A central goal of many responsible fatherhood (RF) programs is helping fathers overcome barriers to effective and nurturing parenting. The quality of the father–child relationship links to many areas of children’s well-being, including language development, social well-being, and juvenile delinquency (Adamsons and Johnson 2013; Cabrera et al. 2007; Yoder et al. 2016). By improving fathers’ parenting, RF programs could ultimately benefit children. Promisingly, RF programs have had favorable effects on fathers’ parenting and father–child interactions (Holmes et al. 2018).

This brief explores how RF programs could improve child well-being by supporting fathers’ parenting engagement. Fathers’ parenting engagement refers to the ways in which fathers interact with their children, for example, how they discipline their children, how nurturing they are, and whether they use corporal punishment. The goals were to identify the following:

1. Rigorous, recent research on programs designed to improve fathers’ parenting engagement, even if the programs were more specialized than typical RF programs
2. Any approach, within and across programs with evidence of effectiveness on fathers’ parenting engagement, that RF programs might incorporate

Little is known about common RF program approaches to supporting fathers’ engagement with their children. Evaluations have typically focused on a few programs and shown favorable but modest effects (Holmes et al. 2018). RF programs might benefit from including the approaches highlighted in this brief. If they are already using them, programs could consider the evidence on how the approaches might be implemented most effectively. Researchers could further assess ways to implement these approaches in RF programs and effectiveness in those settings.

We start with an overview of how fathers’ parenting engagement can benefit children and then provide a brief background on RF programs. After, we summarize the research we identified and highlight practices or approaches designed to improve fathers’ engagement with their children.
BENEFITS OF FATHERS’ PARENTING ENGAGEMENT ON CHILD WELL-BEING

Fathers’ parenting engagement reflects the ways in which a father interacts with his children through shared activities with the child in caretaking, play, or leisure (Lamb et al. 1985). The quality of fathers’ parenting engagement is associated with many aspects of child well-being (Adamsons and Johnson 2013). For example, high-quality parenting engagement is associated with fewer behavioral problems, improved eating habits, and decreased likelihood of smoking or dropping out of school (Coley and Medeiros 2007; Menning 2006; Stewart and Menning 2009; Yoder et al. 2016). Strong parenting skills can enhance the quality of fathers’ engagement with their children. For example, a father’s discipline skills determine the extent to which he is supportive, sensitive, age-appropriate, and effective at changing his child’s behavior.

Importantly, the favorable associations are not limited to resident fathers or fathers with higher levels of income (Adamsons and Johnson 2013; Roopnarine and Hossain 2013). For example, low-income fathers’ developmentally appropriate play with children appears important to children’s cognitive and language ability (Black et al. 1999; Cabrera et al. 2017). Fathers’ responsiveness or prompt replies to their child predicts positive cognitive outcomes, early language development, and emotional development (Cabrera et al. 2007).

In a meta-analysis of 52 studies on nonresident fatherhood and child wellbeing, high-quality father–child engagement had stronger links to positive child outcomes than did the quantity of father involvement or financial support across multiple domains of children’s well-being. These included children’s and adolescents’ psychological well-being (life satisfaction, depression, and anxiety), academic achievement (grades and test scores), behavioral outcomes (delinquency and externalizing behavior) and social outcomes (peer and romantic relationships) (Adamsons and Johnson 2013).

Often, however, nonresident fathers with low incomes face barriers to being fully engaged. Fathers’ ability to engage with their children depends on their access to them, which might be limited if the father has a poor relationship with the mother (Edin and Nelson 2013; Sobolewski and King 2005). Men who grew up without positive father role models might lack knowledge on appropriate ways to engage their children (Holcomb et al. 2015). Other challenges, which can directly or indirectly influence fathers’ parenting engagement, include substance abuse, trauma, and depression (Edin and Nelson 2013; Roy and Dyson 2010).

RF PROGRAMS AND THEIR SUPPORT OF FATHERS’ PARENTING ENGAGEMENT

Widespread funding for fatherhood programs began in the 1990s. Congress created the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program, which enabled states to use part of their funding to promote two-parent families, marriage, and father involvement (Cowan et al. 2010; Martinson and Nightingale 2008; U.S. Congress 1996). As interest in and funding for services grew, public and private organizations developed hundreds of fatherhood programs across the country (Martinson and Nightingale 2008).

