



THE EFFECTS OF FATHER INVOLVEMENT TRAINING ON FAMILY FUNCTIONING AND ADOLESCENTS' PEER RELATIONS¹

(BABA KATILIM EĞİTİMİNİN AİLE İŞLEVLERİNE VE ERGENLERİN AKRAN İLİŞKİLERİNE ETKİSİ)

Ercan KOCAYÖRÜK²
Zeynep HATİPOĞLU SÜMER³

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was twofold: (a) to design and determine the effect of Father Involvement Training (FIT), which is based on social-cognitive theory principles, on family functioning in father-adolescent relationships, and (b) to examine the effect of Father Involvement Training (FIT) on the quality of the peer relationships of 9th grade high school students, whose fathers participated in the study. The sample was composed of twenty- six 9th grade students' fathers. The 2x3 experimental design examined pre-training, post-training and six-month follow-up measurements of an experimental group and control group. Data were collected through Parent Success Indicator (PSI), Parent Adolescent Relationship Scale (PARS) and Peer Relationship Scale (PRS). Data were analyzed by employing Mann Whitney U Test, Friedman Test, and Wilcoxon Sign Rank Test. The results revealed that the Father Involvement Training had significant effects on the father-child relationship and family functioning of experimental group's fathers. The adolescents, whose fathers participated in the experimental group, had improved in close-relationship and sensitivity dimensions at the end of the study. However, the improvements were not maintained after the six months follow-up measurements. Lastly, there was a significant improvement in the trust and identification dimension of peer relationship levels of children whose fathers received the training compared to children whose fathers did not receive the training.

Keywords: father involvement, family functioning, adolescents, peer relationship

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın iki amacı vardır: (a) sosyal bilişsel kuram temellerine dayandırılmış bir "Baba Katılım Eğitimi'nin" geliştirilmesi ve (b) bu eğitimin aile işlevlerine ve lise 9'uncu sınıf öğrencilerinin akran ilişkilerine etkisinin araştırılmasıdır. Araştırmanın örneklemini, lise 9. sınıf öğrencilerinin babaları oluşturmuştur. Baba katılım eğitimine 26 baba, gönüllü olarak katılmıştır. Araştırmada deney ve kontrol grubu ve bu gruplardan ön-test, son-test ve izleme ölçümlerinin alındığı 2x3 deneysel desen kullanılmıştır. Araştırma verileri Anne-Babalık Becerileri ve İletişim Ölçeği Ebeveyn Formu (ABBİÖ-EF), Anne-Baba Ergen İlişkileri Ölçeği Baba Formu (ABEİÖ-BF) ve Akran İlişkileri Ölçeği (AİÖ) ile elde edilmiştir. Veriler Mann Whitney-U Test, Friedman Test ve Wilcoxon İşaret Test ile analiz edilmiştir. Bulgular baba katılım eğitiminin, babaların aile işlevlerine yönelik değerlendirmelerine anlamlı bir etkisi olduğunu göstermiştir. Çalışmaya katılan babaların çocukları, "yakın ilişkiler" ve "duyarlılık" boyutlarında ilerleme göstermelerine rağmen bu ilerleme 6 ay sonraki izleme ölçümlerinde korunamamıştır. Bu bulguların yanısıra çocukların, Anne-Baba Ergen İlişkileri Ölçeği Baba Formu (ABEİÖ-BF) "beklentileri karşılama" alt boyutundaki puanlarında düşüş gözlenmiştir. Son olarak, baba katılım eğitimi alan babaların çocuklarının, Akran İlişkileri Ölçeği'nin "güven ve özdeşim" alt boyutunda, babaları eğitim almayan çocuklara göre ilerleme gösterdiği belirlenmiştir. Deney grubu babalarının değerlendirme formu sonuçları, bir yandan baba-çocuk ilişkilerindeki gelişimi diğer yandan da babaların, çocukları ile ilişkilerindeki davranış değişiklerini ve ilerlemeleri algıladıklarını ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: baba katılımı, aile işlevleri, ergenler, akran ilişkileri

¹ This paper is a summary of the author's thesis in partial fulfillment of a doctoral degree in Educational Science.

² Asst. Prof. Dr., Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Science. E-mail: kocayoruk@comu.edu.tr

³ Asst. Prof. Dr., Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences. E-mail: zeynep@metu.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

Adolescence is a critical period of development during which children become adult and when they also experience crucial changes in the relationship with their parents and social world. Transition to adolescence is marked by an expansion in the social environments the adolescents live in. According to Erikson (1968), during the transition in the course of exploring and searching their culture's identity file, adolescents often experiment with different roles. Identity development is the most crucial issue in this developmental period, because failure to resolve the identity issues of adolescence may result in difficulties in establishing genuine and close relationships in adulthood (Santrock, 2005).

