The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study changed its name to The Future of Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWS). Due to the issue date of this document, FFCWS will be referenced by its former name. Any further reference to FFCWS should kindly observe this name change.

UNMARRIED PARENTS AND MODELS OF FATHERHOOD: NEW OR CONVENTIONAL IDEAS ABOUT PATERNAL INVOLVEMENT?

Center for Research on Child Wellbeing
Working Paper #99-08-FF

Maureen R. Waller

Sara McLanahan

UNMARRIED PARENTS AND MODELS OF FATHERHOOD:

NEW OR CONVENTIONAL IDEAS ABOUT PATERNAL INVOLVEMENT?

Maureen Waller
Public Policy Institute
of California

and

Sara McLanahan
Princeton University

August 10, 1999

DRAFT: Please do not quote or cite without permission of authors

Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, August 10, 1999. Please direct all correspondence to Maureen Waller, Public Policy Institute of California, 500 Washington St., Suite 800, San Francisco, CA 94111 (waller@ppic.org).

In contemporary society, the meaning of fatherhood is in transition (Gerson 1993; Griswold 1993). Following broad cultural and economic changes in the post-World War II period, such as the increase in women's employment, the decline in male wages, the rise of feminism, and increase in single parent households, the basis for breadwinner model of fatherhood has been attenuated, creating much uncertainty about what it means to be a "good father." Kathleen Gerson (1993) has argued that many fathers have moved away from the breadwinner model. At the same time, she suggests that an alternative model of fatherhood had not become dominant. Gerson writes (1993: 22): "now, as in an earlier era, 'good providers' vie with 'autonomous men' and 'involved husbands and fathers' for ideological and social support. But no clear successor has taken the place of the once-ascendant but now embattled ethos of male breadwinning." Older models of fathers as moral overseers, sex-role models, and "pals" also retain cultural currency and are made available to men through the media, popular culture, therapeutic influences, and religious involvements (Pleck 1987).

Perhaps exacerbating this ambiguity surrounding fathers' responsibilities to their children is the fact that more men are attempting to parent their children outside of the household in which they reside. With about 1/3 of all births now occurring to unmarried women, estimates suggest that 1/4 of children will never live with their biological fathers (Garfinkel, et.al. 1998). However, we know little about low-income, unmarried parents' perceptions of paternal responsibility. Based on interviews with middle-class and working-class men, most of whom were white, married, and living with their children, Gerson finds many fathers express ambiguity about the breadwinner model, opting instead for more involved style of parenting. In this paper, we examine whether this same pattern appears among unmarried fathers from diverse race/ethnic

backgrounds, most of whom are low-income and live apart from their children. This paper contributes to the literatures on fatherhood and poverty by examining newly available data from a large, representative sample of low-income, unmarried parents who were asked questions about paternal activities. Drawing on data from the baseline survey of the Fragile Families and Child Well-being (FFCW) Study, we investigate whether unmarried parents differ from married parents in terms of their support for the breadwinner model. We also examine whether unmarried parents are different from married parents in their support for other models of fatherhood.

Models of Fatherhood

Historians have identified at least four different epochs during which one model of fatherhood has gained ascendancy (Lamb 1987). The first model of fatherhood is that of **moral leaders** in their families and **teachers** to their children**.** Historians portray late seventeenth and eighteenth century America as the time when fathers assumed a broad range of responsibilities for their children but primarily took the lead in their moral and religious education (Demos 1986; Pleck 1987). Because conventional ideas of the time regarded children as inherently sinful and "unrestrained," fathers were encouraged to impose moral standards and promote children's rational development. Women -- presumed to be less rational and more susceptible to their emotional impulses -- were given responsibility for taking care of young children. But, as the primary parent, fathers assumed control over childrearing decisions and custody of their children in cases of marital separation (Demos 1986: 46; Furstenberg 1988).

When economic activity moved outside the home during Industrialization, the paternal model of fathers as pedagogues and teachers lost some cultural resonance and was replaced by

the model of fathers as **breadwinners** (Demos 1986: 51). The decline of paternal authority was reflected in new beliefs about childrearing, changes in family law, and state intervention in family life (Griswold 1993: 30). Advice books that appeared early in the century began to regard mothers as the primary and essential parent, particularly during infancy, while fathers′ authority over childrearing and direct involvement with children gradually declined. At the same time, courts increasingly awarded custody for children to mothers, arguing that maternal custody was in the best interest of the child (Demos 1986: 49; Pleck 1987: 86). A new gender ideology also accompanied the pattern of male breadwinning and female domesticity in a privatized, nuclear family. In particular, a "cult of domesticity" emerged that glorified motherhood and gave cultural support to the sexual division of men′s and women′s spheres. Men and women were believed to be essentially different from each other. According to this ideology, women′s purity made them the appropriate parent for nurturing children and guiding their moral development while men were more suited to the participation in economic and political life. Because men were now expected to provide sole economic support for their families, the basis of paternal authority also changed (Gerson 1993: 19-20). At this time, men′s status as breadwinners was the justification for deference in the home (Demos 1986: 52).

