there is just too much material which reflects the advances made in the field in the last 20 years. Such advances are paralleled at a policy level in both this country and the US, where the role of fathers has come under increased scrutiny.

When the first edition was published in 1976, social scientists in general, and developmental psychologists in particular, doubted whether fathers had a significant role to play in shaping the experiences and development of their children, particularly their daughters ([Lamb 1997](#)). Consequently Lamb notes that the first, and to a lesser extent the second edition, were rather defensive in tone and were concerned to show that fathers had a role to play in child development, were often salient in their children's lives, and both positively and negatively affected their development. He notes, by contrast, that contributors to the third volume

all reflect widespread acceptance of the notion that fathers are often affectively and formatively salient, a conclusion that has encouraged a focus on more nuanced issues and concerns. (p. 1)

All the chapters, which are largely but not exclusively US based, provide research based summaries of current developments in a variety of areas. Key areas covered include historical ideals and images; the effects of marital quality on child adjustment; levels, sources and consequences of paternal involvement; the development of father-child relations through the child's lifespan; the effects of divorce on children and their fathers; fathers in stepfamilies; young fathers; gay fathers; and fathers and violence.

Some overall themes from Lamb's introductory chapter seem of importance to highlight. Despite continued agonizing or assertions about the uniqueness or otherwise of the father, Lamb (p. 13) summarizes that fathers and mothers seem to influence their children in similar rather than dissimilar ways. Parental warmth, nurturance and closeness are associated with positive child outcomes whether the parent or adult involved is a mother or a father. The most important dimensions of parental influence have to do with parental characteristics rather than gender-related characteristics. Characteristics of individual fathers, such as their masculinity, intellect, and even their warmth, are much less important formatively than are the characteristics of the relationships they have established with their children. Children who have secure, supportive, reciprocal and sensitive relationships with their parents are much more likely to be well adjusted psychologically than individuals whose relations with their mothers or fathers are less satisfying. The amount of time spent with children is less important than what is done with that time.

Furthermore, fathers must be viewed in the broader context of familial relationships. Positive paternal influences are more likely to occur not only when there is a supportive father-child relationship, but also when the father's relationship with the partner establishes a positive context. The absence of family hostility is the most consistent correlate of child adjustment, whereas marital conflict is the most consistent and reliable correlate of child maladjustment. This makes Ryan's findings on the high levels of conflict and violence in 'child protection' families all the more sobering.

A further important point in relation to context is that a successful father, as defined in terms of his children's development, is one whose role performance matches the demands and prescriptions of his socio-cultural and familial context. For example, high paternal

involvement may have positive effects in some circumstances and negative in others. There is no single father role to which all fathers should aspire.

[Johnson \(1999\)](#) conducted a substantial review of research since the 1960s on the effects of father absence and father presence. She notes that for many years the father absence literature predominated and contributed to the dominant belief that the non-residence of fathers had a negative impact on child development in terms of intellectual, psychosocial and psychosexual development of children. However, class and culture were often confounded, particularly in early research. She argues that the more recent focus on fathers' emotional and functional relationships with children is a welcome move away from simply addressing whether fathers are resident or not.

The concept of father absence is sorely limited by its emphasis on the residential location and personal contact patterns of biological fathers. Furthermore, the paradigm seems to be established upon a cultural ideal of masculinity prevalent in the historical period prior to the 1970s ... as such father presence is more than the mere antithesis of father absence. (p. 1)

Johnson argues that father presence is a rich and complex construction of fathers' roles and relations to children. Although very little research focuses on the broader concept of father presence, those that do are powerful and compelling. They would indicate that men's psychological care and emotional generosity with their children have the greatest long-term implications for children's development. She notes findings that indicate that children take strong cues from the psychological ecology of their development, in which fathers are influential.