The need for close friends also becomes a crucial part of adolescent development. During adolescence, youngsters need to share their emotions, thoughts, doubts, and experiences more than at any other time in their life (Savin-Williams & Berndt, 1990). In this developmental stage, therefore, adolescents begin defining themselves by group affiliation and developing a sense of self, who they are in comparison to others (Erikson, 1968). From this point of view, a very important issue is how the family and the peer relations are connected in the adolescents' social development.

Developmental tasks during adolescence are achieved most effectively in families where autonomy is encouraged, conflict is effectively managed, and members feel supported and loved. In other words, most adolescents are influenced by and live within a family structure. Therefore, it is important to identify how family functions and patterns interact with adolescent behaviors and it is important to provide support for to achieve healthy adolescent development. Parenting factors such as warmth, parental acceptance, parental attachment, family climate and family functioning positively contribute to children's competence with peer groups and are associated with the quality of peer relationship (Ladd & Petit, 2002).

The parents' involvement is related to the general influence of parent-child relationship experiences on children's social development and peer competence. Thus, since the 1960's, several types of training for parents have been designed to involve the parents in healthy child development. However, it is a well known fact that, until recently, parent involvement training programs have been designed to account extensively for the relationship between the mother and child. Levant and Doyle (1983) mention that parent education for fathers was a neglected area and that studies on child development mainly focused on the relationship between a mother and her children. The father's role in child development and outcomes had received limited attention in educational and psychological research studies until the late 1970's. After that time, fathers might not be the primary source of income for the family; and due to full or part time employment, most mothers no

longer stayed at home with the children (Lamb, 1997). Fathers participation in child-rearing has been slowly changing since the 1970's, which Lamb (1979) called an "era of paternal rediscovery".

Due to alterations in the structure of the family and in family roles, more studies in the past three decades have focused on the father and his various roles in the family (Cooksey & Fondell, 1996). Research on the father-child relationship has followed three lines. Initial studies centered on the comparison of the relationship that children establish with their father and mother (Brody, Pillegrini, & Sigel, 1986). Other studies have tended to examine the role of fathers, in terms of their absence, on the development of psychological problems of children. In addition to the above mentioned studies, current ones have been extended to emphasize specific characteristics of the father-child interaction and their influence on diverse areas of the child's development. For instance, Fagan and Iglesias (1999) indicated that father involvement and nurturance were also positively associated with the intellectual development, internal locus of control, and social competence of children.

Furthermore, examination of the relationship between father and adolescents shows that the father-child relationship is associated in a similar way with adolescents' relationship with peers. Parents, specifically fathers, are a power role model for children and due to the changes in today fathers, many fathers allocate more time to their children in indirect interaction, which results in more opportunities for children to observe and learn from their fathers (McBride & Rane, 1997). Children's social competence with peers occurs by means of imitation of an adult model (Schneider, 1999), in other words, by modeling or imitating their father, children would learn both a dyadic style of interaction and the social responses associated with their father and would use those skills in their interactions with peers.

In Turkey, there have been limited studies related with effect of the father on child development. In her study, Koçak (2004) investigated the effects of the Father Support Program on fathers' experiences, relations and perceptions of their role on child development. The aim of the program was to inform and support fathers about child development and to create an awareness regarding their importance in child education. Three pilot studies of the program were carried out from 1996 to 1999, and the program was implemented on a larger scale in İstanbul and Kocaeli. Findings of the study showed that the program fulfilled its aim in creating an awareness and consciousness in fathers regarding their children's development and education.

In a recent study, Şahin (2006) examined the impacts of parent education on children's social skills. The sample of the study was composed of 29 third grade students' parents. The study was designed with two training groups (experimental group I - father involved and experimental group II - father uninvolved). The experimental group received a ten-week parent

education. The results revealed that parent education which involved fathers had a significant effect on children's self-control dimension and total social skills scores.

In conclusion, in the light of research evidence one can assume that developing parent training, especially for fathers, and assessing their differential effect on parent-adolescent relationships and adolescents' peer relationship, appears to be important. Father Involvement Training may help fathers to acquire the knowledge and behavior required to improve relationship with their children (e.g. better use of time, more information on their children) and encourage them on their children's interactions in peer groups, thus contributing effectively to family communication and interaction.