Since 2006, Congress has dedicated substantial funding each year to support RF programming (U.S. Congress 2010). Based on the statute, RF programs awarded grants and overseen by the Office of Family Assistance (OFA) must offer services to promote responsible parenting, foster economic stability, and promote or sustain marriage. RF programs typically offer a combination of group-based curricula, case management, employment services, and peer support aimed at increasing fathers’ capacity as parents (Knox et al. 2011).

The RF programs’ parenting services are most directly tied to supporting and enhancing fathers’ parenting engagement. A study of four RF programs funded by ACF showed that the core parenting group-based workshops typically covered child development, the meaning of fatherhood, and co-parenting (Dion et al. 2018).
The workshops also taught effective parenting skills, such as being nurturing and using positive reinforcement (Dion et al. 2018, Zaveri et al. 2015). RF programs promoted other aspects of parenting—which could indirectly affect parenting engagement—by teaching fathers skills for working cooperatively with the mothers of their children and by providing employment services.

RESEARCH ON PARENTING PROGRAMS AND THEIR EFFECT ON FATHERS’ PARENTING ENGAGEMENT

Despite the importance of the subject, there is little research evidence on how to best support and strengthen fathers’ parenting engagement. Most available research was conducted with mothers and focuses on young children, such as those birth to age five (Grindal et al. 2016, Kaminski et al. 2008). It is unclear how well those practices or approaches would work with fathers (particularly non-resident fathers) or older children.

We searched and screened studies to identify recent impact evaluations of parenting programs focused on fathers’ parenting engagement and skills (Appendix A has details of the approach). We found 13 relevant studies of 12 programs. Eleven studies (of 10 programs) found favorable effects on fathers’ parenting engagement (Appendix B has more information about the studies).

Eleven of the 12 programs served only fathers. We included one program that involved couples in our analysis because it explicitly targeted fathers’ accessibility and parenting engagement. Some primarily served fathers who were minorities or had low incomes (for example, by recruiting fathers of children enrolled in Head Start), others served fathers who were experiencing divorce or separation or and still others focused on fathers of children with behavioral problems.

The most common format used by the fatherhood programs involved group workshops or parenting classes. The group sessions were led by a trained facilitator and typically lasted five to eight weeks or sessions. A few programs used a home visiting approach in which program staff would visit fathers in their homes to deliver program content and engage fathers in practicing parenting skills. One program was delivered entirely online.

Generally, the studies had small samples and short follow-ups, with a range of outcomes across them. Only the two federally funded impact evaluations (Avellar et al. 2018 and Cancian et al. 2019) had more than 500 fathers in their analysis. Most studies relied on fathers’ reports of their own behavior or skills, but a few used coded observational measures (such as coding videotaped play sessions between the father and their child; Roggman et al. 2004). Many of the studies measured outcomes immediately after program completion and none of the studies had a follow-up period longer than one year after the end of the intervention.

In summary, our scan of recent studies suggests parenting programs can improve fathers’ parenting engagement with their children, at least in the short term. But we must be careful in drawing broad conclusions, because the interventions, outcomes, data collection, and analysis across studies varies. Further, most existing studies were not conducted in RF programs (as funded by OFA, with multiple, required services), and their effectiveness could differ in that context. More research on these programs, ideally with larger samples, longer follow-up periods, and within similar implementation settings and contexts of RF programs, would enable firmer conclusions about the promise of these approaches.

PROMISING APPROACHES FOR IMPROVING FATHERS’ PARENTING ENGAGEMENT

Although the current evidence base has limitations, the evidence is also promising because programs have had effects on fathers’ parenting engagement. We looked for promising approaches across the studies, each of which examined the effects of a specific intervention. We identified three approaches across six studies that were good candidates for integrating into RF programs (Figure 1): behavioral parent training (BPT), video-
modeling and web-based programming. BPT is a method to teach parenting behaviors, video modeling is a way of teaching skills, and web-based programming is a medium for delivering content. Although the approaches were supported by at least one study, it is not possible for us to determine whether the approach itself or other aspects of the program caused the favorable effects. We highlight each approach here.

