

**Bowling Green State University**  
**The Center for Family and Demographic Research**

<http://www.bgsu.edu/organizations/cfdr>

Phone: (419) 372-7279      cfdr@bgsu.edu

*Working Paper Series 2011-12*

**NEW FATHER'S EXPERIENCES WITH THEIR OWN FATHERS AND  
ATTITUDES TOWARD FATHERING**

Karen Benjamin Guzzo  
Bowling Green State University

**Abstract**

Using the baseline father sample of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Survey (n=3,525), I consider how father type and presence and biological father involvement is associated with new father's attitudes toward fathering, testing the modeling and compensatory hypotheses. Results generally support the modeling hypothesis. Relative to new fathers who had a very involved coresidential father, men whose father was less involved are less likely to support the notion that fathers serve as authority figures. Men who had neither a coresidential father nor a father figure and whose biological father was not very involved are less agreeable to the idea that fathers are important sources of financial support or direct care. Weak support for the compensatory hypothesis is found for more global attitudes toward fatherhood and in results suggesting men with a father-figure have more favorable father attitudes than men who did not have a father-figure.

Keywords: attitudes; family structure; father involvement

In recent years, there has been an increased emphasis on “responsible fatherhood” (Doherty, Kouneski, and Erickson 1998, 2000; Walker and McGraw 2000), defined, in part, as men’s role identification and commitment to fatherhood. This commitment to fatherhood is affected by many factors, not the least of which are men’s relationships and experiences with their own fathers. Though there is evidence linking men’s attitudes and commitment toward fatherhood with their involvement and interaction with their own children (Beitel and Parke 1998; Gaertner, Spinrad, Eisenberg, and Greving 2007; Marsiglio and Cohan 2000), the factors influencing men’s attitudes toward fatherhood have received less attention. The current research focuses on new fathers’ attitudes toward fatherhood and examines whether they are related to men’s experiences with their own fathers, hypothesizing that men model their own experiences with their father, compensate for negative experiences, or some combination thereof.

Research on fatherhood has expanded dramatically in recent years, but it often focuses on nonresidential fathers (see, e.g., Bronte-Tinkew and Horowitz 2010; Guzzo 2009; Hawkins, Amato, and King 2007; Mincy, Garfinkel, and Nepomnyaschy 2005; Nepomnyaschy 2007). Moreover, with the exception of some small-scale studies, men’s own voices are conspicuously absent in much of the new research on father involvement, which often uses mother’s reports of father behaviors. However, it is important to consider how men themselves view fatherhood, as Doherty, Kouneski, and Erickson (1998, p. 288) note that “a father’s relationship with his own father may be a factor – either through identifying with his father or compensating for his father’s lapses – in contributing to his own role identification, sense of commitment, and self-efficacy.” Though a limited body of work examining men’s experiences with their own father and their attitudes toward fathering exists, it generally comes from small, qualitative studies and specific subpopulations (e.g., Beaton and Doherty 2007; Beaton, Doherty, and Rueter 2003;

Masciadrelli, Pleck, and Stueve, 2006; Morman and Floyd 2006; Nicholson, Howard, and Borkowski 2008; Townsend 2002), limiting its generalizability. The existing body of research on intergenerational linkages between men and their fathers has also ignored the potential influence of social fathers on men's attitudes toward fatherhood – that is, whether the presence of a social father influences men's fathering attitudes.

The present study adds to the body of knowledge by using a large-scale sample of new fathers, the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Survey, to examine new fathers' attitudes toward fatherhood. Specifically, this research examines men's experiences with their own father (measured through the coresidence of a biological father, the presence of a father-figure and men's perceptions of their biological father's involvement in raising them) and how they relate to new father's attitudes toward fathering (measured as the centrality of fathering over career, the importance of fathers for sons relative to daughters, and the importance of direct involvement in childrearing vs. more removed roles such as serving as a provider or authority figure). This research tests two possible ways that family of origin may influence men's attitudes toward fathering: the *modeling hypothesis* and the *compensatory hypothesis* (Masciadrelli, Pleck, and Stueve 2006).

### **The Modeling Hypothesis**

The modeling hypothesis, based on theories of socialization and social learning, suggests that an individual's attitudes and behaviors are learned from and modeled upon the behaviors of people who were important and influential to them, making fathers a key influence (Thorn and Gilbert 1998). Children learn patterns of behavior by observing the adults around them. When adult children become parents themselves, they often model their perception of their parents' attitudes and behaviors consciously and subconsciously (Daly 1993). Men essentially use their

own experiences with their fathers as a “mental model” for their own approach to parenting (Nicholson, Howard, and Borkowski 2008). As such, the modeling hypothesis would predict that men with “good” fathers would themselves be good fathers and vice versa.

Identifying a “good” or “bad” father empirically is challenging. Understandably, many researchers use family structure, particularly father coresidence, to proxy father involvement and thus measure how fathers influence children. For men who grow up in intact families, their biological father is likely to be the primary model of father behavior as they spend more time with their parents than other adults, especially other male adults (Nicholson, Howard, and Borkowski 2008). However, family structure alone does not necessarily reflect father involvement (Lamb, Pleck, Charnov, and Levine 1987; Palkovitz 1997). Many coresidential fathers play a breadwinner role and let mothers do the bulk of the childrearing (Townsend 2002), while some nonresidential fathers may be fairly involved with their children (Cheadle, Amato, and King 2010). If men base their attitudes toward fathering on their experiences with their own father, then their perceptions of their father’s participation in their upbringing, rather than father presence, would be particularly influential. For instance, a father who worked long hours may be perceived by his children as uninvolved; as a result, adult sons may adopt the same withdrawn or detached parenting style they perceived from their own fathers. Conversely, if their own father regularly took care of them (i.e., helped with homework, put them to bed, dealt with problems) and they felt close to their fathers, they may feel that direct care and nurturing of their own children is a natural thing for fathers to do (Forste, Bartkowski, and Jackson 2009).

When fathers disappear or withdraw, men often lose a same-sex role model on which to model their own parenting behaviors (Furstenberg and Weiss 2000), though they may have had a father-figure in the form of a stepfather, male relative, or other influential person such as a

minister or coach (Berger, Carlson, Bzostek, and Osborne 2008; Bzostek 2008; Bzostek, McLanahan, and Carlson 2010), and these men can serve as role models as well. However, when considering what type of father they would like to be, their biological father's involvement may still be paramount given the importance of biological ties in U.S. kinship (Cherlin & Furstenberg 1994). For men without an involved biological father, especially those who also lack a father-figure, the lack of a father role model growing up means they may be unsure of how to be a "good" father. If they feel they turned out "all right," they might even believe that fathers contribute little to children's wellbeing. As a result, they may place little importance on the father role and think that fathers have few duties or responsibilities to their children, where their interpretation of "fatherhood," based on their experiences with their father, would be reflected in less favorable attitudes toward fatherhood. The modeling hypothesis, then, would lead to this:

**Hypothesis 1:** Men who perceived their own father as uninvolved would have less favorable attitudes towards fatherhood than those who perceived their father as very involved. Father involvement, rather than father type/presence, is the key influence.