The purpose of this current experimental study is twofold: (a) to design and determine the effect of Father Involvement Training (FIT), which is based on social-cognitive theory principles, on family functioning in father-adolescent relationships (e.g. better use of time, confidence), (b) to examine the effect of Father Involvement Training (FIT) on the quality of the peer relationship of 9th grade high school students, whose fathers were in either the experimental group or the control group.

METHOD

Population and Sample Selection

The population of this study included all fathers of ninth-grade students enrolled in public high schools in the Ankara metropolitan area. Due to the intensive nature and the mandatory 10-week participation requirements, only 26 volunteer fathers were able to take part in the training. 13 of them were assigned to the experimental group and the remaining 13 were assigned to the control group.

Over half of the participants (57.6%) had two children, the majority of whom were girls (65.4%). In general, educational levels of fathers were high, with the majority (77%) being university graduates employed at public institutions (38.4%). Most fathers (69.2%) were in the 40-49 year age group (Range= 35-53 years; M= 43.2 years, SD= 4.97). Children's ages ranged from 15-17 years (M= 15.84 years, SD= .46). Significantly, 42.3 percent of participating fathers had working wives, whereas the wives of the remaining 57.6 percent did not work. All subjects were the biological fathers, and all lived in the same household as their spouses and children.

Measure and Procedure

The data were obtained through three different instruments. The first one was the Parent Success Indicator (PSI). The PSI, developed by Strom and Strom, was adapted for Turkish culture by Özeke-Kocabaş (2005). PSI was used to assess the quality of various dimensions of the father-child

relationship. The data obtained was subjected to factor analysis, and an adapted Turkish PSI parent form consisting of PSI 59 items converging under five meaningful dimensions, and reliability and internal consistency of the PSI parent form, were assessed by computing Cronbach's alpha coefficients, which were as follows: Total Scale: .90, Communication: .86, Use of Time: .70, Satisfaction: .82, Confidence: .75, and Information Needs: .78. The PSI items are rated on a four-point Likert Scale and weighted from 1 (never) to 4 (always).

The second instrument was the Parent-Adolescent Relationship Scale (PARS). The PARS, developed by Kaner (2002), is a means of measurement to assess adolescent perceptions of parental relationships with their parents. Factor analysis yielded seven factors with regards to adolescent-mother relationships and eight factors for adolescent-father relationships. This study utilized the father form only. The PARS Father Form consists of 54 items converging under eight meaningful dimensions, and reliability and internal consistency of the PARS father form were assessed by computing Cronbach's alpha coefficients, which were as follows: Total Scale: .93, Close Relationships: .86, Involvement Activities: .85, Sensitivity: .83, Love and Trust: .80, Monitoring: .64, Norm Regulations: .78, Meeting Expectations: .74, and Home Regulations: .52. The PARS items are rated on a five-point Likert Scale and weighted from 1 (never) to 5 (always).

The last one was the Peer Relationship Scale (PRS) developed by Kaner (2002) to investigate adolescent-peer relationships. Principle component analysis with varimax rotation yielded 37 items, and subsequent analysis found 18 items converged under four meaningful dimensions. Reliability and internal consistency of the PRS form were assessed by computing Cronbach's alpha coefficients, which were as follows: Total Scale: .86, Attachment: .86, Trust and Identification: .69, Self-disclosure: .58, and Loyalty: .58. The PRS items are rated on a five-point Likert Scale and weighted from 1 (never) to 5 (always).

The Father Involvement Training was implemented in 10 two-hour sessions held once a week. Over the course of the training, 14 separate skills were introduced. Each session comprised a brief discussion of homework assignments, introduction of the session theme and a related scenario, a discussion of skills strategies included in the scenario, and a discussion of similarities and differences in the participating fathers' experiences with their children. Social Cognitive Theory provided the framework for determining the guiding principles of the training, which comprised instruction, rehearsal, feedback and homework.

Data Analysis

Although Repeated Measures of MANOVA testing had been initially planned by the researcher, results of the data obtained did not meet the

necessary criteria for MANOVA; therefore, non-parametric testing was used as an alternative. The Mann-Whitney U Test is a non-parametric alternative for two independent samples that evaluates whether medians of test variables differ significantly between two groups (Green, Salkind, & Akey, 2000). Friedman tests were used to determine whether or not differences existed in pre-test, post-test and follow-up PSI, PARS, and PRS scores for either group. Wilcoxon Sign Rank tests were used for post-hoc analysis of significant differences in pre-test, post-test, and follow-up scores between groups.