She argues that the research would indicate fathers are important as parents,

... however, complete or optimal parenting is not limited to a particular family structure ... optimal parenting may be defined as the rearing of a child in a nurturing, loving and safe environment where skills and ideals are engendered that enable the child to be a happy, whole, contributing member of society. Using this definition, many family configurations, irrespective of parental residence of either gender, can achieve this end if given proper supports. (p. 15)

She also argues for policies which concentrate more on the needs of children and less on household structure and that aid families in sustaining father contact. However, although fathers' presence appears to matter in facilitating optimal child outcomes, it is important to have a degree of flexibility about what their precise role in a particular family will be, as their roles are still in flux and differing familial contexts will involve differing patterns of engaging.

How does this research aid child welfare workers? As we have seen from Ryan's analysis, a significant number of the men in families where there are child protection concerns have significant needs of their own; there are often high levels of conflict between partners as well as actual violence. This has implications for how well they can meet the

needs of their children when located within the wider picture. However, as we have seen from the above, it is important not to become overly concerned about the proportions who are non-resident as a problem in itself. The big challenge has to be, however, exploring how we can engage fathers in positive and safe relations with their children and their partners.

I now want to turn and look specifically at some of the research on an area of considerable concern for child welfare professionals – that of fathers and physical violence.

VIOLENCE, FATHERS AND CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENT

Go to section 

[Peled \(2000\)](#), using material from a number of countries including the UK, the US and Israel, has recently argued that we can no longer ignore the role of abusive men as fathers. 'Abusive men', in this context, are men who are physically violent to their partners. She further argues that holding such men accountable for their children's well-being may, under certain conditions, contribute to the healthier emotional development of their children. She explores the available literature, including her own empirical research, into: (i) children's perceptions of their violent fathers; (ii) abusive men as parents; (iii) qualifications for abusive men's access to their children; and (iv) interventions with children of abusive men and their fathers (p. 25).

Her own small qualitative study of 14 pre-adolescent children of abused women suggested that the children often experienced a conflict of loyalties in terms of choosing sides. Their mothers' pain and suffering engendered empathy and anger amongst children, but siding with the person who had the power and control in the family was also attractive. Moreover, in some situations, children perceived their mothers' efforts to end the abuse as the reason for family breakdown, and they identified with the father who had to leave. They also regretted having less contact with their fathers. Children too seemed torn in terms of their fathers. On the one hand they perceived the violence as wrong, damaging and frightening, but on the other hand they loved and were attached to their fathers. Peled argues that very few of the children managed to live with and accept both sides of their father. Rather, they chose to see them as bad or found way ways to contain, excuse or reframe their behaviour. She notes that the only quantitative study found on this topic was that by [Sternberg *et al.* \(1994\)](#). Here, children who were witnesses of spousal violence, but not themselves victims, did not have differing perceptions of the perpetrating and victim parent. The researchers suggested that the children's evaluations were based on performance of parental but not spousal roles. However, Peled argues that this interpretation ignores the impact of violent spousal behaviour on children's relationships with the perpetrating parent.

In terms of abusive men as parents she appears to concur with [Sternberg \(1997\)](#), whose work will be looked at later, that while the negative impact of abusive men's behaviour on children has been studied, there is little that corroborates children's positive

perceptions of their fathers. The overall parenting behaviour of abusive men has not been studied. She recognizes that assisting children of abused women to maintain a positive relationship with their violent father is extremely complex in the light of the conflicting needs, interests and rights of family members, and the potential danger for the children and their mothers. However, many children of abusive men seem to care deeply for their fathers and wish they could have a gratifying relationship with them. Furthermore, she argues that if we believe parents are responsible for the well-being of their children, and that both parents are to share this responsibility, we can no longer ignore the role of abusive men as fathers. Finally, from a feminist perspective, the empowerment of abused women entails a pursuit of an egalitarian distribution of parenting rights and responsibilities between them and their partners (p. 29).