### **The Compensatory Hypothesis**

Alternatively, it is not uncommon for men to want to be a different father for their own children than their biological father was for them, essentially compensating for their biological father's own shortcomings – the compensatory hypothesis. Men who had unpleasant or distant relationships with their own father likely would want to avoid recreating that experience for their own children. As Daly (1993) suggested, many men feel a need to serve as a role model to their own children in response to the lack of a perceived role model for themselves as fathers. As such, they may want to do everything differently from their biological fathers (Townsend 2002) by adopting attitudes toward fatherhood based on the current ideal of the involved father

(Cabrera et al 2000) or deriving notions of fatherhood from experiences with social fathers and father-figures that contrast with their experiences with their biological fathers.

The compensatory hypothesis would suggest that men would see uninvolved biological fathers as a negative role model, an example of everything they do not want to do as fathers themselves. The widespread image of the involved, nurturing father in American society, discussed in both the popular press (e.g., Bernstein and Foster 2008) and in academia (e.g., Cabrera et al 2000; Goldscheider and Waite 1991), may lead men whose fathers were uninvolved to nonetheless have very concrete and positive attitudes toward fatherhood, where they want to do things very differently from their own fathers (Daly 1993). This may especially affect their attitudes towards sons (Lundberg, McLanahan, and Rose 2007; Mitchell, Booth, and King 2009); in American society, it is widely believed that fathers (and father-figures) are particularly important for sons as role models (see, for instance, Johnson 2006 and Bernstein and Foster 2008). Their fatherhood attitudes are formed in opposition to their childhood experiences; they are determined to act differently than their own fathers and believe in the importance of fathering. Men with a social father or father-figure may hold more favorable attitudes toward fathering than men without a father-figure, as they may have had an opportunity to see father-like behaviors and thus use their experiences with social fathers as a contrast for their own father's perceived inadequacies. As Daly (1993, p. 517) noted in qualitative interviews with fathers of young children, men often mentioned their own fathers "not as a role model, but as a point of reference for describing how they were different." Instead of less favorable attitudes toward fathering among those with uninvolved fathers, as predicted by the modeling hypothesis, the compensatory hypothesis would suggest the following:

**Hypothesis 2:** There would be no differences among those with uninvolved and those with very involved fathers, though there may be more favorable attitudes among those with a father-figure relative to those without a father-figure.

If the modeling hypothesis is correct, men with less involved fathers would have significantly lower odds of agreeing with favorable attitudes toward fatherhood relative to those with very involved fathers. If the compensatory hypothesis is correct, then there would be no differences by father involvement, though possibly men with a father-figure would have more positive attitudes than men without a father-figure or coresidential father.

#### *The multifaceted nature of fatherhood*

In examining the effects of family of origin factors on men's attitudes toward fathering, it is important to consider the multifaceted nature of fatherhood – there are numerous roles (provider, caretaker, authority figure, etc.) associated with fatherhood. The commitment men have toward fatherhood may depend on the salience of the fatherhood role (Marsiglio and Cohan 2000; Olmstead, Futris, and Pasley 2009), and men with different types of relationships with their own father may emphasize different aspects of fatherhood. For instance, there is some evidence that men who are not close to their fathers define fathering through more removed and distal roles such as breadwinners rather than more direct caretakers (Forste, Bartkowski, and Jackson 2009). Their experiences with their father may affect generalized notions about the importance and centrality of fatherhood (for instance, whether men believe that fathers should prioritize the family over career obligations). Conversely, it may affect attitudes toward more specific father roles, such as playing a provider or acting as a disciplinarian.



### *Other factors that may influence paternal attitudes*

Having an involved father may also affect men's attitudes toward fathering indirectly through the relationship between father involvement and adult outcomes. Men whose own fathers were highly involved have higher wellbeing as adults than men with less involved fathers (Yeung, Duncan, and Hill 2000). As such, they may be better able to achieve higher levels of education and income (Amato and Booth 1997; Cooksey and Craig 1988), which are positively associated with father involvement and would allow them to more closely fit and adopt the dominant notions of "good fatherhood." Thus, it is important to account for socioeconomic and demographic factors independent from men's experiences with their father, as socioeconomic characteristics are generally predictive of father involvement and are likely predictive of fathering attitudes as well. If playing the provider role is important, for example, one would expect men's employment situation to be salient. More educated men also tend to adopt more egalitarian attitudes toward housework and childrearing (Brines 1994; Blee and Tickameyer 1995); it is also plausible that men who feel more satisfied and in control of their lives in general might feel more competent as parents and more willing to be involved fathers. Religiosity and military experience, on the other hand, tend to be associated with more traditional attitudes, particularly towards men's roles as providers and authority figures (Kurpius and Lucart 2000; Wilcox 2002), though religiosity tends to be positively associated with paternal involvement overall (Wilcox 2002). Race/ethnicity is also associated with parenting behaviors and attitudes; for instance, African Americans tend to be stricter parents (Garcia Coll, Meyer, and Brillon 1995), so they may hold the father's role as an authority figure to be particularly important.

Child- and relationship-specific factors are important as well. Birth intendedness is linked to favorable parenting practices (The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy

2007), including paternal warmth and nurturing activities (Bronte-Tinkew, Ryan, Carrano, and Moore 2007). Child gender also affects paternal behaviors (Mitchell, Booth, and King 2009), which often reflect dominant beliefs about the importance of fathers for sons while also subject to changes through experiences with daughters. Whether the father has other children likely impacts attitudes toward fatherhood, since men who are first-time fathers may hold idealized attitudes toward fatherhood compared to those who are more experienced fathers. Finally, parental relationship type is also important; the stronger the parental union, the more involved fathers tend to be (Carlson; McLanahan, and Brooks-Gunn 2006; Landale and Oropesa 2001; Laughlin, Danielle, and Fagan 2009); this may extend to father attitudes overall.

### **Method**

The analyses use data from the baseline panel of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (Fragile Families). Fragile Families follows a birth cohort of nearly 5,000 children (and their parents) from birth (in 1998-2000) through age 5 in 20 major U.S. cities, with an over-sample of unmarried parents (see Reichman, Teitler, Garfinkel, and McLanahan, 2001 for an extensive overview of the data). Parents are interviewed at birth and again when the child is approximately one, three, and five years old. At each interview stage, efforts were made to interview both mothers and fathers. The response rate for fathers was about 75% (compared to 87% for mothers) and varied considerably by relationship status: 90% of cohabiting fathers were interviewed but only 38% of fathers who were not romantically involved were interviewed. As such, the sample is more representative of those in coresidential unions. 3,830 fathers were interviewed in total, but 220 were missing information on the key independent variables of family structure and father involvement or the dependent variables indicating father attitudes

(discussed below). An additional 85 were missing information on the covariates, leaving a final sample size of 3,525.