RESULTS

Findings on Family Functioning Level of Fathers

The results of the Mann-Whitney U tests indicated no significant difference between the experimental and control group for pre-test scores on each dimension and total scores of the PSI ($z = -.901$, $p = .368$ for communication; $z = -.833$, $p = .405$ for use of time; $z = -.180$, $p = .857$ for satisfaction; $z = -1.326$, $p = .185$ for confidence; $z = -1.187$, $p = .235$ for information need, and $z = -.077$, $p = .939$ for total score). The results revealed that the mean rank of the experimental and control groups on the five dimensions and total scores of PSI were equal before implementing Father Involvement Training. Yet a significant difference was revealed between the experimental and control groups for post-test total scores of the PSI as shown in Table 1 ($z = -1.977$, $p < .05$).

Table 1. Mean Ranks of Experimental and Control Group Fathers for Post-test Scores of Parent Success Indicator (PSI)

Mann-Whitney U Test							
Dimensions of PSI	Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	U	z	p
Communication	Experimental	13	16.040	208.500	51.500	-1.698	.090
	Control	13	10.960	142.500			
Use of time	Experimental	13	14.080	183.000	77.000	-.389	.697
	Control	13	12.920	168.000			
Satisfaction	Experimental	13	16.190	210.500	49.500	-1.811	.070
	Control	13	10.810	140.500			
Confidence	Experimental	13	15.730	204.500	55.500	-1.498	.134
	Control	13	11.270	146.500			
Information need	Experimental	13	15.500	201.500	58.500	-1.339	.181
	Control	13	11.500	149.500			
Total	Experimental	13	16.460	214.000	46.000	-1.977	.048
	Control	13	10.540	137.000			

The results revealed no significant difference between the experimental and control groups for the post-test scores on the five dimensions ($z = -1.698$,

$p=.090$ for communication; $z= -.389$, $p= .697$ for use of time; $z= -1.811$, $p= .070$ for satisfaction; $z= -1.498$, $p= .134$ for confidence; $z= -1.339$, $p= .181$ for information need).

Another Mann-Whitney U test was carried out to evaluate the difference between the experimental and control groups for follow-up scores of PSI (Table 2). The results of the Mann-Whitney U test revealed that a significant difference was observed between the experimental and control groups for follow-up total scores of PSI ($z= -2.233$, $p< .05$), but no significant difference between the experimental and the control groups for follow-up scores on the five dimensions of PSI, ($z= -.824$, $p=.410$ for communication; $z= -.756$, $p= .450$ for use of time; $z= -1.624$, $p= .104$ for satisfaction; $z= -1.736$, $p= .083$ for confidence; $z= -1.960$, $p= .05$ for information need).

Table 2. Mean Ranks of Experimental and Control Group Fathers for Follow-up Scores of Parent Success Indicator (PSI)

Mann-Whitney U Test							
Dimensions of PSI	Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	U	z	p
Communication	Experimental	13	14.730	191.500	68.500	-.824	.410
	Control	13	12.270	159.500			
Use of time	Experimental	13	14.620	190.000	70.000	-.756	.450
	Control	13	12.380	161.000			
Satisfaction	Experimental	13	15.920	207.000	53.000	-1.624	.104
	Control	13	11.080	144.000			
Confidence	Experimental	13	16.080	209.000	51.000	-1.736	.083
	Control	13	10.920	142.000			
Information need	Experimental	13	16.420	213.500	46.500	-1.960	.050
	Control	13	10.580	137.500			
Total	Experimental	13	16.850	219.000	41.000	-2.233	.026
	Control	13	10.150	132.000			

In order to identify the differences among pre-test, post-test and follow-up measures of the experimental group fathers' ratings on the five dimensions and the total scores of PSI, a Friedman test was used. The results of the Friedman test revealed that there was no significant improvement for the five dimensions [$\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)}= 6.00$, $p=.05$ for communication; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)}= 3.81$, $p= .148$ for use of time; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)}= 1.85$, $p= .395$ for satisfaction; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)}= 5.24$, $p= .073$ for confidence; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)}= 2.17$, $p= .337$ for information need]

and total scores of the experimental group from pre-test to follow-up measures [$\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 5.167, p=.076$].

A similar statistical procedure was followed for the control group. A Friedman test was conducted to evaluate whether the control group fathers demonstrated any significant improvement from their pre-test to follow-up measures of PSI. There was no significant improvement in the control group fathers' scores from pre-test to follow-up measures on the five dimensions [$\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = .167, p=.92$ for communication; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = .600, p=.739$ for use of time; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 5.20, p=.074$ for satisfaction; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 1.36, p=.504$ for confidence; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = .250, p=.882$ for information need] and the total scores of PSI [$\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 3.75, p=.153$].