Whilst respecting the views of those who think contact is not desirable or beneficial, her own view is that an abusive man may be rehabilitated and then allowed to resume contact. Peled goes further than argue for contact, and indeed sees it as possibly contributing to the healthier emotional development of children. This is not a point she fully substantiates in my view. The research she looks at which has evaluated children's programmes does point out that children gain from such programmes. For example, interventions appear to have some success in changing their self-esteem and attitudes about violence, and found significant differences between pre- and post-treatment responses to anger, and to children's sense of responsibility for their father's violence and their mother's safety. Most, if not all, by the end of the programme could define abuse, distinguish between different forms of abuse, and recognize that it was not 'all right'. They were also able verbally to express awareness that they were not responsible for the violence. However, the implications of such changes were complex. For example, in relation to children who had previously felt responsible for the violence, their burden of guilt may have been eased. However, the attribution of responsibility to the father may, in turn, create further burdens for a child already struggling to maintain a positive image of his or her father.

Peled seems to me to be arguing that work with children can promote positive if uneven outcomes, but she does not overtly prove her point in this article that contact with fathers can contribute to children's healthier emotional development. However, if one decodes her earlier point that such children feel torn and confused, then work with them, alongside the direct parenting work which she advocates for fathers, can provide the opportunity for children to integrate their conflicting feelings.

The danger with 'no contact' arguments is that children are left with split feelings, and can therefore end up either idealizing or denigrating the absent father. This is unhelpful for their own development, and their relationships with men and women in the future, as well as with their mothers and fathers.

Peled notes that there is very little information available on parenting work with violent men. Furthermore, there is no evaluation of any parenting work programmes that exist. In the UK context this is unlikely to change in the near future, as the value of existing programmes with violent men is currently being questioned. Consequently it seems

doubtful that they will be extended to more explicitly incorporate the issues for men as fathers.

[Sternberg \(1997\)](#), from a US perspective, reviews the research on fathers, locating it in the context of the evolution of research on family violence as a whole. She argues that although there have been considerable improvements in research design in the field of family violence,

... a number of problems still exist, including failure to carefully document all types of abuse in the family, lack of specificity about who is the perpetrator of the various types of violence in the family, and reliance on single informants for information about family history and outcome measures for parents and children. (p. 284)

She also argues that a review of the literature on children's victimization and observation of violence in the family reveals a conspicuous lack of information from and about fathers in these families.

She reviews why fathers are not included in studies of family violence generally. Firstly, most research has been conducted within social services agencies and battered women's shelters. These agencies routinely do not involve fathers, are staffed by women, open during working hours, and deal in the main with mother-headed families.

She notes there is little data on children who witness spousal violence in terms of their perceptions of fathers. Furthermore, in studies in which researchers have begun to include reports from wives and children about men's behaviour as fathers, the measures they have used focus almost exclusively on aggressive aspects of father-child relationships. She argues that this implicitly rules out the possibility that children may have more positive interactions or perceptions of their fathers.

It is almost as though researchers feel that by inquiring about positive or neutral dimensions, they are endorsing violence by fathers. In addition, researchers have yet to design studies that take into consideration that fathers are involved not as perpetrators of violence but as the spouses of perpetrators. Researchers also must explore how the quality of relationships with non-perpetrating fathers affects the development of abused children. ([Sternberg 1997](#), p. 307)

She argues that the overall quality of research on child and spouse data would be improved by including information from and about fathers. It is important to collect information from multiple sources. This echoes a point made by [Featherstone & Trinder \(1997\)](#) when reviewing some of the methodological and theoretical shortcomings of research into contact and domestic violence. In particular they critiqued the practice of only asking women about men's violence and about their children's desires in relation to contact with their fathers.

In this section I have concentrated on some of the recent research and debates about fathers and domestic violence as this is such a topical issue today in work with children

and families. I have also deliberately chosen research which is less well known and which contests the orthodoxy prevailing in this area. Currently, men who are physically violent to women are constructed as men who offend, and seldom seen in the round in terms of their other roles, for example, as fathers. When their relationships with children *are* considered, it is as the above writers indicate, solely for the purposes of elucidating how damaging and dangerous they can be to their children. Consequently they are usually constructed as one-dimensional characters and dealt with in ways which deny/ignore central aspects of their identities and relationships.