At the turn of the twentieth century, a new, psychological discourse on fatherhood emerged alongside the breadwinning model that suggested fathers played an important part in children′s psychological development. According to these ideas, fathers were expected to participate in children′s socialization and act as their "pal" (Griswold 1993). In the years of economic prosperity after World War II, the association between breadwinning and fatherhood was reinforced, ideas about fathers as **sex-role models** also appeared. This model derived from psychological critiques of maternal influence over children. For example, psychologists

concerned about the impact of fathers' absence during the war argued that fathers were necessary for their children (particularly sons) in forming their sexual identities. Functionalist sociology also supported a clear separation between maternal and paternal responsibility (Griswold 1993). Moreover, in popular culture, the absence of a strong father figure was associated with homosexuality and juvenile delinquency (Pleck 1987: 90-92).

Over the last three decades the breadwinning model of fatherhood has lost much of its cultural resonance, and new ideas about the importance of emotionally **involved fathers** emerged as an alternative to the provider model. Involved fathers today are not only expected to make an emotional connection with their children but to share with women the work of caring for children (Griswold 1993). As Pleck (1987: 93) suggests, "This new father differs from older images of involved fatherhood in several key respects: he is present at the birth; he is involved with children as infants, not just when they are older; he participates in the actual day-to-day work of child care, and not just play; he is involved with his daughters as much as his sons." These ideas about fatherhood followed feminist critiques of men's reluctance to share household responsibilities. In addition, a therapeutic culture drew attention to the "personal growth" and satisfaction men could realize through fathering and the emotional loss they experienced when absent from their children's lives. Supporting this involved or new model of fatherhood was a rejection of the breadwinner ideal that placed unreasonable expectations on men and prevented them from nurturing their children (Furstenberg 1988: 214; Griswold 1993: 247). Cultural representations of the new father as "active," "involved," and "nurturant" have appeared in popular movies, television shows and books (Lamb 1987).[1]

---

[1]While these fathers are typically represented as white middle-class or professional men (e.g., Dustin Hoffman in Kramer v. Kramer and Robin Williams in Mrs. Doubtfire), black representations of these new fathers

Fatherhood in Low-Income Communities

To develop our hypotheses, we draw upon qualitative studies of how poor and working-class families' parents interpret models of fatherhood. These studies were conducted during a time when the involved father model had become widespread in popular culture.[2] Most of these studies suggest that poor and working class families hold more traditional ideas about fatherhood than middle class families that are adapted to conditions of economic insecurity and (often) racial discrimination. These ideas are consistent with the "culture lag" theory that suggest cultural ideas are introduced by the middle class and slowly diffuse to members of lower socio-economic groups (see Lamont 1992: 98-100). The cultural lag theory would suggest that low-income, unmarried parents have not yet have adopted the new ideas about fatherhood present in the middle-class.

Alternatively, the culture of poverty view (e.g., Lewis 1959) would suggest the lower-income families participate in autonomous sub-cultures, adapted to conditions of poverty and disconnected from mainstream society. According to this view, low-income, unmarried parents would reject traditional models of fatherhood such as breadwinning, because their economic

---

have also appeared. Bill Cosby's character on the Cosby Show and his best-selling book on fatherhood, in fact, exemplify the cultural significance of this model.

[2]An older wave of qualitative studies of fatherhood (Lewis 1959; Clark 1965; Liebow 1967; Rainwater 1970; Stack 1974) was conducted at the onset of deindustrialization when the breadwinning model was dominant. Studies differ in regard to what models of fatherhood they address and whether their samples are differentiated by gender, race, and/or class.

circumstances prohibit them from fulfilling this role.

A third approach suggests that low-income, unmarried parents have cultural "tool kits" comprised of ideas diffused through the wider culture by way of institutions, media, the educational system, and popular culture, through institutions, and through their families and social networks (see Waller 1997). This theory suggests that unmarried would be able to draw upon diverse models of paternal responsibility (like higher-income, married parents) but interpret these models in relation to the situational problems they face (Swidler 1986; Lamont 1992). Because low-income, unmarried parents are more likely to experience financial problems and problems related to living in poor neighborhoods (like crime and drug use), these issues may be more salient to them. Therefore, while they adopt diverse models, they may place more emphasis on resolving the set of problems they are dealing with and interpret all models in relation to these issues. In so doing, low-income parents would also innovate upon these models.

Lillian Rubin's (1994; 1976) work on how class shapes family life suggests that working class couples expressed more support for the breadwinning model than middle class couples. While the middle class men and women she interviewed said that fathers should share the work of family and household responsibilities, working class couples continued to endorse the idea that men should have primary responsibility for supporting the family while women should assume responsibility for the home.[3] Rubin (1994: 79-80) writes: "despite the enormous ferment in family life over these last decades, the cultural definition of the good parent has changed little. Parenting, if by that we mean the nurturing of both the body and the spirit of our children, remains women's work. It's mother who's still held accountable for their moral development,

[3] At the same time, Rubin questions whether middle-class fathers have assumed more responsibility in practice.

their emotional stability, and their worldly success or failure. Father need only make a living for them to satisfy his part of the bargain." However, working class women expressed more ideas about gender inequality than men, and the ideas of both men and women seemed more egalitarian in the 1990's than two decades earlier.