Findings on Family Functioning Level of Adolescents

The results of the first Mann-Whitney U tests yielded no significant difference between the children whose fathers were in the experimental group and for those in the control group in terms of the pre-test scores on the eight dimensions and total scores of the PARS, ($z=-1.321, p=.186$ for norm regulations; $z=-1.161, p=.246$ for monitoring; $z=-.705, p=.481$ for home rules; $z=-.788, p=.431$ for love and trust; $z=-1.293, p=.196$ for sensitivity; $z=-1.002, p=.317$ for close relationship; $z=-1.651, p=.099$ for meeting expectations; $z=-.515, p=.606$ for involvement activities; $z=-1.154, p=.248$ for the total score).

The results indicated that there was a significant difference between the children of experimental and control group fathers for post-test scores on the close relationship dimension of PARS ($z=-2.160, p<.05$). However, the Mann-Whitney U test revealed no significant difference between the children of experimental and control group fathers for post-test scores on total and other dimensions of PARS ($z=-1.188, p=.235$ for norm regulations; $z=-.389, p=.697$ for monitoring; $z=-.104, p=.917$ for home rules; $z=-.754, p=.451$ for love and trust; $z=-1.648, p=.099$ for sensitivity; $z=-1.650, p=.099$ for meeting expectations; $z=-.750, p=.453$ for involvement activities; $z=-1.206, p=.228$ for total score).

The results of the third Mann-Whitney U test yielded no significant differences between the children of experimental and control groups' fathers for follow-up total and dimension scores of PARS ($z=-.311, p=.756$ for norm regulations; $z=-.543, p=.587$ for monitoring; $z=-.134, p=.894$ for home rules; $z=-1.374, p=.140$ for love and trust; $z=-1.949, p=.196$ for sensitivity; $z=-1.003, p=.316$ for close relationship; $z=-.079, p=.937$ for meeting expectations; $z=-.335, p=.738$ for involvement activities; $z=-1.693, p=.090$ for the total score).

In order to reveal the differences among pre-test, post-test and follow-up dimensional and total scores of PARS for children whose fathers were in the experimental group, a Friedman test was used. Table 3 shows the changes in PARS scores of children from pre-test to follow-up measures.

Table 3. Mean Ranks of Children of Experimental Group Fathers for Pre-test, Post-test and Follow-up Scores on Parent Adolescent Relationship Scale (PARS)

Dimensions of PARS	Measures	N	Mean	Sd	Mean rank	χ^2	df	p
Norm Regulations	Pretest	13	4.14	.69	1.92	2.36	2	.307
	Posttest	13	4.34	.63	2.27			
	Follow-up	13	4.25	.32	1.81			
Monitoring	Pretest	13	3.30	.95	1.88	.684	2	.710
	Posttest	13	3.40	1.16	2.15			
	Follow-up	13	3.26	.83	1.96			
Home Rules	Pretest	13	3.57	.99	1.81	3.61	2	.206
	Posttest	13	3.86	.86	2.31			
	Follow-up	13	3.73	.59	1.88			
Love and Trust	Pretest	13	4.34	.76	1.85	.735	2	.682
	Posttest	13	4.38	.66	2.12			
	Follow-up	13	4.30	.84	2.04			
Sensitivity	Pretest	13	4.14	.61	1.50	7.13	2	.028
	Posttest	13	4.29	.71	2.46			
	Follow-up	13	4.23	.90	2.04			
Close Relationship	Pretest	13	3.15	.87	1.85	4.87	2	.088
	Posttest	13	3.63	.80	2.46			
	Follow-up	13	3.12	.99	1.69			
Meeting Expectations	Pretest	13	3.80	.66	2.12	6.46	2	.039
	Posttest	13	3.84	1.12	2.13			
	Follow-up	13	3.26	1.11	1.58			
Involvement Activities	Pretest	13	3.64	1.04	2.04	4.53	2	.104
	Posttest	13	4.01	.98	2.38			
	Follow-up	13	3.46	1.03	1.58			
Total	Pretest	13	3.74	.64	1.92	3.36	2	.186
	Posttest	13	3.98	.67	2.38			
	Follow-up	13	3.71	.69	1.69			

As seen in Table 3, there was a significant difference in the scores of children of the experimental group fathers for the sensitivity and meeting expectations dimensions from pre-test to follow-up measures; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)}=7.13$, $p<.05$ and $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)}=6.46$, $p<.05$, respectively. The results indicated no gain in other dimensions and the total score of PARS.