In this final section I want to look at a recent piece of research completed in the UK on engaging fathers in family centres. This piece of research has been chosen because: (i) it is an extensive piece of work, and (ii) because its conclusions raise some little-aired and important issues for all those working with families where there are child care concerns.

ENGAGING FATHERS

It is by now commonplace to assert that workers in child care cases do not engage with fathers, thus overburdening mothers. [Ghate *et al.* \(2000\)](#) from the Policy Research Bureau, in conjunction with the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, conducted some research into how fathers are or are not engaged with within family centres. The report produced is quite detailed in terms of research methods used and sampling and so on. They also provided additional information on the research process in a supplementary publication (<http://www.prb.org.uk>).

They looked at 13 family centres, offering a range of provision in seven local authorities. In-depth interviews and group discussions were conducted with over 90 parents, workers and managers. The aim of the study was to identify barriers and enabling factors in fathers' use of family centres. They argue that their findings indicate that much of what keeps fathers out of family centres is related to the way in which the centres are perceived and experienced by fathers, mothers and staff alike. They are perceived and experienced as either 'women's places' or 'women and children's' places. The only men who appeared to be catered for are men who are 'unusual' in some way, for example lone fathers or fathers who are main carers whilst mothers work, fathers from families in difficulties who have been referred for therapeutic work, and fathers with 'special' and 'unusual' levels of attachment and commitment to family life.

The study revealed a complex network of barriers and enabling factors, which works to prevent and promote fathers' use of family centres. Some of these were rooted in broad social and cultural factors, whereas others were bound up with individual men's family, relationship and personal circumstances. However, the most frequently mentioned incentives and disincentives to family centre use by fathers were not located at the cultural or personal level but at the institutional one, and could be traced back to the ways in which centres are structured, managed, staffed and organized.

Their findings compelled the researchers to ask a basic question: who and what are family centres for? In asking this question they recognized that family centres are fundamentally for children, and that much of what is done is aimed at enhancing children's well-being across a range of dimensions. What appeared less clear, according to them, was the role of adult users within family centres. They argued that if adult users are viewed only as parents or carers of children, and seen as having needs only in relation to their children's needs, then family centres could best be described as child focused. Children come first, and parents come along as part of the package. Therefore, centres would structure priorities and activities mainly around child care and enhancing specific parenting skills. On the other hand some centres did clearly say that they also tried to see parents as adults in their own right and to recognize parents' needs, which were sometimes different from their children's. The rationale here was that parenting and child-parent relationships would be improved if parents' confidence was enhanced. Such centres could be characterized as family focused according to the researchers.

In practice they found that most centres were a mix, with the type of approach mediated by the sex of the user. They were more than likely to be family focused in their approach to working with women and child focused when working with men. This meant that that mothers were related to as women as well as mothers. The notion that happy, fulfilled women make better mothers translated into a range of activities that did not always involve or revolve around children. However, there was unease about engaging with fathers as men. Men were therefore welcome as fathers, but not as men, and there were few activities for men that did not involve or revolve around children. As a result there were difficulties in engaging them. Some centres had tried to create men's spaces, but these tended to be almost 'ghettoized' and rather marginal to the work of the centre as a whole, and were often not welcomed by men.

They argue that on a fundamental level what will be required is an approach that involves listening to what local men say they want and being prepared to try fresh approaches to providing and facilitating activities.

Whilst they recognize that a culture shift is required, I think they do not recognize adequately how deep and potentially painful that culture shift may have to be. In the child protection context, as we have seen, we are dealing with men and women who are impoverished, who frequently have conflicting relationships with each other and with workers. Indeed, although they noted that women workers and service users expressed angry, hostile comments about men, the implications of this were not drawn out.