Elijah Anderson's study (1989) of a poor, African-American community indicates that young men and women embrace two different cultural models. Although the breadwinning model had begun to wane in the larger society at the time the study was conducted, Anderson found that young mothers strongly desired to establish a "conventional" family life with the father and have him act as providers for the family. This finding seems to fit with the idea that there was a "culture lag" in female subculture. In contrast, young men adopted a "traditional" model of male autonomy and freedom. Because the young men he studied were economically marginalized and could not prove their manhood as husbands and breadwinners, they established their masculine identity by accepting the beliefs of their peer groups. As such, the young men he interviewed preferred to have sexual relationships with multiple women, to remain in their own mother's home, and to "play daddy."

Although Mercer Sullivan's (1989: 50) study of black, white, and Latino neighborhoods in Brooklyn reports different findings than Anderson, he also suggests that certain communities aspired to traditional, breadwinning family models. At the same time, he argues that families developed different collective strategies for responding to non-marital childbearing and expressing paternal commitments in response to the particular economic and cultural niches they live in. For example, Sullivan (1989: 57) found that residents of the white neighborhood he studied continued to endorse working-class traditions of marrying following an unexpected pregnancy. Similarly, residents of the lower-income, Latino neighborhood "cling tenaciously to

traditional culture even as its assumptions about a male′s role in the family clash harshly with the realities of the low-wage labor market and the welfare system.″ While African-American families held similar beliefs, they had learned to cope with unemployment and economic stability longer. Therefore, they adopted a distinctive, kin-based model of supporting children.

Although Sullivan only mentions the breadwinning model, he notes that African-American fathers held strong emotional attachments to their biological children and provided direct care. There is empirical evidence from other qualitative studies that low-income parents adopt diverse models of fatherhood, although this is not explicit stated. Based on interviews with single mothers on welfare, Edin (1995) also suggests that women developed adaptive strategies to maximize the resources from the fathers of their children. In addition to the monetary and in-kind contributions, she finds that single mothers value psychological benefits and emotional relationships fathers establish with their children.

Finally, Waller (1997) finds similar beliefs about the importance of ‶involved fatherhood″ low-income, unmarried mothers and fathers in New Jersey and argues these parents have redefined the ‶breadwinning″ model. When describing a good father, black and white parents embrace the ‶involved father″ and ‶role model″ images of fatherhood available from the larger culture but interpret and modify these models in ways that make sense within their circumstances. For example, drawing on a therapeutic discourse about the importance of paternal involvement, family communication and spending ‶quality time″ with their children, parents argue that children with absent or neglectful fathers experience long term emotional harm. Parents also refer to a discourse about the importance of paternal guidance and discipline when describing the challenges of childrearing in low-income neighborhoods. While their accounts disassociate breadwinning from masculinity, they link ideas about socialization and

discipline with manhood. In African-American families, parents also use culturally specific ideas about the importance of male role models for teaching their sons to become men under difficult social and economic conditions.

When describing various dimensions of paternal responsibility, parents consistently include an economic component but suggest that economic support can be provided in various forms. In general, parents characterize economic support as a necessary but insufficient expression of paternal responsibility and talk about this obligation in reference to children′s basic need for love and guidance. Parents also suggest moral distinctions should be made between "good" and "bad" fathers on the basis of their effort and involvement rather than on the absolute monetary value of fathers′ contribution. These eclectic claims about paternal responsibility incorporate contemporary expectations for paternal nurturance with more conventional ideas about discipline and economic provision. This model is also specified for the needs of children living in poverty and the constraints of low-income fathers.

In sum, the qualitative research could lead us either to expect lower-income, unmarried parents to hold more traditional ideas about fatherhood than their higher-income, married counterparts or to hold similar ideas but to interpret these ideas in relation to the situational problems they face. From Rubin′s findings, we would expect working class parents to strongly endorse the breadwinning model of fatherhood. We could draw a similar conclusion from Anderson′s study for young, low-income, unmarried women. However, among young unmarried men, we should see a rejection of breadwinning. Research by Sullivan, Edin, and Waller suggest more qualified support for breadwinning and significant support for other models of fatherhood, particularly the "involved father" model. Sullivan′s work suggests white, working class and Latino parents may embrace breadwinning more strongly than African-

American parents. On the other hand, Edin finds a similar orientation toward fatherhood among racially diverse mothers and Waller, among black and white parents, with low-incomes.

Data and Methods

This paper investigates whether unmarried parents are different from married parents in their support for the traditional "breadwinner" model as well as other models of fatherhood. We examine the initial wave of the Fragile Families and Child Well-being (FFCW) study, a national, birth cohort survey that samples parents at the time of their child's birth. While the sample is representative of all births to married and unmarried parents in cities with populations over 200,000, the survey over samples unmarried parents. It is also important to note that taking a representative sample of unmarried parents means that our sample is primarily low-income. This is an innovative survey that investigates the characteristics of unmarried parents (particularly fathers), relationships among unmarried parents and their children, and the well being of children born outside of marriage. This study is unique in providing previously unavailable information about the characteristics of unmarried parents and their relationships as well as in providing "coupled" data from interviews with unmarried mothers and fathers.[4]

This investigation analyzes responses from 1176 parents living in Oakland, California and Austin, Texas -- the first two sites surveyed in the FFCW study. However, when completed, the study will include twenty-one U.S. cities, stratified by different labor market conditions and varying welfare and child support policy regimes. The total sample size will be 4700 families, including 3600 unmarried couples and 1100 married couples. To generate a random sample of

[4]Sara McLanahan and Irv Garfinkel are the principal investigators for the FFCW study and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn and Marta Tienda are co-investigators. Other researchers involved in this project include: Sheila Ards, Waldo Johnson, Yolanda Padilla, Lauren Rich, Mark Turner, and Maureen Waller.

births, the research team asked the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) to interview all parents giving birth in a particular time period.

The response rate in the first two sites of the survey has been close to 95% for unmarried mothers and 75% for unmarried fathers. Most parents were interviewed in the hospital, immediately after their child's birth, but some fathers were interviewed in the field, shortly after the birth.[5] Two different measures of support for fathering activities are used in this analysis. The first is an absolute measure and comes from a question asking how important it is to provide regular financial support, to teach children about life, to provide direct care (such as feeding, dressing and child care), to show love and affection to the child, to provide protection for the child, and to acting as an authority figure/discipline the child.[6] Parents had the option of choosing that they considered these activities very important, somewhat important, or not very important. If parents' chose "very important," they were coded 3 in this analysis, if they chose "somewhat important," they were coded 2, and if they chose "not very important," they were coded one. The second measure is a relative measure and comes from the question on "what is most important?"[7] When parents rank an activity first it is coded 1 and 0 otherwise.

---

[5] Follow-up interviews with both parents will be conducted by phone when the child is 12, 30, and 48 months old. Data on child health and development will be collected each year from the mother. In addition, in-home assessments of child well-being will be carried out at the 4 year interview.

[6] The question reads: "Fathers do many things for their children. Please tell me how important each of the following activities is to you."

[7] The question reads: "Which of these is the most important to you?"

The independent variables used in this analysis measure are relationship status, race, employment, education, and other demographic characteristics. Recent studies have shown that growing numbers of parents are living together and suggest that these informal unions may resemble formal unions in important ways. Therefore, we compared unmarried parents who cohabited, had other romantic, non-cohabiting relationships, or who had no romantic relationship at the time of the birth to married parents (e.g., Bumpass and Raley 1995). We also included dummy variables for race (in which white was the excluded category) and education (where the category for no high school degree was excluded). Age is measured as a continuous variable. Finally, if parents reported having other biological children they were coded 1 and 0 otherwise.

In the first part of the analysis, we used separate OLS regression models for mothers and fathers to examine whether parents′ absolute support for each of these 6 fathering activities varied significantly by their relationship status, race, education, and other characteristics. Because a factor analyses did not show that any of the outcome variables were highly correlated with each other, we ran each fathering outcome variable separately. The second part of the analysis uses logistic regression equations to examine the factors related to parents′ support for each fathering activity in relation to others. Again, the outcome variable in these models is whether or not parents ranked each fathering activity as most important.

Support for Fathering Activities

When parents in the FFCW survey were asked to assess the importance of various fathering duties, they tended to rate each activity highly. As table 1 indicates, there is little

Table 1 about here

variation in the means for the fathering outcome items. However, parents rated showing love

and affection, teaching children about life, and providing protection the most highly. All parents rated providing financial support, direct care, and acting as an authority figure, lower, with mothers rating each of these activities lower than fathers. This suggests that parents have embraced older models along with the newer involved father model. At the same time, parents did not rank providing direct care to children--another element of involved fatherhood--as highly.

Parent's responses to what they consider the most important thing that fathers do for their children are much more interesting. These results show that showing love and affection received overwhelming support from parents, followed by teaching children about life. Again, many more parents ranked the emotional aspect of the involved father role higher than the care-giving role. Providing regular financial support was not ranked first among many parents, suggesting little support for the "pure" breadwinning model. Although parents reported that providing protection was a very important fathering activity, this received the lowest support in the rankings. Acting as an authority figure−another traditional fathering activity−also received low support across the board.