### *Measures*

#### *Dependent Variables*

Attitudes toward fatherhood are measured in five ways. Two attitudinal indicators examine general attitudes toward fatherhood, measured on a scale of 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree. The first attitudinal statement, “It is more important for a man to spend time with his family than to work a lot,” reflects the centrality of fatherhood relative to a man’s career. The second attitudinal statement, “Fathers play a more important role in raising boys than raising girls,” reflects men’s own feelings toward their fathers as well as their perceived influence on their children and how “necessary” they are as parents for their sons relative to daughters. The other three attitudinal variables reflect more defined responsibilities of fathers – what these new fathers see as father’s roles and obligations and whether they think fathers play an active, involved role or whether their familial role is more indirect and fathers serve more as a figurehead and provider. These activities, measured on an importance scale where 0 = not important to 2 = very important, include providing regular financial support, providing direct care (such as feeding, dressing, and child care), and serving as an authority figure and disciplining the child.

#### *Independent variables*

*Family type/presence and involvement* The key independent variables concern measures of the father’s own family structure and paternal involvement, derived from a series of questions. First, respondents were asked if they lived with both their biological parents at age 15, which is used to determine whether the respondent lived with his biological father. Next, all respondents were

asked “how involved in raising you was your biological father?,” with possible responses of very involved, somewhat involved, not at all involved, and never knew father. Respondents were then asked if there was another man who was like a father to them while growing up, with a number of possible responses such as stepfather, uncle, grandfather, minister, neighbor, and so on. Involvement for father-figures was not asked. It should be noted that the father-figure question does not specify an age, and it is possible that father-figures were not stable over childhood. About half of the respondents who reported another man who acted like a father reported a stepfather (53%), and just under a third of the respondents with a father-like figure reported other family members (grandfathers, uncles or brothers, at 29%) as well as a small number of other men (such as teachers, neighbors, or members of community or religious organizations). Note that these questions are not mutually exclusive. For instance, about 20% of men who lived with their biological father also reported a father-figure, of whom the majority identified a male relative or close family friend as a father-figure. For these men, though, it seems likely that their biological father served as their main paternal influence, and these men are thus coded as having a biological father. For men who did not live with their biological father at age 15, father type and presence is determined by the presence or absence of a father-figure, creating three possible father categories: coresidential biological father, father-figure, or neither.

Because of the interest not just in father type and presence but involvement as well, these categories are then further disaggregated by biological father involvement to create nine mutually exclusive categories: coresidential biological father, biological father not involved; coresidential biological father, biological father somewhat involved; coresidential biological father, biological father very involved (omitted); no coresidential biological father but a father-figure, biological father not involved; no coresidential biological but a father-figure, biological

father somewhat involved; no coresidential biological father but a father-figure, biological father very involved; no father-figure or coresidential biological father, biological father not involved; no father-figure or coresidential biological father, biological father somewhat involved; and no father-figure or coresidential biological father, biological father very involved. The categories of never knew their father and father was not at all involved are combined into one category in the final analyses due to small sample size; exploratory analyses indicated that there was little difference between these two categories substantively.

*Control variables* Demographic variables include race/ethnicity, nativity, and father's age at the birth (or survey). Socioeconomic variables include employment status, education, and frequency of religious service attendance (all measured at the time of the survey), whether he is involved in illegal activities, and whether he has ever been in the military. Analyses also include one psychosocial measure – whether the father is very satisfied with himself. Characteristics pertaining to the child include whether the father thought about abortion when he found out his partner was pregnant (as a proxy for intendedness), the gender of the child, whether the father had other children, and relationship status at the time of the birth/survey (married, cohabiting, romantically involved but not coresiding (referred to as “visiting”), friends, or no romantic relationship). Appendix A describes the characteristics for each category of father type/presence and father involvement. Generally, men who lived with a biological father at age 15 and who perceived their father as very or somewhat involved are more advantaged relative those whose coresidential father was not involved and to those who did not live with their biological father.

#### *Data Analysis*

Because the dependent variables are all ordered, the analyses use ordinal logistic regression and odds ratios are presented. In ordinal logistic regression, the “distance” between

categories is not uniform as they would be with a continuous variable (i.e., moving from not important to somewhat important or moving from somewhat important to very important). The intercepts presented show the estimated cutpoint of the latent variable used to distinguish the categories (Allison 1999). Preliminary analyses indicated that neither of these two groups of measures scaled well together and thus tap into different dimensions of fatherhood, so each of these attitudinal indicators is examined separately.

## **Results**

### *Descriptive and Bivariate Statistics*

Table 1 displays the distribution of father presence and the perceptions of involvement for the fathers in the baseline Fragile Families Sample. Of the 3,525 fathers in the sample, just under half (46.7%) lived with their biological father (and mother) at age 15. Just under a third (30.3%) reported having a father-figure but did not live with both biological parents at age 15. About a fourth (23.0%) did not live with their biological father at age 15 nor had a father-figure. About 40% characterize their father as very involved, and roughly equal proportions of new fathers characterize their father as somewhat and not at all involved (28.6% and 29.9% respectively). The majority of men who lived with their biological father at age 15 report their father as very involved (67.8%) whereas the majority (62.3%) of men who report having no coresidential biological father but who had a father-figure report that their biological father was not at all involved. Men with a father-figure are also least likely to report having a very involved biological father. For men without a coresidential biological father at age 15 or father-figure, about a fourth characterize their own father as very involved, about a third characterized their father as somewhat involved, and about 40% characterized their father as not at all involved.

- Table 1 here -

Table 2 shows the bivariate association between the measure of father type/presence and involvement. Looking first at the measure of the relative importance of fatherhood compared to work, 26.0% of the respondents overall disagree or strongly disagree that it is more important for a man to spend more time with his family than work a lot, while 50.0% of men agree and 24.0 % strongly agree with that statement. This suggests a minority of fathers do not place great emphasis on the centrality of fatherhood over other aspects of their lives. There are significant bivariate differences in agreement with this statement by father type/presence and involvement. Men who lived with their biological father but who reported he was not involved reported lower percentages of agreement (70.5%) than those who reported their father was somewhat (76.5%) or very involved (77.0%). Men with a father-figure (but no coresidential biological father) reported fairly high levels of agreement as well, with 73.7% of those who reported their biological father was not at all involved agreeing and 74.3% of those who reported their biological father was somewhat involved agreeing that it is more important for a man to spend time with his family than work. Men without either a coresidential biological father or a father-figure reported the highest levels of disagreement with this statement, regardless of biological father involvement.

- Table 2 here -

Attitudes toward the importance of fathers for sons and daughters are also varied; about 60% of fathers disagree or strongly disagree that fathers play a more important role in raising boys than raising girls, but 27.9% agree and 12.2% strongly agree. The presence/type of father and perceptions of father involvement are significantly related to fathering attitudes toward sons and daughters. Men with a father-figure but no coresidential biological father, on average, are most likely to agree or strongly agree that fathers are more important for sons than daughters (42.1%-44.0%), though the highest percentage of agreement occurred among men without a

father-figure or coresidential biological father and who reported no involvement with their biological father, at 46.8%. At the bivariate level, then, this suggests that men who had a father-figure but did not live with their biological father particularly feel as if they missed out on something important that a biological father would have provided for them.