In order to engage men within settings such as family centres, thought and time will need to be devoted to how power relations and inter-personal dynamics are managed. This will need underpinning by a broader recognition of how men and women feel about their lives and prospects today.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

 

This paper has explored a small number of research writings on fathers today which appear to highlight important and difficult insights for all involved in working with children and families where there are concerns about children's welfare. As indicated at the beginning of the article, there is a host of material emerging from a range of disciplines on fathers and fathering. This coincides with a policy context in the UK and US particularly, where fathers are very firmly on the agenda. The government signalled its intention in *Supporting Families* ([Home Office 1998](#)) to devote resources to fathers and boys, and followed this up a year later with grants to projects around the country which were engaging with fathers and boys. However, it makes only tokenistic mention of such concerns in the *Framework for the Assessment of Children in Need and Their Families* ([Department of Health 1999](#)), indicating that its approach is not quite as 'joined up' as it might be.

There is an urgent need, in the view of the author, to explore the issues which face fathers today, how they are perceived by women and children, and what supports are required by professionals in engaging with fathers. This research review has highlighted some of the concerns emerging from recent research. It has had a limited brief as indicated at the outset. There would appear to be a range of issues in relation to fathers and father figures, which are clearly deserving of further attention from those involved with child welfare and child protection concerns. These should include research into the mental and physical health needs of fathers as well as further research into how fathers, wherever they are resident, can be supported in developing safe and positive relationships with their children.

References

1

Clarke, L. (1997) Who are fathers? A socio-demographic profile. In: *Fathers and Fatherhood in Britain* (eds L. Burghes, L. Clarke & N. Cronin). FPSC, London.

2

Daniels, C.R. (ed.) (1998) *Lost Fathers: The Politics of Fatherlessness in America*. Macmillan, Hampshire.

3

Department of Health (1995) *Child Protection: Messages from Research*. HMSO, London.

4

Department of Health (1999) *Framework for the Assessment of Children in Need and Their Families*. HMSO, London.

5

Family Policy Studies Centre (2000) *Family Change: Guide to the Issues*. Family Briefing Paper 12. FPSC, London.

6

Featherstone, B & Trinder, L. (1997) Familiar subjects? Domestic violence and child welfare. *Child and Family Social Work*, 2, 147–159.

[Synergy](#)

7

Ghate, D, Shaw, C, Hazel, N. (2000) *Fathers and Family Centres: Engaging Fathers in Preventive Services*. York Publishing Services, York.

8

Home Office (1998) *Supporting Families: A Consultation Document*. HMSO, London.

9

Johnson, D. (1999) *Father Presence Matters: A Review of the Literature*. National Center on Fathers and Families, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

10

Lamb, M.E. (1997) *Fathers and child development: an introductory overview and guide*. In: *The Role of the Father in Child Development* (ed. M.E. Lamb), 3rd edn, pp. 1–19.

Wiley, Chichester.

11

MacLeod, M. (2000) Keynote address, 'Care, Values and Welfare', University of Leeds, 12 May.

12

Peled, E. (2000) Parenting by men who abuse women: issues and dilemmas. *British Journal of Social Work*, 30, 25–36.

[CrossRef](#), [ISI](#)

13

Ryan, M. (2000) *Working with Fathers*. Radcliffe Medical Press, Oxon.

14

Sternberg, K.J. (1997) Fathers: the missing parents in family violence research. In: *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, 3rd edn (ed. M.E. Lamb), pp. 284–309. Wiley, Chichester.

15

Sternberg, K.J, Lamb, M.E, Greenbaum, C, Dawud, S, Cortes, R.M, Lorey, F. (1994) The effects of domestic violence on children's perspectives of their perpetrating and nonperpetrating parents. *International Society for the Study of Behavioural Development*, 17, 779–795.

[ISI](#)

16

Williams, F. (1998) Troubled masculinities in social policy dis-courses: fatherhood. In: *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare* (eds J. Popay, J. Hearn & J. Edwards). Routledge, London.