Table 1 also presents information on the sample characteristics. We can see that around one-quarter of parents in this analysis are married and three-quarters are unmarried. Among the unmarried parents, over half were cohabiting at the time of their child's birth and about 30 percent more were romantically involved but not living together. The remaining parents indicated they were either "friends" or had no contact. The responses of unmarried fathers indicate a higher level of cohabitation than mothers. This is because the survey's response rates were higher for unmarried women than men, and the men who participated in the survey were probably more highly committed than those who did not. The sample in Austin and Oakland is

primarily composed of black parents (about 30 percent) and Hispanic parents (about 45 percent). The remaining parents are white or of another race. More of the white parents in the sample are married than unmarried and more black parents are unmarried. While the majority of parents in the survey have at least a high school degree, over 40 percent do not. We would expect married parents to have higher educational levels than unmarried parents. Perhaps because many of the married, Hispanic parents are immigrants, over 1/3 of married parents do not have a high school degree. Finally, the mean age for parents is in the mid-late twenties, with married parents slightly older than unmarried parents. The majority of married and unmarried parents have another biological child.

Are Unmarried Parents Different from Married Parents?

This section will present results of regression equations that examine whether parents in various types of relationships prefer different models of fatherhood. In particular, we examine the association between relationship status and support for the breadwinner model (providing regular financial support), involved father models (showing love and providing direct care) and models of fathers as teachers, protectors, and authority figures. Separate models were run for the sample of mothers and fathers.

Table 2 about here

Tables 2 presents coefficients from the OLS regression equations for fathers. The findings show no significant differences between married and unmarried fathers in regard to the importance of financial support (i.e., breadwinning). As table 1 indicated, almost all parents rated providing financial support as very important. Furthermore, the results show that cohabiting fathers do not differ significantly from married fathers in their support for any of the

models of paternal obligation. However, unmarried fathers who were not cohabiting with their child′s mother at the time of his/her birth do differ from married parents in responses to other models. In particular, fathers who are in romantic relationships with the mother but not living with her, report significantly less support for fathers providing love or affection, providing direct care, acting as teachers, protectors, and authority figures.

Other independent variables that show significant variation are father′s employment status and, to a lesser extent, race and education. Employed fathers report more support for fathers showing love/affection, teaching their children, and providing protection than other fathers. Fathers with education beyond high school report less support for financial support than fathers without a high school degree and black fathers endorse the authority figure model more strongly than white fathers. Because few of these variables indicate differences among fathers, the R-squares on all models are low.

Table 3 about here

Table 3 presents the coefficients of the OLS models for mothers in the FFCW survey. Again, we do not see differences between married and unmarried mothers in support for financial support. Like fathers, mothers cohabiting with their child′s father do not differ significantly from married mothers in their support for any models of fatherhood. In addition, mothers involved in non-cohabiting, romantic relationship resemble married mothers. However, unmarried mothers who were not involved with the father at the time of birth do differ in reporting less support for fathers showing love/affection, providing direct care, and teaching children about life. Unlike fathers, mothers' support for models of fatherhood is not associated with employment status, but is associated with level of education on the love/affection variable. Similar to fathers, mothers who have education beyond the high school level report more support

for fathers providing love and affection than mothers without a high school degree. In addition, black mothers support the teacher model more strongly than white mothers.

Table 4 about here

Table 4 presents the coefficients for logistic regression models for fathers. The outcome variable in these models asks parents to rank the most important thing fathers do for their children. When asked to choose one paternal "role" as the most important, the results indicate that there are no significant differences between married and unmarried fathers in regard to any models of fatherhood. However, we see more race/ethnic differences and age differences in these models. In particular, black fathers support the breadwinner and teacher models more and the love/affection model less than white fathers; Hispanic fathers also support the love/affection model less and the teacher model more; and fathers in the "other race" category support financial support more and love/affection less. Fathers with more than a high school degree support the love/affection model more than those without a degree. And, as we would expect, age is positively related to support for the older breadwinning model and negatively related to the newer love/affection model. This could either suggest a culture lag or that providing money and teaching children are more salient to fathers of color and lower SES men because of their life experiences.

Table 5 about here

Coefficients from the logistic regressions for mothers presented in table 5 show interesting gender differences between mothers of fathers. While we saw no difference between married and unmarried fathers' support for financial support or other models of fatherhood, these results suggest that unmarried mothers in all types of relationships place a much higher value on financial support than married mothers. (Recall that we saw no variation in the first

variable for financial support.) Romantically involved, non-cohabiting mothers also place less emphasis on fathers acting as authority figures. For mothers, race seems to be less important for supporting different models of fatherhood. But, as in the models for fathers, black mothers support love/affection activities less. Being black or Hispanic is also associated with ranking authority figure first. Mothers with earnings support the love/affection model more and the teacher and authority figure models less. Furthermore, mothers with at least a high school degree support the love/affection model more and those with some college support the caregiver model less than mothers with less education. Again, age is negatively related with strong support for the emotional involvement model.

Discussion

During a time when the meaning of fatherhood is in transition, findings from the FFCW survey suggest that married and unmarried parents endorse diverse models of fatherhood. The absolute measures of fathering activities suggest most parent believe providing financial support, showing love and affection, providing direct care, teaching the child about life, acting as a protector, and acting as an authority figure/disciplinarian are very important. Moreover, the regression models examining the importance of these activities also show little difference between married and unmarried parents. In particular, cohabiting fathers and mothers involved in cohabiting and non-cohabiting romantic relationships look much like married parents.