Turning now to the specific facets of fatherhood that men find important, the vast majority of fathers (92.2%) report that providing regular financial support is very important, with only 7.8% believing it is somewhat or not important. There is no statistically significant variation in the importance of financial support by the measures of family structure and father involvement. For direct care, again, most fathers (92.0%) report it is very important to provide direct care such as feeding, dressing, and child care; only 8.1% report it is somewhat or not important. The differences across father type/presence and involvement are only marginally significant; it appears as if men with a father-figure and men who lived with their biological father and who reported he was very involved are most likely to agree that direct care is important. Finally, turning to the belief that fathers serve as an authority figure and disciplinarian, again the vast majority (90.8%) report that is very important, with 9.3% reporting it is somewhat or not important. Differences by father type/presence are statistically significant, with men who lived with their biological father but perceived him as not at all involved much less likely to believe that being an authority figure is very important, at 75.4%.

### *Multivariate Analysis*

The bivariate analysis suggests that there is some variation in attitudes toward fatherhood by father type/presence and involvement, but socioeconomic and demographic factors are likely to be associated both with family structure and father involvement during childhood as well as attitudinal factors. To disentangle any associations, I turn to multivariate analysis. Table 3



shows the odds ratios from ordinal logistic regression for each attitudinal measure. Generally speaking, men's own experiences with their fathers while they were growing up are unrelated to the more global fatherhood attitudes. In Model 1, looking at the importance of men spending time with their family rather than working, none of the father type/presence and involvement variables are statistically significant. For the importance of fathers for sons over daughters (Model 2), men who did not live with biological father or have a father-figure but whose biological father was somewhat involved are about 35% less likely to be in agreement than men who lived with their biological father and perceived him as very involved in the presence of socioeconomic and demographic controls. This provides some weak support for the modeling hypothesis, in that men who had some moderate interaction with their biological father but did not have a strong relationship with their father nor had a father-figure do not seem to believe that sons particularly need fathers.

– Table 3 here –

The overall lack of differences between father type/presence and involvement and attitudes toward time spent with one's family and the importance of fathers for sons, however, could also be interpreted as support for the compensatory model, in that men whose fathers are not involved hold similar attitudes to men whose fathers were very involved. Further, in models where the omitted category is changed to provide contrasts between those with a father-figure and those without both a coresidential father or a father-figure, men with father-figure but whose own father was only somewhat involved are significantly more likely to believe in the importance of fathers spending time with their family rather than working and of the greater importance of fathers for sons than daughters. This is consistent with the compensatory hypothesis.

Models 3-5 examine more specific aspects of father behaviors, and there is statistically significant variation in beliefs about these behaviors by father type/presence and involvement. For the importance of financial support (Model 3), men who did not live with their biological father at age 15 and who reported their biological father was not at all involved, regardless of whether they had a father-figure, are significantly less likely to believe in the importance of providing financial support than those who lived with their biological father and perceived him as very involved. Men who did not live with their biological father or have a father-figure but who reported their biological father was somewhat involved are also marginally less likely to believe in the importance of financial support. For the importance of direct care (Model 4), men who had neither a coresidential biological father at age 15 or a father-figure and who did not have a very involved biological father are less likely to believe that direct care is important. Men with a coresidential but only somewhat involved father were also less likely to believe that direct care was important. Finally, Model 5 shows the results for serving as an authority figure. Here, we see that the differences are limited to those with coresidential fathers. Compared to those with very involved fathers, men who lived with their biological father but did not perceive him as very involved are significantly less likely to think it is important for a man to serve as an authority figure. Again, though there are some differences across models, the overall findings are consistent with the modeling hypothesis.

The above models, except where mentioned, all contrast men who coresided with a very involved type of father – both the modal category and the ‘ideal’ father experience – with other types of fathers and levels of involvement. Models with alternate omitted categories (not shown) were also examined to see if involvement within the other forms of father type/presence differed significantly in their association with fathering attitudes and beliefs. There is no statistically

significant variation in any of the attitudinal indicators among men who did not live with their biological father but had a father figure by types of involvement. Among men who neither lived with their biological father at age 15 nor had a father-figure, men whose father was very involved are significantly more likely to believe in the importance of financial support than men whose father was not at all or only somewhat involved, which is consistent with the modeling hypothesis. These contrasts also provided some limited support for the compensatory hypothesis; relative to men with no coresidential biological father or father-figure and whose father was not at all involved, men who had a father-figure but an uninvolved biological father are significantly more likely to believe in the importance of fathers providing financial support.

Other factors also impact paternal attitudes. Compared to blacks, white men place more emphasis on spending time with one's family over working and are less likely to believe in the notion that fathers are more important for sons than daughters; they are also less likely to believe in the importance of providing direct care or acting as an authority figure. Hispanics are also less likely than blacks to believe that fathers play a greater role in raising sons, and they place less emphasis than blacks on providing financial support. Foreign born men are more likely to think men should spend time with their family rather than working, and they place less emphasis on providing financial support and direct care. Education is positively associated with beliefs about spending time with family over working (though college-educated men are less likely than men with a high school degree or GED to stress the importance of providing direct care) and negatively associated with believing fathers are more important for sons than daughters. New fathers who considered abortion are more likely to believe that fathers play a more important role in raising sons than daughters, and they place less importance on providing direct care.

The frequency of religious service attendance is generally unimportant, though men who attend services weekly or more tend to believe that it is more important for men to spend time with their children than to work and to believe in the importance of acting as an authority figure. Men who spent some time in the military also place an emphasis on the father's role as an authority figure. Men who report being very satisfied with their life are about 40% more likely to stress the importance of fathers taking direct care of their children. Whether men had other children is generally unrelated to men's attitudes toward fatherhood, though fathers with other children are about 15% less likely to think it is more important for a man to spend time with his family than to work compared to first-time fathers. Finally, relationship status is important – compared to new fathers who were married at the time of birth (and the time of survey), men in any type of nonmarital relationship are less likely to agree that it is more important for a man to spend time with his family than work. Cohabiting and visiting fathers are about 25% more likely than married fathers to believe that fathers are more important for sons than daughters, and those with no relationship at all with the mother are even more likely to believe that fathers are more important for sons. Men with no relationship at all are about half as likely to stress the importance of direct care. Finally, fathers who had a non-romantic relationship also are less likely to report that providing financial support is important relative to fathers who were married.

### **Discussion**

Although scholarship on fatherhood is hardly new, there is renewed interest in studying the factors that influence paternal involvement in recent years as fewer families fit the “traditional” model. With the current government emphasis on “responsible fatherhood,” discovering the factors that influence paternal involvement has become a major research focus. Paternal involvement is certainly influenced by men's attitudes toward fatherhood and their

beliefs about fatherhood, but there is relatively little research on the determinants of these attitudes and beliefs using large-scale, generalizable studies. Although some work examines the effects of men's experiences in their family of origin on their involvement with their children (e.g., Cowan and Cowan 1987; Daly 1993; Forste, Bartkowski, and Jackson 2008; Furstenberg and Weiss 2000; Nicholson, Howard, and Borkowski 2008), virtually no research has examined with a large and representative sample how experiences with both biological *and* social fathers impact men's attitudes toward the family and fatherhood. This is vitally important given that many of today's new fathers experienced or witnessed family disruption and reformation while at the same time, they are also among the first generation to have potentially benefited from the relatively recent cultural models of the involved, nurturing dad.

As shown in the descriptive results, there is a fair amount of variation in new father's experiences with their own fathers. Just under half of new fathers lived with their biological father at age 15, and nearly a third of new fathers did not live with their biological father at age 15 but had some experience with a father-figure. Only two-thirds of new fathers characterized their own coresidential biological father as very involved, while a fourth of those who had neither a father-figure nor a coresidential biological father nonetheless characterized their biological father as very involved. The results here show that the vast majority of new fathers believe it is very important to be involved in their children's lives through providing financial support and direct care and acting as an authority figure. Traditional attitudes toward fathering still exist, though, as a sizeable minority of men feel that it is more important for men to work than spend time with their family and that fathers are more important for sons than daughters.

When accounting for socioeconomic and demographic variables, the results generally showed that compared to men who lived with their biological father at age 15 and perceived him

as being very involved in their upbringing, men with different experiences with their fathers report less favorable attitudes toward specific aspects of father behaviors. Overall, these findings are consistent with the modeling hypothesis – men tend to hold attitudes toward fathering that reflect their own father’s involvement, and this is consistent with the work done in smaller-scale studies (e.g., Nicholson, Howard, and Borkowski 2008). However, contrary to the hypothesis, there seemed to be differences in modeling behavior by father/type and presence. Providing financial support and direct care appear to be less important for men who neither lived with their biological father nor had a father-figure, unless they perceived their own father as being very involved. Men who perceived their coresidential biological father as being not at all or only somewhat involved are less likely to believe in the importance of fathers as an authority figure. This suggests that although men model their behaviors on their fathers, men without an involved coresidential father or a father-figure model the *concrete behavior* of their biological father that they are more likely to be aware of and actually observe (such as paying support or taking care of a child), while those with a coresidential but uninvolved father are modeling the removed parenting *style* of their fathers.

The compensatory hypothesis (Daly 1993) was weakly supported. For the more global attitudinal indicators, the overall lack of differences between those with very involved coresidential fathers and those with other types of fathers and other levels of involvement could be interpreted as consistent with the compensatory hypothesis, though it could also be interpreted that men’s own fathering experiences simply do not influence these attitudes. There is also some suggestion that among those who did not live with their biological father at age 15 and whose biological father was not very involved, men who had a father-figure held more favorable attitudes toward fatherhood than men without father-figure, though this only appears to be the

case in a few instances. Still, this would suggest that having a father-figure provides important role models for young men that they use to compensate for their own father's lack of high involvement. In some ways, then, the compensatory hypothesis may also be a modeling hypothesis, if fathers compensate for their own father's uninvolvement by adopting a social father upon which to model their own notions of fatherhood.

### *Limitations*

A major drawback to this research concerns the measurement of fathers' attitudes. First, the attitudes were measured at or near the time of birth, and this tends to be an emotional time, one in which new parents are particularly optimistic and positive towards parenting and their role as parents. Similarly, these measures are most certainly prone to social desirability – the dominant ideal of the involved father in our society may lead men to state what they think they should say, rather than what they believe. As such, the estimates here may overestimate the positive aspects of new father's attitudes toward fathering. Further, the data available to study included somewhat limited measures that could be used to operationalize fathers' attitudes or address the broader research question. For instance, there were no direct questions on whether and how new fathers were influenced by their experiences with their own fathers, and attitudes toward fatherhood were not ascertained by asking men to discuss fatherhood and their own experiences in their own words but rather in response to a pre-set list of measures. The analysis here used various indicators of paternal attitudes to tap into different aspects of men's attitudes toward fatherhood, emphasizing the centrality of fatherhood in men's lives (vs. career), the importance of fathers for sons (reflecting to some extent their own experiences with their father and the experiences they would like to give to their own son, if they have one), and more direct questions regarding men's role in childrearing. Using a varied set of measures allows examining

multiple aspects of fatherhood but also makes it difficult to draw a singular, overarching conclusion. Moreover, researchers have identified different types of father role identities (provider, teacher, protector, disciplinarian, caretaker, supporter, and co-parent) (Olmstead, Futris, and Pasley 2009), and the research here only analyzed a subset of these identities; indicators measuring different role identities may have produced different results.

Another limitation is that although there is information on men's experiences with their own fathers, the information is incomplete. Father presence is measured by family structure at age 15, which includes both biological parents; a better measure would also include men who lived only with their father, though single coresidential fathers are relatively rare. Similarly, the information on father involvement is less than ideal. There is no information on father-figures' involvement, which would likely vary by relationship (stepfather, uncle, teacher, etc.), or the age when the father-figure was involved. Retrospective accuracy of their own father's involvement may not be accurate and could be affected by their relationship with their father at the time of the interview. It is also possible that today's ideals of involved fatherhood alter how a young man evaluates his own father, measuring him against today's standards rather than the standards of the past.

Finally, another limitation with this research concerns the Fragile Families father sample overall in that it is not entirely representative of the population. The Fragile Families data was designed to be representative of nonmarital births (not parents) occurring in large cities. Further, because father survey participation varied by relationship status at the focal child's birth, it is more representative of married fathers (who had higher response rates) than fathers who were no longer involved with the mother of the child (the group with the lowest response rates). It is possible that the fathers who were not romantically involved with the mother but who still



participated in this survey are different from those in the population in general; they may be more dedicated to fatherhood than their non-participating counterparts.

### *Conclusion*

One of the key assumptions behind the emphasis on “responsible fatherhood” is that most men want to be good fathers but face barriers in doing so. However, the paucity of research on what men think about fatherhood and what they think fathers should do makes such an assumption problematic: how do men view fatherhood, and what is it that they expect to do as fathers? This research suggests that the cultural ideal of involved fatherhood has been adopted by most new fathers, as they want to be involved and expect to fulfill various responsibilities. However, if men’s attitudes toward fatherhood are also modeled upon their experiences with their own father, as suggested here, then the large-scale changes in family structure and interactions over time may produce conflicting notions of fatherhood for today’s fathers. While most men base their ideas about fathering on their experiences with their own fathers, some may have social fathers or father-figures which stand in contrast to an uninvolved biological father and provide important alternative role models.

This research contributes to the process of understanding the influences on men’s fathering behaviors, but there is relatively little evidence linking fathers’ attitudes directly to father involvement – how do men’s attitudes impact their actual behaviors? That is, it is easy to assume that men who hold fatherhood as central to their role will try to be good fathers, but if they lack the necessary skills or face obstacles, their ability to do so will suffer. Even among those who had an uninvolved father or appeared to have few role models to look to in creating their own fatherhood identity, the vast majority believed that fathers should be involved in numerous ways and play a central role. Yet, it is quite possible that this men may not know how

actually enact and carry out their beliefs toward fathering as the actual demands of fathering (as well as other demands, such as work or relationship stressors) increase. Thus, this research is merely a first step in investigating how men's attitudes toward fatherhood emerge and how they affect fathering behaviors.

**Appendix A. Descriptive Statistics for Fathers in the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, by Father Type/Presence and Biological Father Involvement**

	Cores bio dad, not involved	Cores bio dad, somewhat involved	Cores bio dad, very involved	Father-figure, not involved	Father-figure, somewhat involved	Father-figure, very involved	No cores dad or father-figure, not involved	No cores dad or father-figure, somewhat involved	No cores dad or father-figure, very involved
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>									
Black	44.3%	27.1%	33.1%	57.8%	64.3%	59.5%	66.7%	59.9%	51.8%
White	8.2%	29.7%	27.7%	14.3%	17.7%	19.8%	6.7%	13.6%	16.4%
Hispanic	44.3%	37.6%	33.8%	30.0%	15.9%	17.5%	23.6%	23.5%	28.2%
Other	3.3%	5.6%	5.4%	5.0%	2.2%	3.2%	3.1%	3.0%	3.6%
Foreign born	18%	26.9%	29.4%	6.9%	6.9%	11.9%	8.9%	11.4%	16.8%
Age at child's birth in years	29.5	30.4	29.3	26.6	26.2	26.2	26.2	26.4	27.0
Employed	68.9%	87.8%	87.6%	76.0%	71.1%	74.6%	71.0%	80.7%	79.6%
<b>Education</b>									
Less than HS	39.3%	29.3%	28.2%	36.9%	33.9%	30.2%	42.5%	37.9%	33.6%
HS/GED	27.8%	26.9%	27.0%	36.8%	47.7%	40.5%	35.6%	38.6%	38.2%
Some college/technical training	24.6%	23.9%	26.5%	22.8%	21.7%	23.0%	19.6%	16.7%	21.8%
College or more	8.2%	19.9%	18.3%	3.5%	4.3%	6.4%	3.4%	6.8%	6.4%
<b>Religious service attendance</b>									
Never/Hardly	52.5%	42.1%	36.3%	51.8%	50.5%	39.7%	58.1%	50.4%	47.7%
Several times/year	14.8%	22.4%	23.2%	21.8%	24.6%	27.0%	20.2%	27.7%	23.6%
Several times/month	6.6%	15.8%	16.9%	12.0%	13.0%	11.9%	12.5%	9.5%	12.3%
Weekly or more	26.2%	19.7%	23.6%	14.4%	11.9%	21.4%	9.2%	12.5%	16.4%
Very satisfied with life	67.2%	73.7%	82.5%	69.4%	67.5%	76.2%	71.3%	69.3%	77.3%
Participates in illegal activity	4.9%	3.0%	1.3%	4.8%	3.6%	4.0%	3.7%	5.7%	0.5%
Considered an abortion	11.5%	16.7%	11.3%	21.2%	22.0%	20.6%	22.3%	23.9%	17.7%
Female baby	45.9%	49.6%	45.8%	46.4%	50.2%	49.2%	45.9%	46.6%	45.5%
Ever in military	9.8%	11.5%	13.2%	13.4%	10.8%	15.9%	10.1%	9.9%	12.3%
<b>Relationship status at birth</b>									
Married	32.8%	43.0%	38.5%	17.1%	16.6%	21.4%	13.8%	18.9%	24.6%
Cohabiting	44.3%	40.6%	40.2%	49.6%	47.3%	46.0%	60.2%	46.6%	45.9%
Visiting	19.7%	12.4%	16.4%	26.4%	26.7%	23.0%	89.6%	27.6%	21.4%
Friends	1.6%	3.4%	3.6%	5.3%	6.8%	7.1%	96.9%	4.9%	5.5%
No relationship	1.6%	0.6%	1.3%	1.7%	2.5%	2.4%	3.1%	1.9%	2.7%
Had other children	59.0%	59.2%	54.1%	58.9%	58.8%	64.3%	62.0%	62.5%	55.0%
<b>Percent</b>	1.7%	13.3%	31.7%	18.9%	7.9%	3.6%	9.3%	7.5%	6.2%
<b>N</b>	61	468	1,116	666	277	126	327	264	220

May not total 100% due to rounding.

## REFERENCES

- Allison, P. (1999). Comparing logit and probit coefficients across groups. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 5, 186-208.
- Amato, P. R. and A. Booth. (1997). A generation at risk: Growing up in an era of family upheaval. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Beaton, J. M. and W. J. Doherty. (2007). Fathers' family of origin relationships and attitudes about father involvement from pregnancy through first year postpartum. *Fathering*, 5, 236-245.
- Beaton, J. M., W. J. Doherty, and M. A. Rueter. (2003). Family of origin processes and attitudes of expectant fathers. *Fathering*, 1: 149-168.
- Beitel, A. H. and R. D. Parke. (1998). Paternal involvement in infancy: The role of maternal and paternal attitudes. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 12, 68-288.
- Berger, L. M., M. J. Carlson, S. H. Bzostek, and C. Osborne. (2008). Parenting Practices of Resident Fathers: The Role of Marital and Biological Ties. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70, 635-635.
- Bernstein, N. and B. L. Foster. (2008). There when he needs you: How to be an available, involved, and emotionally connected father to your son. New York: Free Press.
- Blee, K. M. and A. Tickameyer. (1995). Racial differences in men's attitudes towards women's gender roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 21-30.
- Brines, J. (1994). Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 652-688.
- Bronte-Tinkew, J. S. and A. Horowitz. (2010). Factors associated with unmarried, nonresident father's perceptions of their coparenting. *Journal of Family Issues*, 31, 31-65.

- Bronte-Tinkew, J. S. Ryan, J. Carrano, and K. A. Moore. (2007). Resident fathers' pregnancy intentions, prenatal behaviors, and links to involvement with infants. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 977-990.
- Bzostek, S. (2008). Social fathers and child well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70, 950-961.
- Bzostek, S., S. S. McLanahan, and M. J. Carlson. (2010). Mother's repartnering after a nonmarital birth. Center for Research on Child Wellbeing Working Paper 2006-27-FF. Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
- Cabrera, N. J., C. S. Tamis-LeMonda, R. H. Bradley, S. Hofferth, and M. E. Lamb. (2000). Fatherhood in the twenty-first century. *Child Development* 71: 127-136.
- Carlson, M., McLanahan, S., and Brooks-Gunn, J. (2006). Do good partners make good parents? Relationship quality and parenting in two-parent Families. Center for Research on Child Wellbeing Working Paper #06-34-FF. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Cheadle, J. E., P. R. Amato, and V. King. (2010). Patterns of nonresident father contact. *Demography*, 47, 205-225.
- Cherlin, A. J. and F. F. Furstenburg, Jr. 1994. "Stepfamilies in the United States: A Reconsideration." *Annual Review of Sociology* 20: 259-281.
- Cooksey, E. C. and P. H. Craig. (1998). Parenting from a distance: The effects of paternal characteristics on contact between nonresidential fathers and their children. *Demography*, 35, 187-200.
- Cowan, C. P. and P. A. Cowan. (1987). Men's involvement in parenthood: Identifying the antecedents and understanding the barriers. Pp. 145-174 in P. W. Berman and F. A.

- Pedersen (Eds.) *Men's transition to parenthood: Longitudinal studies of early family experience*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Daly, K. J. (1993). Reshaping fatherhood: Finding the models. *Journal of Family Issues, 14*, 510-530.
- Doherty, W. J., E. F. Kouneski, and M. F. Erickson. (1998). Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual Framework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*, 277-292.
- Doherty, W. J., E. F. Kouneski, and M. F. Erickson. (2000). We are all responsible for responsible fathering: A response to Walker and McGraw. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62*, 570-574.
- Forste, R., J. P. Bartkowski, and R. A. Jackson. (2009) "Just be there for them": Perceptions of fathering among single, low-income men. *Fathering, 7*, 49-69.
- Furstenberg, F. F. and C. C. Weiss. (2000). "ntergenerational transmission of fathering roles in at-risk families. *Marriage and Family Review, 29*, 181-200.
- Gaertner, B. M., Spinrad, T. L., Eisenberg, N., & Greving, K. A. (2007). Parental childrearing attitudes as correlates of father involvement during infancy. *Journal of Marriage & Family, 69*, 62-976.
- Garcia Coll, C. G., E. C. Meyers, and L. Brillon. (1995). Ethnic and minority parenting. Pp 189-209 in M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting, vol. 2: biology and ecology of parenting*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Goldscheider, F. K. and L. J. Waite. (1991). *New families, no families?* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Guzzo, K. B. (2009). Men's visitation with nonresidential children: Do characteristics of coresidential and nonresidential children matter? *Journal of Family Issues, 30*, 921-944.

- Hawkins, D. N., P. R. Amato, and V. King. (2007). Nonresidential father involvement and adolescent well-being. *American Sociological Review*, 72, 990-1010.
- Johnson, R. (2006). *Better dads, stronger sons: How fathers can guide boys to become men of character*. Grand Rapids, MI; Fleming H. Revell.
- Kurpius, S. E. R. and A. L. Lucart. (2001). Military and civilian undergraduates: Attitudes toward women, masculinity, and authoritarianism." *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 43, 255-265.
- Lamb, M. E., J. H. Pleck, E. Charnov, and J. A. Levine. (1985). Paternal behavior in humans. *American Psychologist*, 25, 883-894.
- Landale, N. S., and Oropesa, R. S. (2000). Father involvement in the lives of mainland Puerto Rican children: Contributions of nonresident, cohabiting and married fathers. *Social Forces*, 79, 945-968.
- Laughlin, L., D. Farrie, and J. Fagan. (2009). Father involvement with children following marital and non-marital separations. *Fathering*, 7, 226-248.
- Lundberg, S., McLanahan S., and Rose, E. (2005). Child gender and father involvement in fragile families. *Demography*, 44, 79-92.
- Masciadrelli, B. P., J. H. Pleck, and J. L. Stueve. (2006). Fathers' role model perceptions: Themes and linkages with involvement. *Men and Masculinities*, 9, 23-34.
- Marsligio, W. and M. Cohan. (2000). Contextualizing father involvement and paternal influence: Sociological and qualitative themes. *Marriage and Family Review*, 29, 75-95.
- Mincy, R., Garfinkel, I., and Nepomnyaschy, L. (2005). In-hospital paternity establishment and father involvement in fragile families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 611-626.

- Mitchell, K. S., A. Booth, and V. King. (2009). Adolescents with nonresidential fathers: Are daughters more disadvantaged than sons? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71, 650-662.
- Morman, M. T. and K. Floyd. (2006). Good fathering: Father and son perceptions of what it means to be a good father. *Fathering*, 4, 113-136.
- Nepomnyaschy, L. (2007). Child support and father-child contact. *Demography*, 44, 93-112.
- Nicholson, J. S., K. S. Howard, and J. G. Borkowski. (2008). Mental models for parenting: Correlates of metaparenting among fathers of young children. *Fathering*, 6, 39-61.
- Olmstead, S. B., T. G. Futris, and K. Pasley. (2009). An exploration of married and divorced, nonresident men's perceptions and organization of their father role identity. *Fathering*, 7, 249-268.
- Palkovitz, R. (1997). Reconstructing "involvement": Expanding conceptualizations of men's caring in contemporary families. Pp. 200-217 in A. J. Hawkins and W. J. Doherty (Eds). *Generative Fathering*. London: Sage.
- Reichman, N., Teitler, J., Garfinkel, I., and McLanahan, S. (2001). The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study: Sample and design. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 23, 303-326.
- The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy. (2007). *One in three: The case for wanted and welcomed pregnancy*. Washington, D.C.
- Thorn, B. L. and L. A. Gilbert. (1998). Antecedents of work and family role expectations of college men. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 12, 259-287.
- Townsend, N. W. (2002). *The package deal*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Walker, A.J. and L. A. McGraw. (2000). Who is responsible for responsible fatherhood? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 563-569.



Wilcox, W. B. (2002). Religion, convention, and paternal involvement. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 780-792.

Yeung, W. J., G. J. Duncan, and M. S. Hill. (2000). Putting fathers back in the picture: Parental activities and children's adult outcomes." *Marriage and Family Review*, 29, 97-113.

**Table 1. Distribution of Fathers' Family Structure and Perceptions of Their Own Fathers' Involvement in the Baseline Wave of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study**

	Perceptions of Father Involvement			<i>Overall distribution</i>
	Very involved	Somewhat involved	Not at all involved/ never knew father	
Family Structure				
Lived with both biological father at age 15	67.8%	28.5%	3.7%	46.7% (n=1,645)
Did not live with biological father at age 15, had stepfather/father-figure	11.8%	25.9%	62.3%	30.3% (n=1,069)
Did not live with biological father at age 15, did not have a stepfather or father-figure	27.1%	32.6%	40.3%	23.0% (n=811)
<i>Overall distribution</i>	41.5% (n=1,462)	28.6% (n=1,009)	29.9% (n=1,054)	100.0% (n=3,525)

**Table 2. Bivariate Associations between Childhood Father Presence and Involvement and Attitudes Toward Fatherhood**

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
<i>It is more important for a man to spend time with his family than work a lot.</i>				
Percentage for all fathers	2.4%	23.6%	50.0%	24.0%
Father type/presence and involvement (Pr=0.011)				
Cores bio dad, bio dad not involved	0.0%	29.5%	37.7%	32.8%
Cores bio dad, bio dad somewhat involved	2.1%	21.4%	51.5%	25.0%
Cores bio dad, bio dad very involved	2.2%	20.9%	48.5%	28.5%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad not involved	2.1%	24.2%	51.2%	22.5%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	3.3%	22.4%	51.6%	22.7%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad very involved	3.2%	26.2%	50.0%	20.6%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad not involved	2.8%	26.9%	50.2%	20.2%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	2.7%	29.6%	51.5%	16.3%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad very involved	2.7%	26.8%	50.9%	19.6%
<i>Fathers play a more important role in raising boys than raising girls.</i>				
Percentage for all fathers	10.2%	49.7%	27.9%	12.2%
Father type/presence and involvement (Pr=0.003)				
Cores bio dad, bio dad not involved	9.8%	49.2%	26.2%	14.8%
Cores bio dad, bio dad somewhat involved	7.1%	61.1%	23.1%	8.8%
Cores bio dad, bio dad very involved	10.8%	50.3%	27.8%	11.2%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad not involved	10.8%	46.1%	29.6%	13.5%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	9.8%	45.9%	29.6%	14.8%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad very involved	8.7%	49.2%	28.6%	13.5%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad not involved	9.2%	44.0%	30.0%	16.8%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	13.6%	47.7%	28.8%	9.9%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad very involved	11.4%	49.6%	27.3%	11.8%