1. Behavioral parenting training (BPT)

BPT is a form of cognitive behavioral therapy that focuses on giving parents skills and strategies to more effectively manage their child’s behavior. BPT has emerged as one of the most successful and well-researched interventions to date in treating and preventing child and adolescent problem behaviors, with extensive empirical support (Mingebach et al. 2018). Similarly, considerable evidence suggests that BPT is effective at improving parenting behaviors (Eyberg et al. 2007).

Four of the six studies in our review that examined programs using BPT found favorable effects on fathers’ parenting engagement (Figure 1). BPT can be offered one on one, but of the three programs with favorable effects, one was video-vignette online modules and two were in a group setting. Most programs taught BPT through video modeling, in which trained people demonstrate desired parenting behaviors in a video.

BPT can be effective for preventing child problem behaviors, promoting strong parenting practices, and addressing existing parenting challenges. Two of the studies with favorable effects examined fathers of children without specified issues or challenges, and the third studied fathers of children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Across the studies, all children were age 12 or younger.

A typical BPT program teaches ways to develop structure (for example, household rules) and consequences (for example, time-out) for the child’s target behaviors. The goal of BPT is to disrupt patterns of parental behavior that may otherwise promote oppositional and aggressive behaviors in children (Cornacchio et al. 2017). BPT trains parents in constructive communication strategies such as how to give children effective directions and commands. The commands or requests should be specific, positive, developmentally appropriate, and straightforward. They should also provide an explanation. For example, if a parent wants their child to stop watching videos on their phone and join the family for dinner, an effective command might be: “It’s time for dinner. Please come to the table.” In addition, BPT trains parents in disciplinary strategies such as parents giving differential attention to different child behaviors. Parents are encouraged to give positive attention to their child for appropriate behaviors and to ignore minor misbehavior from the child.

Although BPT shows promise for inclusion in RF programs, our review of the research suggested that a few factors should also be considered:

- RF programs should frame BPT as a strengths-based approach rather than training to fix a parenting deficit. Many fathers in RF programs already feel devalued as parents and, without a strengths-based framing, might be less motivated to engage with BPT or change their behaviors (Fabiano 2007).

- RF programs should tailor BPT to be relevant to the role that non-resident fathers typically play in their children’s lives. For example, a non-resident father might be less likely to ask their child to clean their room. BPT is likely to be more effective in improving skills, and better received by fathers, when the content is tailored for them. One example of such tailoring, the Fathers Supporting Success in Preschoolers program, applied common elements of BPT (such as praise and effective communication) to father–child shared book reading. This program had favorable impacts on positive parenting, coercive parenting, discipline and nurturance modeling (Chacko et al. 2018).

- Although BPT was successfully used in online and group settings, it requires trained clinicians and can be relatively time-intensive for fathers, requiring both in-and out-of-session practice.
### Figure 1. Evidence of effectiveness for selected parenting interventions for fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Evidence of effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Our Acting-out Children: Heightening Essential Skills (Modified)</td>
<td>Group workshops (8 weeks; 1-hour sessions)</td>
<td>At each session: 5-min introduction to a “skill of the day”, followed by a soccer game with children during which fathers are encouraged to apply the skill and are provided feedback.</td>
<td>Fathers of children aged 4-12 years old, who were recently separated or divorced</td>
<td>Reduction in use of negative talk; no impact on use of commands; mixed evidence of impact on use of praise⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Our Acting-out Children: Heightening Essential Skills (Modified)</td>
<td>Interactive program that provides fathers with video modeling, web-based interactive exercises, social connectivity and networking, electronic journal, and email and phone text prompting.</td>
<td>Interactive program that provides fathers with video modeling, web-based interactive exercises, social connectivity and networking, electronic journal, and email and phone text prompting.</td>
<td>Fathers of children attending Head Start</td>
<td>Reduction in use of negative talk; no impact on use of commands; mixed evidence of impact on use of praise⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathering Through Change</td>
<td>Online program (10 weeks)</td>
<td>At each session: fathers view video vignettes focused on parenting errors in the context of father-child shared book reading, followed by group discussion and brainstorming.</td>
<td>Fathers of children attending Head Start</td>
<td>Improvement in discipline, nurturance and positive parenting; reduction in negative parenting⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers Supporting Success in Pre-schoolers</td>
<td>Group workshops (8 weeks; 1.5-hour sessions)</td>
<td>At each visit: fathers use a tablet or computer to watch videos modeling target skills. Then a trained provider engages the father in practicing skills with the child and provides corrective feedback.</td>
<td>Fathers of children aged 2-5 years old at risk for child maltreatment</td>
<td>No impact on use of corporal punishment, non-violent discipline, psychological aggression or neglectful behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SafeCare Dad2Kids</td>
<td>Home visits 6 visits</td>
<td>At each visit: fathers view video vignettes of desirable and undesirable behaviors in daily father-child interactions, followed by group discussion and role-play, with assigned homework.</td>
<td>Fathers of children attending Head Start</td>
<td>No impact on discipline skills or nurturing behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incredible Years</td>
<td>Group workshops (8 weeks)</td>
<td>At each session: fathers view video vignettes of desirable and undesirable behaviors in daily father-child interactions, followed by group discussion and role-play, with assigned homework.</td>
<td>Fathers of children attending Head Start</td>
<td>No impact on discipline skills or nurturing behaviors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions on integrating these promising approaches into RF programs

How can RF programs target fathers’ participation and engagement with BPT? How can BPT be adapted for non-resident fathers who have more limited access to their children? Is BPT effective for fathers of older children? Is video modeling just as effective as in-person modeling at demonstrating parenting skills? Is video modeling effective for fathers without BPT? Should videos model both desirable and undesirable behaviors? How much does the effectiveness of video modeling depend on the quality of feedback, peer discussion or opportunities to practice with one’s child?

2. Video modeling

RF programs could use video-modeling, in which trained people demonstrate desired parenting behaviors in a video (Kaminski et al. 2008; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2009; Grindal et al. 2016). The approach might be an effective tool for teaching a range of parenting skills to improve fathers’ parenting engagement, though current evidence for fathers is based on BPT. As described in the previous section, BPT-focused video modeling had favorable results for three of five programs evaluated (Figure 1). For example, the Coaching Our Acting-out Children: Heightening Essential Skills (COACHES) and Fathers Supporting Success in Preschoolers programs showed videos demonstrating parenting errors and encouraged group discussion and learning (Chacko et al. 2018; Fabiano et al. 2012). Fathers were encouraged to identify parenting errors and brainstorm alternative, which allowed them to use their own expertise (Fabiano et al. 2012).

Broadly, modeling is a well-established approach in parenting education. Video-modeling has advantages over live modeling, in which facilitators model parenting skills in-person to fathers. Multiple studies of parenting programs showed that modeling effective parenting skills was successful, though the research mainly included mothers of young children (Grindal et al. 2016; Kaminski et al. 2008). Both live and video modeling are good for visual learners. Video modeling can incorporate children in the modeled interactions and can simulate a broad range of settings and circumstances, which might not always be possible with live modeling. Video modeling of parenting has been incorporated into a range of BPT programs to increase parents’ exposure to new parenting strategies, increase engagement, and generate discussion of key principles and strategy use (Chacko et al. 2009; Cunningham et al. 2000; Fabiano et al. 2012; Gross et al. 2007; Webster-Stratton 1990).

Our review of the research suggests that RF programs should consider the following factors if they intend to use video modeling:

• Programs should use suitable videos that show men modeling the skills covered in their curriculum. They might need to purchase or borrow existing videos, or create their own. RF programs could create their own videos by recording staff or previous clients, which might be particularly compelling.

• If creating these kinds of videos is too complex or cost prohibitive, an alternative approach is to record each fathers interacting with their child and then an instructor provides feedback (See the box for a description of video self-modeling).

• As with BPT, RF programs must use videos tailored for their program population. For example, the videos should demonstrate skills that are relevant to the activities that non-resident fathers typically engage in with their children. The videos also should be culturally sensitive and appropriate, for example, by using language and showing circumstances that would be familiar to the fathers in the program.

**Video self-modeling**

With this approach, fathers record themselves (or are recorded by others) interacting with their children. The father watches the recordings with an instructor who provides feedback. During the replay of the video, the instructor highlights specific behaviors the father demonstrated in the video to discuss. The instructor provides positive feedback that supports the father (Fukkink 2008).

None of the studies from our literature scan included video self-modeling, but studies from other contexts (for example, programs that served mothers and fatherhood programs outside the United States) suggest that video self-modeling could be an effective tool in improving parents’ engagement (Alvarenga et al. 2019; Magill-Evans et al. 2007). The research suggests video self-modeling is better when combined with in-person instruction, case management, counseling and other forms of parental support (Fukkink 2008).

It is not yet known whether video self-modeling might be difficult to use for non-resident fathers without regular or predictable access to their children. It is also not yet known if self-modeling is effective in RF programs.
3. Web-based programs

Using the Internet to deliver some aspects of a parent training intervention can potentially offer advantages for RF programs. First, it can increase fathers’ access to programs by facilitating delivery of the intervention in new places and formats, such as in remote geographic areas or with subtitles for people who are hearing impaired. Second, its flexibility can enhance fathers’ engagement with the program, such as by allowing fathers to access content at a time and pace that is convenient for them. Low participation in parenting programs is a common challenge (Eisner and Meidert 2011; Fabiano 2007; Nock and Photos 2007).

Our scan found only one fatherhood program that was delivered entirely online and rigorously tested (Figure 1). Fathering Through Change is a 10-week program that includes video modeling, social connectivity and networking, and prompts sent by email and phone text messages. The program encouraged fathers’ interaction with knowledge tests, goal-setting prompts, and an electronic journal to note progress, challenges, and successes. The 10 modules leverage a range of learning processes, including instruction, modeling, and practice. The program reduced fathers’ self-reported coercive parenting behaviors at the three-month post-test (DeGarmo et al. 2019).

Evidence from other contexts suggests that an online approach might be more effective when supplemented with in-person or live online interactions with staff and other participants. For example, a synthesis of studies about online K–12 programs found that blended programs, which included both online and face-to-face instruction had the most promising results, compared with only online and only face-to-face instruction (US Department of Education 2010).

Blended approaches would allow for staff and peer-to-peer interaction, encouraging feedback, support, and bonding (please see text box). With blended approaches, programs could design activities to incorporate active learning techniques, such as group discussions or presentations by program participants, which have been shown to improve student engagement and performance (Freeman et al. 2014; Ambrose et al. 2010).

RF programs interested in using a web-based approach should consider the following:

- Web-based programs might not be suitable for all fathers. Participants with poor technical skills may struggle with online programs. For example, problems navigating the system or difficulty using interactive features would likely interfere with learning. In addition, some fathers might have limited or unreliable access to the internet that could make participation difficult. RF programs should consider how to support fathers with less technical skills or access – for example, by offering use of a computer at the program office.

- A web-based program should be interactive. Programs should consider how to structure the program so that fathers could quickly receive answers to questions and direct, timely feedback. The program should also include—either online or through in-person components—activities such as writing, talking, problem solving, which are known to increase learning (Deslauriers et al. 2019).

- Peer networking and bonding might be harder to foster in an online environment. Although fathers could post messages to each other, for example, that might not be as effective as in-person interactions in cultivating a sense of community and program engagement.
CLOSING THOUGHTS

Although RF programs can improve fathers’ parenting engagement, potentially benefitting child well-being, research has shown modest effects on fathers’ parenting engagement, to date. To identify potentially new approaches that RF programs could incorporate and use to strengthen their capacity to improve fathers’ parenting engagement, we identified 13 rigorous impact studies of programs for fathers. Across those studies, we highlighted three promising approaches that are worth further exploration:

- BPT is a well-studied parenting approach that teaches skills such as differential responses to positive and negative child behaviors. It has been taught through video modeling in group and online settings. BPT can not only help address established problems, but also be used preventatively.

- The effectiveness of video modeling—in which a parenting skill is demonstrated on video—has been demonstrated for BPT, but it might be a strong approach for teaching other parenting practices.

- Web-based programs have the potential to increase fathers’ access to and participation in services. Fathers can participate in services on their own schedule. Research suggests, however, that the approach is best paired with in-person or online interactive components.

We cannot definitively conclude that the highlighted approaches caused the favorable impacts on fathers’ parenting engagement, nor that they would be effective in different settings or with different populations. But the current evidence suggests the approaches have potential for improving fathers’ parenting engagement and skills; RF programs might benefit from adding them to their existing services to further strengthen fathers’ parenting and their children’s well-being.
The studies that did not find program impacts were Self-Brown et al. (2017)’s study of the SafeCare Dad2Kids program and Helfenbaum–Kun and Ortiz’s (2007) study of the Incredible Years program. The lack of impacts in the latter study could be explained by low statistical power; their analyses were based on 15 fathers. SafeCare Dad2Kids emphasized preventing child maltreatment behaviors, whereas the other programs had more general goals such as promoting parenting skills (Self-Brown et al. 2017).
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## Appendix B. Summary of eligible studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program (Citation)</th>
<th>BPT</th>
<th>Video modeling</th>
<th>Web-based</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Coaching Our Acting-out Children: Heightening Essential Skills (COACHES) (Fabiano et al. 2012) | X   | X              | Group workshop | 8 weeks; 2 hours per week | Each session comprises one hour of group BPT for fathers, during which fathers learn how to implement effective parenting strategies through reviewing homework, watching videotapes of parenting errors, discussing and identifying the errors, and generating solutions. The second hour of the session includes a parent-child recreational activity that provides a context for the fathers to practice the parenting strategies taught in the classroom, such as praise and using effective commands, and for clinicians to provide feedback to the fathers. | 55 fathers of children ages 6 to 12 with ADHD | - Significant positive impact on fathers' observed use of praise at post-test  
- Significant negative impact on fathers' observed use of negative talk at post-test  
- No significant impact on fathers' observed use of commands at post-test |
| Coaching Our Acting-out Children: Heightening Essential Skills (COACHES) (Caserta et al. 2018) | X   |                | Group workshops | 6 weeks; 1 hour per week | Parents and children participated in a five-minute group discussion at the beginning of the session where a “skill of the day” was introduced (for example, labeled praise) and parents were provided a hand-out with a space to track their use of the skill. Then, parents were encouraged to apply the skill during a soccer game with their children. | 67 fathers of young children at risk for academic or behavioral challenges because of their enrollment in Head Start classrooms | - Significant negative impact on fathers' observed use of negative talk at post-test  
- No significant impact on fathers' observed use of praise or commands at post-test |
| Dads Tuning into Kids (Wilson et al. 2016)                                         |     |                | Group workshops | 7-sessions; 2 hours per week | The program targeted fathers' emotion-socialization parenting practices using sequential exercises to teach skills such as noticing the child's emotion and recognizing the expression of emotion as an opportunity for intimacy and teaching. It also taught about the benefits of positive father involvement to children's development and the importance of fathers' play. The program encouraged fathers to read books with their children as a dad-friendly way of scaffolding emotion discussions. | 162 fathers of children ages 3 to 6 | - Significant positive impact on fathers' self-reported empathy and encouragement of emotion expression at 10 weeks post-test  
- Significant negative impact on fathers' self-reported emotion-dismissing beliefs and emotion-dismissing practices, dismissive reactions to children's negative emotions, and hostile parenting responses at 10 weeks post-test |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program (Citation)</th>
<th>BPT</th>
<th>Video modeling</th>
<th>Web-based</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fathers Supporting Success in Preschoolers (Chacko et. al. 2018) | X | X |  | Group workshops | 8 weeks; 90 mins per week | The program integrated BPT with shared book reading that uses key conceptual models, such as common elements, deployment model, and task shifting, to engage and improve father and child outcomes. The program used a coping-modeling-problem-solving subgroup approach, in which videotaped vignettes of father–child reading interactions were used to prompt group discussions. | 126 fathers with low income and their children were recruited across three Head Start centers in urban communities | • Significant positive impact on fathers’ self-reported discipline and nurturing behaviors and observed use of positive parenting (praise, positive affect, and physical positive) at post-test  
• Significant negative impact on fathers’ observed use of negative parenting (critical statements) at post-test |
<p>| Incredible Years (Helfenbaum-Kun and Ortiz 2007) | X | X |  | Group workshops | 8 weeks; 8 sessions | In this intervention, parents view videotapes of vignettes depicting families carrying out both desirable and undesirable parenting behaviors. Discussions and role-plays are encouraged, and participants are assigned homework to practice the skills they learn. The intervention covers play, positive interactions, praise and rewards, limit setting, and handling misbehavior. | 39 fathers of children ages 3 to 5 attending Head Start preschool | • No significant impact on father’s self-reported discipline or nurturance skills at post-test |
| Men as Teachers (Fagan and Stevenson 2004) |  |  |  | Group workshops | 6 weeks; 6 sessions of 90 minutes each | The structured support and self-help program focused on improving fathers’ parenting attitudes and increasing their sense of well-being. The first three sessions were focused on the meaning and value of being a father, the need to challenge racism in society, and ways to gain control over one’s destiny. The rest of the sessions were focused child-rearing, including children’s racial socialization, the role of fathers in teaching their children, and positive discipline strategies. | 38 fathers of children in Head Start | • Fathers perceived that they had greater ability to facilitate the teaching-learning process for their children at post-test |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program (Citation)</th>
<th>BPT</th>
<th>Video modeling</th>
<th>Web-based Format</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Together (Doherty et al. 2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home visit and group workshops</td>
<td>8 sessions</td>
<td>Couple-based group sessions in clinics comprising lectures, discussion, videotapes, skills demonstrations, role-play, and role models. The program began in the second trimester of pregnancy and ended at five months postpartum. It targeted fathers’ knowledge, skills, and commitment to the fatherhood role, mothers’ support and expectations for fathers’ involvement, and co-parenting.</td>
<td>165 married or cohabiting couples expecting their first child</td>
<td>• Significant positive impacts on observed quality of father–child interactions (including subscales of warmth and emotional support, positive affect, intrusiveness, and dyadic synchrony) at 6- and 12-months postpartum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Children Together-Responsible Fatherhood (Avellar et al. 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group workshop</td>
<td>Varied across four programs</td>
<td>Group workshop facilitators led discussions about topics such as the meaning of fatherhood, child development, co-parenting, and finding and retaining employment. The programs also provided individualized support to help with economic stability. Programs covered personal development topics, such as coping with stress, responding to discrimination, problem solving, self-sufficiency, and goal planning.</td>
<td>5,522 nonresident fathers</td>
<td>• Significant positive impact on fathers’ self-reported nurturing behaviors and engagement in age-appropriate activities with child at 12-month follow-up • No significant impact on fathers’ self-reported use of nonviolent discipline at 12-month follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SafeCare Dad to Kids (Dad2K) (Self-Brown et al. 2017)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Home visits</td>
<td>6 visits</td>
<td>This BPT program was designed explicitly to be implemented with families at risk for maltreatment. It teaches a variety of skills focused on positive parenting, home safety, and child health. In each session, the father engages with (1) interactive technology via a tablet computer that delivers learning and modeling of skills through software-based activities and (2) a SafeCare provider who engages the father in practice of skills with the child and provision of corrective feedback. The goal of these sessions is to advance fathers’ skills to prevent challenging behavior and enhance positive interaction with their child during daily routines.</td>
<td>99 fathers of a child ages 2 to 5 meeting two or more risk factors (low education level, low household income, relationship status of unmarried, young age at time of first child’s birth)</td>
<td>• No significant impact on fathers’ use of corporal punishment, nonviolent discipline, psychological aggression, or neglectful behaviors at the eight-week assessment (post-intervention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Citation)</td>
<td>BPT</td>
<td>Video modeling</td>
<td>Web-based</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The New Beginnings Program for Dads (NBP-Dads) (Sandler et al. 2018) |     |                |          | Group workshop | 10 sessions | This program about parenting after divorce teaches skills such as positive family activities, open communication, reducing children's exposure to interparental conflict, and effective discipline. It includes activities, examples, and video testimonials and modeling from fathers led by a trained facilitator. | 384 fathers of children ages 3 to 18 who varied in their legal divorce status | • Significant positive impact on fathers' self-reports of discipline skills and warmth at post-test and child reports of positive parenting at post-test  
• Significant negative impact on fathers' self-reports of rejection at post-test  
• No significant impact on fathers' self-report of warmth, discipline, monitoring, and rejection nor child reports of positive parenting at 10-month follow-up |
| Young Dads (Mazza 2002) |     |                |          | Customized intervention | Varied | The intervention was tailored to father's needs and could comprise weekly individual counseling, biweekly group counseling, educational and vocational referrals and placements, medical care and referrals, housing and legal advocacy, cultural and recreational activities and parenting skills training. | 60 first-time fathers ages 16 to 18 | • Positive significant impact on fathers' self-reported quality of their current relationship with their child and the self-reported expected quality of their future relationship at 6-month follow-up |

ADHD = attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder; BPT = behavioral parenting training.