However, when asked to rank the most important activity in relation to each other, parents′ responses do vary. Consistent with the hypothesis that low-income, unmarried parents adopt new models of fatherhood, the results show that both married and unmarried parents strongly endorse the emotional component of the "involved father" model while giving

somewhat less support for the "direct care" component of this model. Parents also indicate strong support for the teacher model. The activities least likely to be ranked as the "most important" components of fatherhood are the more traditional roles of providing financial support, providing protection, and acting as authority figures.

In the logistic regression models that use this relative variable, we see a notable difference between married and unmarried parents. In particular, unmarried mothers in all types of relationships differ significantly and consistently in ranking financial support as the "most important" fathering activity while unmarried fathers resemble married fathers on this item. This striking gender difference suggests that married mothers can take financial for granted, whereas this is more relevant for unmarried mothers, including cohabiting mothers, who cannot afford to take it for granted. Taken as a whole, the findings suggest parents are adopting diverse models of fatherhood while placing more emphasis on activities salient to them in raising their children. This may be illustrated by the fact that unmarried women emphasize the importance of financial support and black and Hispanic parents place a high value on teaching children about life.

References

Anderson, Elijah. 1989. "Sex Codes and Family Life among Poor Inner-City Youths." *Annals* 501:59-78.

Bumpass, Larry L. and R. Kelly Raley. 1995. "Redefining Single-Parent Families: Cohabitation and Changing Family Reality." Demography 32(1): 97-109.

Clark, Kenneth B. 1965. *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power,* Second Edition. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1989. "The Social Construction of Black Feminist Thought." *Signs* 14:4.

Demos, John. *1986. Past, Present and Personal: The Family and the Life Course in American History*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Edin, Kathryn. 1995. "Single Mothers and Child Support: The Possibilities and Limits of Child Support Policy." *Children and Youth Services Review* 17(1-2): 203-230.

Furstenberg, Frank. 1995. "Fathering in the Inner City: Paternal Participation and Public Policy." Pp. 119-47 in *Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research, and Social Policy,* edited by William Marsiglio. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

______________. 1988. "Good Dads--Bad Dads: Two Faces of Fatherhood." Pp. 193-218 in *The Changing American Family and Public Policy*, ed. Andrew Cherlin. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.

Garfinkel, Irwin, Sara McLanahan, Daniel Meyer, and Judith Seltzer. 1998. *Fathers Under Fire: The Revolution in Child Support Enforcement*. New York: Russell Sage.

Gerson, Kathleen. 1993. *No Man's Land: Men's Changing Commitments to Family and Work*. New York: Basic Books.

Griswold, Robert L. 1993. *Fatherhood in America: A History*. New York: Basic Books

Hochschild, Arlie (with Anne Machung). 1989. *The Second Shift*. New York: Avon Books.

Lamb, Michael E. 1987. *The Father's Role: Cross-Cultural Perspectives.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lamont, Michèle. 1992. *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper-Middle Class.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lewis, Oscar. 1959. *Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty*. New York: Mentor Books.

Liebow, Elliot. 1967. *Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Pleck, Joseph H. 1987. "American Fathering in Historical Perspective." Pp. 83-97 in *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity,* ed. Michael Kimmel. Newbury Park: Sage.

Rainwater, Lee. 1970. *Behind Ghetto Walls: Black Families in a Federal Slum.* Chicago: Aldine.

Rubin, Lillian B. 1994. *Families on the Fault Line: America's Working Class Speaks about the Family the Economy, Race, and Ethnicity*. New York: HarperCollins.

____________ .1976. *Worlds of Pain: Life in the Working-Class Family*. New York: Basic Books.

Stack, Carol. 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. NY: Harper & Row.

Sullivan, Mercer L. 1989. "Absent Fathers in the Inner City." *Annals* 501: 48-58.

Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51: 273-286.

Waller, Maureen R. 1997. *Redefining Fatherhood: Paternal Involvement, Masculinity, and Responsibility in the "Other America."* Doctoral Dissertation, Princeton University.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Father Outcome Indicators and Parent Characteristics

	All Mothers	All Fathers	Unmarried Mothers	Unmarried Fathers	Married Mothers	Married Fathers
How Important?						
Financial Support	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.9
Love/Affection	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Caregiver	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.9
Teacher	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Protector	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Authority Figure	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.9
Most Important						
Financial Support	7%	10%	9%	12%	1%	7%
Love/ Affection	69%	50%	66%	47%	78%	57%
Caregiver	6%	13%	7%	15%	4%	8%
Teacher	12%	20%	13%	19%	9%	24%
Protector	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%
Authority	4%	4%	3%	4%	6%	2%
Relationship Status						
Married	24%	28%				
Cohabiting	39%	45%	52%	62%		
Other romantic Relationship	23%	22%	30%	31%		
No romantic relationship	14%	5%	19%	7%		
Race						
Black	35%	29%	40%	43%	16%	18%
Hispanic	45%	45%	43%	43%	50%	48%
White	14%	11%	10%	8%	28%	28%
Other	4%	3%	4%	3%	5%	5%
Employment						
Father employed		81%		76%		93%
Mother worked	57%		57%		57%	
Education						
Less than High School	45%	42%	49%	44%	36%	38%
High School Degree	26%	27%	30%	30%	17%	18%
More than High School	28%	31%	22%	26%	48%	44%
Other Characteristics						
Age (mean)	25	28	24	27	28	31
Other Children (%yes)	64%	57%	64%	55%	63%	59%

Table 2. Coefficients from OLS Regressions of Fathers' Attitudes about the Importance of Paternal Activities on Selected Characteristics (Variable 1)

	Financial Support	Show Love/ Affection	Caregiver	Teacher	Protector	Authority Figure
Relationship Status						
Cohabiting	-.018 (.031)	.003 (.011)	-.016 (.033)	.003 (.018)	-.013 (.015)	-.045 (.040)
Other romantic Relationship	.001 (.042)	**-.027* (.014)**	-.047 (.045)	-.003 (.024)	**-.041* (.020)**	**-.112* (.054)**
No romantic Relationship	-.059 (.063)	.005 (.021)	**-.155* (.067)**	**-.098** (.035)**	.000 (.030)	-.044 (.080)
Race						
Black	.006 (.045)	.026 (.015)	.021 (.048)	-.017 (.025)	.029 (.021)	**.157** (.057)**
Hispanic	-.043 (.045)	.016 (.015)	.032 (.048)	-.048 (.025)	.007 (.021)	.040 (.057)
Other	.020 (.075)	-.023 (.025)	.015 (.080)	-.001 (.042)	-.065 (.036)	.074 (.096)
Employment						
Father employed	.024 (.036)	**.027* (.012)**	.002 (.039)	**.046* (.020)**	**.041* (.017)**	.047 (.046)
Education						
High School Degree	.005 (.034)	.004 (.011)	.014 (.036)	.009 (.020)	.016 (.016)	.033 (.043)
More than High School	**-.071* (.037)**	.017 (.012)	-.023 (.039)	-.004 (.021)	.007 (.017)	-.057 (.047)
Other Characteristics						
Age	-.001 (.002)	.000 (.001)	.001 (.002)	-.001 (.001)	.001 (.001)	.001 (.003)
Other Children	-.022 (.028)	.013 (.010)	-.001 (.030)	.014 (.016)	.006 (.013)	-.019 (.036)
Intercept	2.988 (.081)	2.935 (.027)	2.884 (.086)	2.997 (.046)	2.901 (.038)	2.774 (.104)
R squared	**.02**	**.04**	**.02**	**.04**	**.05**	**.03**

<p<=.05
****p<=.01**

Table 3. Coefficients from OLS Regressions of Mothers' Attitudes about the Importance of Paternal Activities on Selected Characteristics (Variable 1)

	Financial Support	Show Love/ Affection	Caregiver	Teacher	Protector	Authority Figure
Relationship Status						
Cohabiting	-.051 (.051)	-.000 (.012)	-.006 (.046)	-.013 (.025)	.001 (.016)	.045 (.049)
Other romantic Relationship	-.032 (.060)	-.006 (.014)	-.035 (.055)	-.004 (.029)	-.027 (.019)	-.001 (.058)
No romantic Relationship	-.101 (.066)	**-.045** (.015)**	**-.122* (.060)**	**-.067* (.032)**	-.009 (.021)	-.052 (.063)
Race						
Black	.066 (.061)	-.015 (.014)	-.002 (.056)	**-.059* (.030)**	.009 (.019)	.100 (.059)
Hispanic	.047 (.060)	.002 (.014)	.059 (.054)	-.045 (.029)	.022 (.019)	.078 (.057)
Other	.046 (.098)	-.037 (.023)	.110 (.091)	-.003 (.048)	-.002 (.031)	.157 (.095)
Employment						
Father employed	-.042 (.044)	- .008 (.010)	-.018 (.041)	-.021 (.022)	.000 (.014)	.026 (.043)
Mother had earnings	.039 (.040)	-.005 (.009)	.025 (.036)	.005 (.019)	.012 (.013)	-.014 (.038)
Education						
High School Degree	.046 (.048)	.011 (.011)	-.005 (.044)	.017 (.023)	.026 (.015)	.073 (.046)
More than High School	.005 (.054)	**.027* (.012)**	-.068 (.049)	.018 (.026)	.012 (.017)	.075 (.052)
Other Characteristics				.		
Age	-.003 (.004)	-.001 (.001)	-.000 (.003)	-.000 (.002)	.001 (.001)	.003 (.004)
Other Children	-.002 (.042)	-.001 (.010)	.003 (.038)	-.021 (.020)	-.005 (.013)	-.020 (.040)
Intercept	2.847 (.121)	3.018 (.028)	2.839 (.111)	3.032 (.059)	2.946 (.038)	2.604 (.117)
R squared	**.01**	**.03**	**.03**	**.02**	**.02**	**.02**

*** p<=.05**
****p<=.01**

Table 4. Coefficients from Logistic Regressions of Fathers' Attitudes about the Most Important Type of Paternal Involvement on Selected Characteristics (Variable 2)

	Financial Support	Show Love/ Affection	Caregiver	Teacher	Protector	Authority Figure
Relationship Status						
Cohabiting	.681 (.410)	-.214 (.222)	.343 (.336)	-.389 (.268)	.738 (.712)	-.077 (.623)
Other romantic Relationship	.742 (.480)	-.489 (.301)	.391 (.428)	-.202 (.356)	-.164 (1.220)	.822 (.726)
No romantic Relationship	-.033 (.829)	.626 (.478)		-.202 (.551)	.972 (1.217)	
Race						
Black	**1.336* (.664)**	**-1.072** (.345)**	.385 (.603)	**1.023* (.477)**	.335 (1.231)	-1.248 (.946)
Hispanic	-.154 (.706)	**-.858** (.346)**	.538 (.597)	**1.081* (.477)**	1.513 (1.138)	-1.485 (.928)
Other	**1.689* (.840)**	**-1.690** (.562)**	1.065 (.785)	1.009 (.704)		-.472 (1.348)
Employment						
Father employed	.042 (.375)	-.131 (.257)	-.208 (.358)	.103 (.321)	.734 (1.102)	1.116 (.841)
Education						
High School Degree	-.165 (.388)	.256 (.240)	-.078 (.332)	-.258 (.297)	1.154 (.715)	-.902 (.632)
More than High School	-.409 (.422)	**.860** (.263)**	-.768 (.426)	-.319 (.320)	.931 (.785)	
Other Characteristics						
Age	**.044* (.021)**	**-.029* (.015)**	-.024 (.024)	.032 (.017)	.024 (.043)	-.061 (.049)
Other Children	-.174 (.334)	.133 (.202)	-.161 (.291)	-.157 (.248)	.273 (.633)	.487 (.557)
Intercept	-4.471 (.993)	1.585 (.600)	-1.466 (.944)	-2.874 (.748)	-7.116 (2.097)	-1.191 (1.704)
Pseudo R-squared	**.08**	**.06**	**.04**	**.03**	**.07**	**.06**

*** p<=.05**
****p<=.01**

Table 5. Coefficients from Logistic Regressions of Mothers' Attitudes about the Most Important Type of Paternal Involvement on Selected Characteristics (Variable 2)

	Financial Support	Show Love/ Affection	Caregiver	Teacher	Protector	Authority Figure
Relationship Status						
Cohabiting	**2.075*** **(1.061)**	-.322 (.263)	-.384 (.461)	.407 (.389)	1.141 (.833)	-.545 (.505)
Other romantic Relationship	**2.382***	-.402 (.299)	-.363 (.534)	.639 (.433)	1.085 (.941)	**-1.714*** **(.835)**
No romantic Relationship	**2.139*** **(1.109)**	-.585 (.332)	-.667 (.639)	-.877 (.477)	1.475 (.964)	-.383 (.678)
Race						
Black	1.036 (.773)	**-.864*** **(.358)**	.547 (.818)	.376 (.505)	-1.008 (.841)	**17.455**** **(.752)**
Hispanic	-.219 (.828)	-.651 (.353)	1.034 (.785)	.333 (.498)	-.458 (.749)	**17.222**** **(.787)**
Other	1.632 (.921)	-.928 (.520)		-.757 (1.114)	-.094 (1.210)	18.253 .
Employment						
Father employed	-.420 (.356)	.175 (.214)	-.753 (.394)	.426 (.319)	-.088 (.591)	.056 (.524)
Mother had earnings	-.392 (.359)	**.449*** **(.191)**	.345 (.353)	**-.552*** **(.276)**	.025 (.518)	**-.908*** **(.460)**
Education						
High School Degree	-.072 (.406)	**.517*** **(.236)**	-.753 (.457)	-.217 (.335)	-.808 (.698)	-.440 (.630)
More than High School	-.473 (.521)	**.824**** **(.276)**	**-1.249*** **(.615)**	-.487 (.412)	-1.126 (.800)	.060 (.596)
Other Characteristics						
Age	.022 (.033)	**-.043*** **(.018)**	.004 (.033)	.024 (.025)	.064 (.043)	.068 (.041)
Other Children	.220 (.413)	-.301 (.213)	.409 (.413)	.430 (.320)	-.092 (.573)	-.271 (.490)
Intercept	-5.291 (1.508)	2.342 (.628)	-2.773 (1.195)	-3.552 (.885)	-5.097 (1.540)	-20.978 (1.316)
Pseudo R squared	**.13**	**.07**	**.07**	**.05**	**.06**	**.12**

*** p<=.05**
****p<=.01**