Chi<sup>2</sup> test probability values in parentheses. Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding

**Table 2. Bivariate Associations between Childhood Father Type/Presence and Involvement and Attitudes Toward Fatherhood (continued)**

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
<i>Importance of...</i>			
<i>Providing regular financial support</i>			
Percentage for all fathers	1.3%	6.5%	92.2%
Father type/presence and involvement (Pr=0.555)			
Cores bio dad, bio dad not involved	1.6%	8.2%	90.2%
Cores bio dad, bio dad somewhat involved	1.7%	8.8%	89.5%
Cores bio dad, bio dad very involved	1.8%	6.0%	92.2%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad not involved	1.1%	5.9%	93.1%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	0.7%	6.1%	93.1%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad very involved	0.0%	6.4%	93.7%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad not involved	1.2%	7.3%	91.4%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	0.8%	7.6%	91.7%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad very involved	0.9%	4.1%	95.0%
<i>Providing direct care, such as feeding, dressing, and child care</i>			
Percentage for all fathers	0.4%	7.7%	92.0%
Father type/presence and involvement (Pr=0.061)			
Cores bio dad, bio dad not involved	0.0%	9.8%	90.2%
Cores bio dad, bio dad somewhat involved	0.4%	10.7%	88.9%
Cores bio dad, bio dad very involved	0.2%	6.5%	93.4%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad not involved	0.0%	6.8%	93.2%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	0.4%	7.2%	92.4%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad very involved	0.0%	6.4%	93.7%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad not involved	1.2%	9.5%	89.3%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	0.8%	8.3%	90.9%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad very involved	0.9%	7.3%	91.8%
<i>Serving as an authority figure and disciplining the child</i>			
Percentage for all fathers	0.9%	8.4%	90.8%
Father type/presence and involvement (Pr=0.000)			
Cores bio dad, bio dad not involved	6.6%	18.0%	75.4%
Cores bio dad, bio dad somewhat involved	1.3%	11.3%	87.4%
Cores bio dad, bio dad very involved	0.8%	7.2%	92.0%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad not involved	0.6%	7.4%	92.0%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	0.7%	9.8%	89.5%
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad very involved	0.0%	9.5%	90.5%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad not involved	0.9%	9.2%	89.9%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	1.1%	6.8%	92.1%
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad very involved	0.0%	6.8%	93.2%

Chi<sup>2</sup> test probability values in parentheses. Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding

**Table 3. Odds Ratios from Ordinal Logistic Regression, continued**

**Table 3. Odds Ratios from Ordinal Logistic Regression**

	<i>Model 1</i>		<i>Model 2</i>	
	<b>Importance of spending time with family rather than working</b>		<b>Fathers more important for sons than daughters</b>	
Father Presence (Omitted=cores bio dad, very involved)				
Cores bio dad, bio dad not involved	1.219		0.977	
Cores bio dad, bio dad somewhat involved	0.904		0.927	
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad not involved	1.194		0.859	
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	1.243		0.914	
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad very involved	0.920		0.894	
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad not involved	1.123		0.925	
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	0.868		0.645	***
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad very involved	0.875		0.785	
Race/ethnicity (Omitted=Black)				
White	1.759	***	0.406	***
Hispanic	1.181		0.551	***
Other	1.178		0.697	*
Foreign born	1.374	***	1.176	
Age at birth	1.004		0.995	
Employed	1.134		0.862	
Education (Omitted=HS/GED)				
Less than HS	1.067		1.117	
Some college/technical training	1.337	**	0.655	***
College or more	1.416	**	0.659	***
Religious service attendance (Omitted=Never/Hardly)				
Several times/year	1.095		1.072	
Several times/month	1.006		1.130	
Weekly or more	1.477	***	1.072	
Very satisfied with life	1.102		1.159	#
Participates in illegal activity	0.998		1.252	
Considered an abortion	0.999		1.324	**
Female baby	0.952		0.723	***
Ever in military	1.152		0.926	
Relationship status at birth (Omitted=Married)				
Cohabiting	0.612	***	1.254	*
Visiting	0.579	***	1.250	*
Friends	0.425	***	1.138	
No relationship	0.554	*	1.637	
Had other children	0.847	*	1.002	
Intercept: Somewhat disagree	-3.578		-2.901	
Intercept: Somewhat agree	-0.842		-0.161	
Intercept: Agree	1.509		1.450	
<b>N</b>	3525		3525	
<b>df</b>	30		30	
<b>- 2 log likelihood</b>	7596.025		8101.131	

\*p≤.05 \*\*p≤.01 \*\*\*p≤.001

	<i>Model 3</i> Importance of providing financial support	<i>Model 4</i> Importance of direct care	<i>Model 5</i> Importance of serving as authority figure	
Father Presence (Omitted=cores bio dad, very involved)				
Cores bio dad, bio dad not involved	0.646	0.523	0.223	***
Cores bio dad, bio dad somewhat involved	0.705	0.612 *	0.113	**
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad not involved	0.656 *	0.788	0.167	
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	0.686	0.722	0.152	
No cores bio dad, father-figure, bio dad very involved	0.884	0.899	0.216	
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad not involved	0.542 *	0.443 ***	0.151	
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad somewhat involved	0.601 #	0.576 *	0.226	
No cores bio dad or father-figure, bio dad very involved	1.264	0.653	0.317	
Race/ethnicity (Omitted=Black)				
White	0.818	0.666 *	0.630	*
Hispanic	0.505 ***	1.027	0.732	
Other	1.066	0.695	0.526	*
Foreign born	0.215 ***	0.897	0.702	*
Age at birth	1.009	0.988	1.004	
Employed	1.137	0.868	0.988	
Education (Omitted=HS/GED)				
Less than HS	1.239	1.155	0.979	
Some college/technical training	0.885	0.919	0.914	
College or more	0.818	0.586 *	0.683	
Religious service attendance (Omitted=Never/Hardly)				
Several times/year	1.036	1.041	1.353	*
Several times/month	1.124	0.750	1.198	
Weekly or more	0.873	1.109	2.299	***
Very satisfied with life	1.277	1.404 *	1.173	
Participates in illegal activity	1.760	0.937	1.120	
Considered an abortion	0.972	0.631 **	1.167	
Female baby	1.080	1.001	1.072	
Ever in military	1.019	0.765	1.541	*
Relationship status at birth (Omitted=Married)				
Cohabiting	1.134	1.273	1.123	
Visiting	1.082	1.346	0.831	
Friends	0.404 ***	1.122	1.056	
No relationship	0.743	0.471 #	0.596	
Had other children	0.784	0.905	1.198	
Intercept: Somewhat important	-4.927	-6.430	-4.722	
Intercept: Very important	-2.999	-3.234	-2.523	
<b>N</b>	3525	3525	3525	
<b>df</b>	30	30	30	
<b>- 2 log likelihood</b>	2004.666	1991.158	2294.554	

# p≤.055 \*p≤.05 \*\*p≤.01 \*\*\*p≤.001