A Wilcoxon Signed Rank test was used as a post-hoc procedure for the children's sensitivity and meeting expectations scores. Although the Friedman test revealed significant differences among the pre-test, post-test and follow-up scores of the sensitivity dimension, the Wilcoxon Signed Rank test yielded no significant difference between the pre-test-post-test ($z= -1.962$, $p= .05$), post-test-follow-up ($z= -.534$, $p= .593$), and pre-test-follow-up ($z= -1.024$, $p=.306$) measures. On the other hand, the results revealed that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and follow-up meeting expectations dimension scores of PARS in the experimental group fathers' children ($z= -2.263$, $p<.05$). The negative mean rank of the meeting expectations subscale between pre-test and follow-up score was 4.86 and the positive mean rank was

2.0. However, there was no significant difference between the pre-test and post-test measures of the meeting expectations dimension ($z = -.259, p = .796$) for the children of experimental group fathers.

In order to analyze whether the control group fathers' children showed any significant improvement in their PARS scores from pre-test to follow-up measures, a Friedman test was employed. According to the results of the Friedman test, there was no significant improvement in PARS dimensional [$\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 2.13, p = .345$ for norm regulations; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = .341, p = .843$ for monitoring; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 1.08, p = .581$ for home rules; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 5.16, p = .076$ for love and trust; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = .174, p = .917$ for sensitivity; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 1.59, p = .465$ for close relationship; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 2.93, p = .231$ for meeting expectations; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = .286, p = .867$ for involvement activities] and the total scores [$\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 5.26, p = .072$] of children whose fathers were in the control group.

Findings on Adolescent's Peer Relationships

The results of the Mann-Whitney U test indicated no significant difference between the children of experimental and control group fathers for pretest dimensional and total scores of PRS ($z = -.700, p = .484$ for attachment; $z = -1.383, p = .167$ for trust and identification; $z = -1.479, p = .139$ for self-disclosure; $z = -.546, p = .584$ for loyalty; $z = -.077, p = .938$ for total score). These results emphasized that the mean ranks of the children of experimental and control group fathers for pre-test dimensional and total scores of PRS were equal before implementing the Father Involvement Training.

Likewise, the results of the study indicated that there was no significant difference between the children whose fathers were in the experimental group and children whose fathers were in the control group for post-test total and dimensional scores of the PRS ($z = -.129, p = .897$ for attachment; $z = -.261, p = .794$ for trust and identification; $z = -1.942, p = .052$ for self-disclosure; $z = -1.648, p = .099$ for loyalty; $z = -1.698, p = .089$ for the total score).

However, the results in Table 4 show there was a significant difference between the ratings of children whose fathers were in the experimental group and children whose fathers were in the control group in terms of follow-up scores on the trust and identification dimension of PRS ($z = -2.032, p < .05$). Nevertheless, the Mann-Whitney U test revealed no significant difference between the children of experimental and control group fathers for follow-up scores on the total and other dimensions of PRS ($z = -1.267, p = .205$ for attachment; $z = -.675, p = .500$ for self-disclosure; $z = -.569, p = .570$ for loyalty; $z = -.464, p = .643$ for total score).

Table 4. Mean Ranks of Children of Experimental and Control Groups for Follow-up Scores on Peer Relationship Scale (PRS)

Mann-Whitney U Test							
Dimensions of PRS	Groups of Fathers	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	U	z	p
Attachment	Experimental	13	15.380	200.000	60.000	-1.267	.205
	Control	13	11.620	151.000			
Trust and Identification	Experimental	13	16.500	214.500	45.500	-2.032	.042
	Control	13	10.500	136.500			
Self-Disclosure	Experimental	13	12.500	162.500	71.500	.675	.500
	Control	13	14.500	188.500			
Loyalty	Experimental	13	12.650	164.500	73.500	.569	.570
	Control	13	14.350	186.500			
Total	Experimental	13	14.190	184.500	75.500	-.464	.643
	Control	13	12.810	166.500			

In order to reveal the differences among pre-test, post-test and follow-up dimensional and total scores of PARS for children whose fathers were in the experimental group, a Friedman Test was carried out. The Friedman test revealed no significant differences in PRS pre-test, post-test and follow-up scores of children whose fathers were in the experimental group [$\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 1.60$, $p = .44$ for attachment; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 2.53$, $p = .28$ for trust and identification; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 1.89$, $p = .38$ for self-disclosure; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 1.60$, $p = .44$ for loyalty; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = .55$, $p = .75$ for total score].

The last Friedman test was conducted to evaluate whether the ratings of children whose fathers were in the control group showed any significant improvement in PRS scores from pre-test to follow-up measures. The results revealed no significant difference in PRS pre-test, post-test and follow-up scores of children whose fathers were in the control group [$\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 2.44$, $p = .29$ for attachment; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = .047$, $p = .97$ for trust and identification; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 4.15$, $p = .12$ for self-disclosure; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 1.72$, $p = .42$ for loyalty; $\chi^2_{(df=2, N=13)} = 1.75$, $p = .41$ for total score].

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

Results of the study identified that although there was no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in terms of the communication, use of time, satisfaction, confidence and information need dimensions of the family functioning assessed in this study, the results showed that the experimental group fathers had gained higher total scores both at the end of the study and in the follow-up measures of PSI, compared to control group fathers. To sum up, the findings of the present study appear to be consistent with training, which has recently been designed for fathers, and resulted in positive contributions to the relationship between fathers and children as well as family life (Aydın, 2003; Fagan & Iglesias, 1999).

This result can be accounted for by the changing role of women and men in the Turkish family with the change in social and economical conditions. According to Fişek (1982), these changes have created an egalitarian style between spouses especially in the life of families living in urban areas. Several studies indicated that when parents are highly educated, are dual-earner families, and have a middle income, the fathers' involvement in childcare and housework increases (Ahmeduzzaman & Roopnarine, 1992; Yılmazçetin 2003). In the present study, the fathers of the experimental group were highly educated and had a regular job. This may demonstrate that fathers underwent positive changes in their relationship with their children during the training. This may be interpreted as an explanation for the improvement of fathers' total gain in the relationship with their children.

The results obtained from children whose fathers were in the experimental group and received FIT perceived positive changes in their relationship with their fathers, as seen in the PARS scores. When the children's ratings were compared, it was observed that there was a significant effect of the training on the close relationship in the post-test measures of children whose father received FIT. However, the gain was not maintained in the follow-up six months later. This result showed that the gained skills were not displayed or observed after some time. An explanation for this result could be stated that one of the objectives of the father involvement training developed in the present study was to make fathers reinforce the socially skilled behaviors of their children. Based on the findings, the significant difference in the post-test scores might indicate that some skills (effective communication, close-relationship) were taught in natural settings but fathers might have not continued to reinforce the taught skills.

The results of the study also indicated that in the ratings of children whose fathers were in the experimental group, the meeting expectations dimension scores decreased from post-tests to follow-up and from pre-test to follow-up measures of the PARS. Namely, children feel that they do not meet their father's expectations and they are not the kind of child their father desires. Interestingly, children feel that they do not meet their father's expectations and they are not the kind of child their father desires while there was a very close and sensitive relationship between fathers and children in terms of fathers' ratings. These findings reveal that adolescent children may have a different perception of their relationship with their father. This discrepancy can be explained by Grotevant and Cooper's (1985) model of "individuation" that views both adolescent individuation and connectedness to the family as being important during adolescence. The individuation process is a cooperative endeavor between parent and child that involves the child asserting and parents granting independence while both parent and adolescents maintain their connection.

In addition, this finding of the present study appears to be in line with those of Kağıtçıbaşı and Ataca (2005). In their recent study, Kağıtçıbaşı and Ataca (2005) revealed that the desired qualities of children have been changing over three decades compared with 1975. Independence/self-reliance was not an important desired quality of children in 1975; however, today it has started to emerge as a desired child quality, especially for the urban high SES families (Kağıtçıbaşı, & Ataca, 2005). In other words, this change in parenting orientation reflects the emergence of autonomy in child rearing together with changing lifestyles. This change was posited by Kağıtçıbaşı (1996) as the “Family Change Model” to provide a great deal of information and insight into understanding the current situation and dynamics of change in Turkish society. In the present study, the decrease in children’s expectation score can be explained by the independence and self-reliance concepts of Kağıtçıbaşı’s family change model. That is, the emphasis of the training was on practical skills to motivate fathers to focus on interaction with their children and very close and sensitive father-child relationships may promote the development of independence and self-reliance of the child. Hence, a child may not feel that he/she meets the father’s expectations and desires.

Given the findings of adolescents’ peer relationships, the results of the current study revealed that there was a significant difference between children whose fathers were in the experimental group and children whose fathers were in the control group in the trust and identification dimension of the Peer Relationship Scale (PRS) scores in the follow-up measure. A possible interpretation of this outcome is that the significant improvement in trust and identification shows that children were overpowered by the main strategy of the training. The present study consists of a demonstration or modeling of appropriate social skills, discussion, and reasoning about social skills as well as the use of reinforcement to improve children’s social skills. This finding of the study may be the result of the training’s emphasis on social cognitive skills to motivate fathers to improve their children’s social skills in actual social situations.

In conclusion, the results of the study showed that father involvement training was effective in terms of improving the overall family functioning of fathers. A particular strength of the training seems to be the ability to encourage fathers to apply skills in their relationship with their adolescent children. Results of the current study might be valuable for identifying the dimensions of parent-adolescent relationships that could be targeted in prevention and intervention programs.

The results of the study may ultimately allow interventions to be designed that are geared towards improving the father-child relationship. Especially by understanding the way adolescents perceive their relationship with their fathers, school counselors may develop workshops or group training sessions in which adolescents and fathers participate to learn various skills to

help them improve the quality of their relationship, including components like communication skills, positive discipline, and social interaction management. The aim of this kind of training or education program is to strengthen the bond between adolescents and their parents, so that they can establish better interaction to overcome difficulties in this transitional period.

It is through these efforts that school counselors, researchers and practitioners alike will develop a better understanding of the modifiability of father involvement in adolescent development. This improved understanding may lead to the development and implementation of parent training and support programs or training that can effectively increase fathering options.

REFERENCES

- Ahmeduzzaman, M., & Roopnarine, J. (1992). Sociodemographic factors, functioning style, social support, and fathers' involvement in African American intact families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 699-707.
- Aydın, A. (2003). *The effect of father involvement training on the fathers' involvement level and perceptions of their fathering roles*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara: Turkey.
- Brody, G. H., Pillegrini, A. D., & Sigel I. E. (1986). Marital quality and mother-child and father-child interactions with school-aged children. *Developmental Psychology*, 22(3), 291-296.
- Cooksey, E. C., & Fondell, M. M. (1996). Spending time with his kids: Effects of family structure on fathers' and children's lives. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 693-707.
- Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis*. New York: W., W. Norton.
- Fagan, J., & Iglesias, A. (1999). Father involvement program effects on fathers, fathers' figures, and their head start children: A quasi-experimental study. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 14(2), 243-269.
- Fişek, G. O. (1982). Psychopathology and the Turkish family: A family system theory analysis. In Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Ed.), *Sex roles, family and community in Turkey* (pp. 295-321). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Green, S. B., Salkind, N. J., & Akey, T. M. (2000). *Using SPSS for windows. Analyzing and understanding data*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Grotevant, H. D., & Cooper, C. R. (1985). Patterns of interaction in family relationship and the development of identity exploration in adolescence. *Child Development*, 56(2), 415-429.
- Kaner, S. (2002). Kontrol kuramına dayalı anababa-ergen ilişkileri ölçeği geliştirme çalışması. *Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33(1-2). Ankara: Ayrı Baskı, Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.

- Kaner, S. (2002). Akran ilişkileri ölçeği ve akran sapması ölçeği geliştirme çalışması. *Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33(1-2). Ankara: Ayrı Baskı. Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures. A view from the other side*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of children and family change: A three-decade portrait from Turkey. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(3), 317-337.
- Koçak, A. A. (2004). *Evaluation report of the father support program*. Retrieved July 26, 2007 from www.acev.org/english/researches/research/eng_er_fsp.doc.
- Ladd, G. W., & Pettit, G. S. (2002). Parenting and the development of children's peer relationship. M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of Parenting*, Vol: 5. Practical Issues in Parenting. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Lamb, M. E. (1979). Paternal influences and the father's role. *American Psychologist*, 34, 938-943.
- Lamb, M. E. (1997). Father and child development: An introductory overview and guide. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development*. (3rd ed, pp.1-18). New York: JohnWiley.
- Levant, F. R., & Doyle, F. G. (1983). An evaluation of a parent education program for fathers of school-aged children. *Family Relations*, 32, 29-37.
- McBride, B. A., & Rane T. R. (1997). Role identity, role investment, and paternal involvement: Implications for parenting program for man. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 12, 173-197.
- Özeke-Kocabas, E. (2005). *The effects of a parent training on different dimensions of parent adolescent relationships*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Santrock, J. W. (2005). *Adolescence*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Savin-Williams, R., & Berndt, T. J. (1990). Friendship and peer relations. In S. S. Feldman & G. R. Elliott (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (pp. 277-307). Cambridge: MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schneider, B. H. (1999). Children's social competence in context. In M. Woodhead, D. Faulker & K. Littleton (Eds.), *Making sense of social development*. London: Routledge
- Şahin, R. (2006). *The effect of parent education on third grade children's social skills*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara..
- Yılmazçetin, C. (2003). *The relationship between father involvement and behavioral problems of preadolescents*. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul.