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Welcome to the seventh edition of Father Facts, NFI's flagship research tool!

We have published Father Facts since the early 1990s, when our organization first started its work to end father absence and connect fathers to their children, heart to heart.

From the one-page fact sheet of yesterday to the 122-page volume you have today, Father Facts continues to make the same point, loud and clear: children need good dads. The data in this book are ideal for writing effective grant proposals, for providing a news story with the statistic that will drive the story home, or for giving an issue brief or piece of legislation the fact-based evidence it needs to make an impact.

Father Facts 7 contains the research you need to be more effective in your work to promote involved, responsible, and committed fatherhood. As with past editions, it includes abstracts of the most recent studies, published since the last edition, and helpful tables that organize the data on rates of father absence. For this edition, we added brief summaries at the start of each chapter and section on the state of the research in each area that distills what we know related to that fatherhood-related topic.

We also dedicated an entire chapter—the first chapter—to a single study. It is arguably the most important study done on the causal effects of father absence. It proves beyond reproach that father absence causes many of the poor outcomes we see for children.

We decided to publish this edition in an ebook format. This format makes acquisition of Father Facts faster and easier (just purchase and download), while maintaining the “searchable” aspect of the previous edition. It also allows us to update Father Facts as relevant data and research are released from sources we monitor, shared with us by others committed to addressing father absence, or that we find in the course of our work. As a result, we now have the ability to provide every user of Father Facts with the most recent data and research the moment they acquire it.

Father Facts is only a part of the story here at NFI. While we continue to be one of the leading producers of research on the causes and consequences of father absence, we do a whole lot more. Please visit our websites, fatherhood.org and fathersource.org, to learn about our state-of-the art portfolio of fatherhood skill-building materials, training programs, and technical assistance. Also, join our online community on Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, and our blog The Father Factor so you can stay connected to all of the work we do to ensure a brighter future for our nation’s children.

I hope you find Father Facts 7 to be an extremely valuable tool. Please let us know about your experiences using it by emailing us at info@fatherhood.org.

Wishing you the very best,

Christopher A. Brown
President
National Fatherhood Initiative
I. The Proof is In: Father Absence Harms Children

Despite reams of data that NFI compiled in the previous six editions of Father Facts (the most comprehensive collection of data available on the consequences of father absence and the benefits of father involvement for children), the recognition among people across the political spectrum of the need to combat father absence, and the commitment of many private and public funders to addressing this problem, there are still some scholars and members of the public who are not convinced that dads are important to children. Many people believe that family structure doesn’t really matter, as long as children are cared for and loved by someone, anyone. One valid reason for the skepticism among scholars, at least, is the lack of rigorous analytical methods employed in much of the research.

Late last year, researchers Sara McLanahan, Laura Tach, and Daniel Schneider stepped into the fray with their review of nearly 50 studies that employed innovative, rigorous designs to examine the causal effects of father absence. Published in the Annual Review of Sociology, “The Causal Effects of Father Absence” examined studies that focused on the relationship between father absence and four outcomes for children: educational attainment, mental health, relationship formation and stability, and labor force success. Although these studies varied in the use of analytical approaches and found different effect sizes, they prove beyond reproach that father absence causes poor outcomes for children in each of these areas.

This is a critical distinction. The old adage, “correlation does not imply causation,” does not apply to the effects of father absence on children. In other words, for many of our most intractable social ills affecting children, father absence is to blame.

Furthermore, what’s impressive about the review is not only its inclusion of studies that employed a variety of analytical methods; it also included studies from nine countries, mostly developed countries (including the U.S.) but also developing countries. Consequently, this cross-cultural analysis of research lends strength and credibility to the conclusion about the devastating effects of father absence. Father absence isn’t just a U.S. problem. It’s a human problem.

One particular conclusion of these scholars is very sobering and should haunt us as a nation given that the U.S. has reached an all-time high in the number of children born to single parents: the earlier in their lives that children experience father absence the more pronounced are its effects.

As you continue to review the data and research in Father Facts 7, keep this study and that conclusion in the forefront of your mind.

II. The Facts of Father Absence

This chapter provides the most recent general data on father absence. These data include national data on rates of father absence by examining children’s living arrangements by type of family form and race. This edition of Father Facts adds rates of father absence in each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Detailed tables on the national and state data are included in Appendix A.

National Level

What We Know

Father absence has rapidly increased since 1960 with the number of children growing up without their fathers having stabilized somewhat in the past decade. Father absence disproportionally affects Black and Hispanic children, and nearly a quarter of all American children live in father-absent homes. The relationship between the mother and father at birth affects later father involvement. Fathers who have a romantic relationship with the mother are more likely to be involved compared to fathers who do not have a romantic relationship with the mother.

The Data and Research

In America, 23.6% of children (17.4 million) lived in father-absent homes in 2014.


In 2014, 68.7% of children under age 18 lived in two-parent families, 23.6% in single-mother families, 3.9% in single-father families, and 3.8% with neither parent. Of those children residing with neither parent, 56.2% live with grandparents, 23.8% live with other relatives, 16.1% live with nonrelatives, and 3.9% live in an other arrangement.


Of the 73.7 million children under 18 years living in the United States in 2014, 68.7% (50.6 million) were living with two parents, 27.5 % (20.3 million) were living with one parent, 23.6% (17.4 million) of those in single parent households were living with a single mother, and 3.8% (2.8 million) were living with neither parent.


A study of 3,197 fathers from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study examined father identity and involvement patterns. The study found:

- Resident fathers had consistently higher levels of involvement than separated/divorced and nonresident fathers; however, both types of fathers did not have statistically different involvement when their child was 1 year old.

- Separated/divorced fathers had higher levels of involvement than nonresident fathers.

- Father involvement was found to decrease over time.

- Fathers with a high school education or bachelor’s degree were found to be more involved than fathers with lower education.

A nationally representative sample of urban families from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study examined the circumstances of previously married and unmarried parents who were living apart 5 years after the birth of their child. Major findings included:

- About 66% of parents who were unmarried at the time of their child’s birth reported living in separate households when their child was 5 years old. The figure showed that, among unmarried parents, those who had no relationship at birth were the most likely to be living apart (92%) when their child was 5 years old, followed by those who had romantic non-cohabitating relationships (82%), and those who were cohabiting at birth (47%). About two (2) percent of unmarried parents reported living together part-time or inconsistently 5 years after their child’s birth.

- Compared to other fathers, fathers who did not have a close relationship with the mother at birth had less contact with their children and the weakest connections with their children.

- Unmarried mothers who were cohabitating with the father at the time of their child’s birth were more likely to have established legal paternity for the child (87%). In comparison, of those who did not have a romantic relationship at birth, 63% established legal paternity.


About 41% of children born in the U.S. in 2012 were born to never-married parents. The percentage of births to unmarried women is more than double the percentage in 1980 (18.4%).


According to the U.S. Census Bureau:

- In 2012 Black children and Hispanic children were more likely to live with one parent than non-Hispanic White children or Asian Children.

- The percentage of mother-only and father-only family households increased since 2007. Among single-parent households, single-father families rose from 10% to 17% between 1980 and 2012.

- In 2012, father-only family groups were in better economic standings than mother-only families. This is evidenced by better educational attainment, higher employment rates, higher home ownership rates, and lower rates of SNAP benefits.

- In 2012, 19% of single fathers had a bachelor’s degree compared with 17% of single mothers. Fifty-seven (57) percent of single-father families were homeowners compared with 38% of mother-only families.

- In 2012, 44% of children living with father-only had a divorced father.


A Pew Research Center analysis of the National Survey of Family Growth yielded the following findings:

- 87% of males aged 15-44 with no children would like to have children at some point. Fifty-one (51) percent of childless men aged 40-44 also indicated a desire to have children.

- More than 25% of fathers with children under 18 lived apart from their children. Eleven (11) percent lived apart from some of their children and 16% lived apart from all of their children.

- Twenty (20) percent of fathers who live apart from their children have visits more than once a week, 29% visit at least once a month, 21% visit several times a year, and 27% do not have visits at all.
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- Of fathers who lived apart from their children, 41% were in touch with their children by phone or email several times a week, 28% communicated at least monthly, and 31% talked with their children less than once a month.

- Ninety (90) percent of resident fathers shared a meal and spoke with their children about their children’s day almost daily, 63% helped their children with homework, and 54% took their children to or from activities throughout a given week. In comparison, 31% of non-resident fathers spoke with their children about their children’s day several times a week, 16% have shared a meal with their children several times a week, 10% helped with homework, and 11% took a child to or from activities.


In 2013, 24.7 million fathers were part of married-couple families with children under 18 years old. Twenty-one (21) percent of fathers among married-couple family households were raising three or more children younger than 18 years old.


One-third of children in the United States are expected to live with a non-biological parental figure at some point in their lives. This is in part related to the fact that out-of-wedlock births, divorce, and re-partnering have become more common, contributing to greater complexity in family structures.


About 21% of American children will see at least two live-in partners of their mothers by the time they are 15, and an additional 8% will see three or more. Only six (6) percent of American children have parents who live together without being married.


More adults are living alone—27% are married and living with kids, 23% are married, living without kids, 14% are living alone, 14% are living with another family member, and 10% are unmarried, living with kids.


The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, a joint project of Princeton and Columbia, followed 5,000 children from birth to age 9, and found that more than half of the unmarried parents were living together at the time their child was born and 30% of them were romantically involved but living separately.


In 1970, 85% of children under age 18 lived in two-parent families, 11% in single-mother families, 1% in single-father families, and 3% lived with neither parent. In 2004, by contrast, only 61% of children lived with married biological parents, 9% lived with two parents who were either unmarried or only one of whom was the child’s biological parent, 23% lived with single mothers, three (3) percent with single fathers, and four (4) percent resided with neither parent—usually with grandparents or other relatives.


A national two-generation longitudinal survey revealed that 80% of children were born to married mothers, but only 64% remained with both parents by 2000. In 2000, children aged 5 to 14 had experienced, on average, slightly less than one household transition. Ninety-one percent of white children surveyed were born into a married household. Sixteen percent of these households dissolved by 2000. In contrast, 52.6% of black children were born into a married household; 30% of those households dissolved by 2000.


Fifty-nine percent of young adults have had contact with their noncustodial fathers at least once a month. 10% had contact less than once a month, and 31% report no contact in the past 3 months. Sixty-two percent of young adults said they would not talk to their noncustodial father if they were depressed or unhappy, while 21% said they definitely or probably would.

State Level

What We Know

Father absence rates for each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico highlight trends in the regions most impacted by father absence. Rates of father absence vary dramatically across the country and within specific regions and states. Data on father absence for the major and most populated cities in each state reflect this variance. Nevertheless, it’s clear that more children in the south and in Puerto Rico live in father-absent homes compared to other areas of the country. **Detailed tables on the state data are included in Appendix A.**

The Data and Research

Among the 50 states, the three states with the highest numbers of children growing up in father absent homes are in the southern region. Specifically:

- Mississippi has the highest number of children living in father absent homes (36.2%) followed by Louisiana (34.4%), and Alabama (30.7%).

- In Puerto Rico, 42.7% of children are raised in father-absent homes.

- Major cities with the highest numbers of children in father-absent homes include Wilmington, DE (65.5%), Detroit, MI (63.3%), and Birmingham, AL (61.5%).

- The states with the lowest rates of father absence include Utah (11.5%), North Dakota (14.4%), and Idaho (16.0%).
III. Consequences of Father Absence for Children

This chapter provides the most recent data on the negative effects of father absence on child well-being. Father absence places children, on average, at greater risk for alcohol and substance abuse, child abuse, crime, lower educational success, emotional and behavioral problems, poorer physical health, poverty, risky sexual activity, suicide, and teen pregnancy. While these are not the only negative affects of father absence, they are the most concerning and well-researched. Be aware that this chapter includes data and research that, while placed within the context of consequences, also includes the benefits of father involvement (e.g. lower levels of alcohol and drug use/abuse and child abuse). Because much of the data and research compare children from father-absent homes to father-present homes, it has implications for Chapter VII: Benefits of Father Involvement. Specifically, the topic on benefits of father involvement for child well-being. The data and research in this chapter are, however, not repeated in Chapter VII. That chapter includes data and research on additional benefits of father involvement for child well-being.

Alcohol and Substance Abuse

What We Know

Family structure significantly impacts adolescent substance and alcohol use, particularly for young men. Children from father-absent homes are more likely to engage in substance or alcohol use. Recent studies add to the research in the previous edition of Father Facts regarding the specific effect of father absence on the likelihood of substance abuse for Black adolescents. Children with fathers who abuse drugs are also at greater risk for substance use. Research points to the importance of parental involvement as a protective factor against alcohol and substance abuse.

The Data and Research

A study of 736 adolescents found that on average, adolescents in nuclear families were less likely to participate in alcohol and drug use than adolescents in any other family type.


A representative national sample of 2,179 10th grade students was used to investigate how parenting practices impacted the likelihood of an adolescent driving while under the influence, or riding with someone impaired drivers in the 11th grade. The study found that paternal monitoring was a significant predictive factor against driving while intoxicated.

Researchers, using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, examined the relationship between family structure and marijuana use for 1,069 African American adolescents aged 13-18. The study investigated the influence of father absence on marijuana use in African American boys and girls, as well as the effects of mediating factors such as poverty, neighborhood quality, and self-control. Researchers found that:

- Young men with never-married mothers, stepfathers, and early divorce had significantly greater marijuana use rates than those in two-biological family households.
- While family structure significantly impacted young men’s marijuana use, it did not affect young women.
- Findings accounting for mediating factors suggest that adolescents with absent fathers are at a greater risk for using marijuana for they are more likely to live in poverty and poorer quality neighborhoods.


Using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, researchers examined the relationship between parent-child involvement, such as shared communication, shared activity participation, and emotional closeness and three adolescent alcohol outcomes, including alcohol use, alcohol related problems, and risky behavior co-occurring with alcohol use. This study investigated both paternal and maternal involvement in understanding adolescent alcohol outcomes. The results indicate that shared communication with fathers and emotional closeness to fathers, but not shared activity participation, had a unique impact on each alcohol outcome and were not related to maternal involvement.


A study with 441 college students revealed that a poor parental bond with one’s father was highly predictive of depression, a well-known predictor of alcohol abuse and related problems for both females and males. These findings suggest evidence for parental influences on pathways to alcohol abuse through depression.


A study of 296 at-risk adolescents whose fathers were drug abusers revealed that paternal smoking and drug use lead to strained father-child relationships. This weakened relationship led to greater adolescent maladjustment with family and friends and a higher risk for adolescent drug use and smoking. Fathers who smoke cigarettes were less likely to enforce antismoking rules for their children and had weaker bonds in terms of adolescent admiration and emulation.


In a study using a sample of 86 African American adolescents, the researchers assessed the effects of father’s absence on adolescent drug use. The results revealed that boys from father-absent homes were more likely than those from father-present homes to use drugs. Interestingly, the results didn’t reveal any difference between father-present and father-absent girls’ self-reported drug usage. For girls, friends’ drug use was the main predictor of drug use, while father absence was for boys. African American boys from father-absent homes might be at increased risk for drug use problems.

Child Abuse

What We Know

Family structure impacts the likelihood of victimization of children, with children from father-absent homes at an increased risk for experiencing child abuse. The absence of a biological father is a significant predictor for exposure to child abuse for children. While most perpetrators of child abuse are biological parents, children living with stepfathers and absent both biological parents are also at an increased risk for victimization. An involved father protects against child abuse perpetrated by the mother.

The Data and Research

A study of 118 men with biological and step-children found that they were more likely to abuse their step-children, pointing to the increased risk of child abuse for children with absent biological fathers.


According to the Child’s Bureau 2013 Child Maltreatment Data:

- The majority of victims consisted of three races or ethnicities: White (44.0%), Hispanic (22.4%), and African American (21.2%).
- In 2013, an estimated 1,520 children died from abuse and neglect in the United States.
- Nearly 74% (73.9%) of all child fatalities were younger than 3 years old.
- Four-fifths (78.9%) of child fatalities were caused by one or both parents.
- In 2013, one or both parents maltreated 94% of victims. Slightly more than 20% (20.3%) of victims were maltreated by father only, one (1) percent by father and nonparents, 40.7% by mother only, 6.8% by mother and nonparents, and 22.5% by mother and father.
- Of the perpetrators who were parents, 88.6% were biological parents, 3.7% were stepparents, 0.6% were adoptive parents, and 7.6% were the unmarried partner of a parent.


The absence of one or both parents was found to be a risk factor for sexual assault for girls 17 years of age and younger, according to a study sampling 1,087 girls, their primary caretakers, and household heads.


A study of 4,046 United States children ages 2-17 found that those living in single parent, stepfamily, or parent-partner households had higher rates of victimization than those in traditional family households. More specifically, the study found:

- 19% of youth in stepfamilies and 16% with single parents were exposed to some form of maltreatment in 2013.
- Only 7% of those living with both biological parents were exposed.
- About 28% of youth in stepfamilies and 26% in single parent families were assaulted compared to 17% of youth living with two biological parents.
- Rates of witnessing family violence were twice as high in single parent and stepfamilies.
- Sexual victimization was also higher for children in stepfamilies (8.3%) and single parent families (7.9%) than those in two biological parent families (6.5%).

A study using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study revealed that in many cases the absence of a biological father contributes to increased risk of child maltreatment. The results suggest that Child Protective Services (CPS) agencies have some justification in viewing the presence of a social father as increasing children’s risk of abuse and neglect. It is believed that in families with a non-biological (social) father figure, there is a higher risk of abuse and neglect to children, despite the social father living in the household or only dating the mother.


A study using a sample of 385 Brazilian women with a male partner and a child aged 1-12 explored whether the presence of a stepfather could be a potential risk factor for violence against children, as reported by the mothers. Furthermore:

- Being in a non-marital relationship may increase maternal risk for aggression toward children.
- Mothers were more likely to abuse their own children when their partners were stepfathers to the children as compared to birth fathers.
- The presence of a stepfather was a predictor of child physical abuse by the mothers as physical abuse was reported for 34% of the children with stepfathers compared to 17.6% of those living with birth fathers.
- Households with the child’s mother plus stepfather had twice the risk of child abuse compared to households with the child’s two genetic parents where the mother was the primary perpetrator.


In a study examining father-related factors predicting maternal physical child abuse risk, researchers conducted interviews with mothers of 3-year-old children. The results revealed that mothers who were married to fathers were at lower risk for maternal physical child abuse. Moreover, it was found that higher educational attainment and positive father involvement with their children were significant predictors of lower maternal physical child abuse risk.


In a study using data from 26 cases of fatal child abuse with fathers as perpetrators, the type of relationship between victim, perpetrator, and the victim’s mother was investigated. It was found that:

- 62% of the offenders were stepfathers and only in four cases the perpetrator was a birth father married to the birth mother.
- 81% of the stepfathers were cohabiting with the birth mother compared to only 15% that were married to the birth mother, and four (4) percent that were in dating relationships with the mother.
- It was also found that stepfathers had more disrupted and disadvantaged backgrounds and experiences than birth fathers.

These findings indicate that the nature of intimate relationship (married v. cohabiting) and fathering relationship (birth v. stepfather) are important factors in fatal child abuse cases.
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Crime

What We Know

The absence of fathers, and father figures in a community, is a predictor for children engaging in criminal activity. Research suggests that there are differences in whether or not father absence affects delinquency based on gender, with father absence being closely linked to criminal activity for young men but not for women. While there are no specific studies on how father absence affects female engagement in crime, research suggests that the absence of a father is a greater risk factor for delinquency for young men.

The Data and Research

A recent study, using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, examined the effect of father absence on adolescent boys and girls as well as adults. The study found that:

- Adolescent boys with absent fathers are less likely to engage in delinquency than those with fathers who are present.
- Father absence was not found to have a statistically significant effect on adolescent girls likelihood of engaging in delinquent behavior.
- For men aged 25-32, those who lived with their biological fathers in adolescence are less likely to engage in delinquency than those without a father figure.
- While growing up with an involved biological father does have some protective factors for women, growing up with a father does not affect the likelihood of engaging in delinquent behavior.


Using Census Data for the average monthly assaults for youth, age 10-24 years, found that adult male scarcity in a community was a predictor for high rates of youth assault.


Researchers using secondary data from the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research examined gun carrying and drug trafficking in young men, linking father absence to the likelihood of engaging in these behaviors. Results from a sample of 835 juvenile male inmates found that father absence was the only disadvantage on the individual level with significant effects on gun carrying, drug trafficking, and co-occurring behavior. Individuals from father absent homes were found to be 279% more likely to carry guns and deal drugs than peers living with their fathers.


In a study using a sample of 309 adolescents and their parents, researchers examined changes in adolescent disclosure, parental solicitation, and parental control and their associations with the development of delinquent activities. The analysis was based on adolescents’ and both parents’ reports on adolescent disclosure, parental solicitation, and parental control, and adolescents’ reports on delinquent activities and parental support. The researchers found that:

- A stronger increase in delinquent activities was related to a stronger decrease in disclosure in mother and adolescent reports and to lower levels of disclosure in father reports.
- The correlation between levels of disclosure and delinquent activities was stronger in families with high parental support than in families with lower support.
Additionally, in lower parental support families, a stronger decrease in paternal control was related to a stronger increase in delinquent activities. On the other hand, in high parental support families, a stronger decrease in adolescent-reported parental control was related to a less strong increase in delinquent activities.


A study of low-income minority adolescents aged 10–14 years found that higher social encounters and frequent communication with nonresident biological fathers decreased adolescent delinquency.


Researchers examined the relationship between childhood experiences of parenting and criminal behavior among offenders against the person, property offenders, and non-offenders. The results revealed that:

- Non-offenders perceived their fathers to be warmer and more overprotective compared to person offenders.
- Moreover, person offenders perceived their mothers to be less warm than did property offenders and non-offenders, and less overprotective than non-offenders.
- In general, mothers were perceived to be more overprotective and warmer than fathers among all three groups.


A study using a sample of 15,428 ninth graders investigated risk behaviors, victimization and mental distress among adolescents in different family structures using sub-groups of single parents (including single mother, single father and shared physical custody families). The assessed risk behaviors included use of alcohol, illicit drugs and smoking. The results revealed that:

- Adolescents in single-mother and single-father families were at higher risk of risk behaviors, victimization and mental distress compared to those in two-parent families.
- Adolescents in shared physical custody didn’t show an increased risk of any of the investigated outcomes (except drunkenness).
- Based on the research findings, children of single mothers or single fathers are at higher risk of different behavioral problems than children in two-parent families.


In a study using data from the 1997 National Longitudinal Study of Youth, the researchers examined father-child relationship and father’s parenting style as predictors of first delinquency and substance use among adolescents in intact families. The results indicated that:

- A more positive father-child relationship predicts a reduced risk of engagement in multiple first risky behaviors.
- Having a father with an authoritarian parenting style is associated with an increased risk of engaging in delinquent activity and substance use.
- The negative effect of authoritarian parenting can be reduced when fathers have a positive relationship with their adolescents.
Permissive parenting also predicts less risky behavior when the father-child relationship is positive.

The positive influence of the father-child relationship on risk behaviors seemed to be stronger for male than for female adolescents.


A study using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health explored the relationship between family structure and risk of violent acts in neighborhoods. The results revealed that:

- If the number of fathers is low in a neighborhood, then there is an increase in acts of teen violence.
- A one (1) percent increase in the proportion of single-parent families in a neighborhood is associated with a three (3) percent increase in an adolescent’s level of violence. In other words, adolescents who live in neighborhoods with lower proportions of single-parent families and who report higher levels of family integration commit less violence.


### Educational Attainment

#### What We Know

The absence of a father can have adverse affects on educational attainment and child development. Transitions that occur in nontraditional families affect children’s learning and success in school. The duration of father absence is a factor in educational success. Family structure not only affects educational outcomes for children, but also influences educational expectations.

#### The Data and Research

A study of the relationship between father absence and lower educational attainment for African American females found that a longer duration of father absence is a predictive factor for lower educational success. Researchers discovered that longer duration of father absence often leads to lower income and family economic stress, which puts young women at risk for lower educational achievement.


Parental absence was linked to lower achievement expectations in a study of 268 new immigrant youth from Argentina, Columbia, and Cuba. Causes for parental absence included divorce, parental death, and serial migration, and these factors were found to adversely affect academic competence.


A study assessing 4,109 two-parent families examined the effects of early maternal and paternal depression on child expressive language at age 24 months and the role that parent-to-child reading may play in child’s language development. The results revealed that:

- For mothers and fathers, depressive symptoms were negatively associated with parent-to-child reading.
- Only for fathers, however, was earlier depression associated with later reading to child and related child expressive vocabulary development.
The less the fathers read to their infants, the worse their toddlers scored on a standard measure of expressive vocabulary at age two.

Parents’ depression has more impact on how often fathers read to their child compared to mothers, which in turn influences the child’s language development.


In a study of 13,988 adolescents in grades 7-12 who have lived with at least one biological parent, youth that experienced divorce, separation, or a nonunion birth reported lower grade point averages than those who have always lived with both biological parents. Moreover:

- No significant grade differences were found between youth in single-mother families and youth in married stepfather families.
- Grades were significantly lower, however, for youth living in cohabiting stepfather families formed following divorce/separation than youth living in single-mother families formed following divorce/separation.
- Youth who have experienced divorce, separation, or a nonunion birth have significantly higher levels of behavioral problems in school than do youth who have always lived with both biological parents.
- In contrast to previous GPA findings, youth living in stepfamilies or single-parent families are both more susceptible to school-related behavioral problems than youth who have always lived with both biological parents.
- Youth in cohabiting stepfather families, currently the fastest growing family type, have significantly lower college expectations than youth from other types of stepfamily and single-parent households.


A national two-generation longitudinal survey revealed that children who experienced multiple family transitions were more at risk for developmental problems than children who lived in stable, two-parent families. Furthermore:

- Black children experience more familial instability than white children.
- White children raised in a mother-only household for at least 75% of their first four years greatly increased externalizing behaviors and decreased cognitive achievement scores.
- Black children’s well-being and achievement scores are more reliant on current family structure than household status at birth. Black children are less likely than white children to be affected by family transitions.


A study of 1,977 children age 3 and older living with a residential father or father figure found paternal biological relationships had greater influence than marital relationships.

- Children living with their married biological father tested at significant higher levels than those living with a non-biological father.
- There was no significant difference on mathematical and comprehension tests between children living with unmarried biological parents and children living with married biological parents.
Children living with single fathers scored significantly lower than children living with married biological parents.

Children living with a biological father and non-biological mother scored at similar levels to children living with both married biological parents.


---

**Emotional and Behavioral Problems**

**What We Know**

Family structure is a significant predictor of children's cognitive development, emotional well-being, externalizing behaviors, and adolescent risk behaviors. Multiple transitions experienced by children in single-mother households can have adverse affects on children's behavioral health. Studies point to differences based on gender, with some studies pointing to increased risk for girls. Father absence impacts children as young as toddler age and continues to lead to adverse behavioral outcomes through adolescence.

**The Data and Research**

A study of 8,019 adolescents and their mothers from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health found that single-mother and stepfamily residence during adolescence lead to frequent family transitions, weakened maternal bonds, teenage dating, and teenage cohabitation.


A study using a subsample of 679 single mothers from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study suggest that nonresident father's financial support is directly associated with children's cognitive development. The findings suggest that a lack of nonresident father financial support can lead to higher maternal economic hardship, and stress, which can affect child development outcomes.


Absence of a biological father, as well as the unpredictability of undefined father roles, was found to lead to distress in a sample of toddlers from the National Early Headstart Research and Evaluation Project.


A study using a representative sample of 4,046 United States Children, ages 2-17, found that children and youth living in single parent and stepfamily or parent-partner households had higher rates of victimization than those living with both biological parents or adoptive parents. Children in these nontraditional family types had significantly higher levels of distress symptoms than children living in homes with two biological or adoptive parents.


Disengaged and remote interactions of fathers with infants is a predictor of early behavior problems in children and can lead to externalizing behaviors in children as early as age 1.

Researchers examined the relationship between family structure and behavior problems in 515 predominantly urban, ethnic minority children. Findings suggest that:

- Second and third grade children from two-parent families consistently had less externalizing behavior and hyperactivity than children from parent-absent households.

- While girls in single-mother households had more externalizing behavior and hyperactivity than their two-parent household peers, boys in single-mother households showed no difference in behavior than those from two-parent homes.


Data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (N= 10,061) revealed that divorce diminished children’s psychosocial well-being, which in turn caused a decline in academic achievement.


Based on a longitudinal data from a community sample of 451 families, research findings indicate a contribution of paternal depressive symptoms to adolescent functioning. Results of this study revealed that:

- Paternal depressive symptoms were significantly related to depressive symptoms in adolescents.

- Adolescent gender and perception of the father-adolescent relationship seem to be important factors contributing to the correlation between paternal depressive symptoms and adolescent adjustment.

- Paternal depressive symptoms were a strong predictor of adolescent functioning for females, as the paternal depressive symptoms were positively associated with adolescent depressive symptoms for girls who reported that their relationship with fathers lacked closeness.


A sample of 4,027 resident fathers and children from the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Survey was used to investigate the effects of a biological father’s multi-partner fertility (having at least one child with more than one mother) on adolescent health. Resident fathers engaging in multi-partner fertility were older, more likely to be White, and had lower education levels and income, compared to fathers with one partner. Results indicated children’s externalizing behaviors were negatively affected directly and indirectly when their biological father had children with multiple partners.


A Dutch study of 2,149 children, aged 10-15 years, revealed a three-way interaction of gender, age, and parental divorce. Adolescent girls were most at risk to develop depressive symptoms following their parents’ divorce.


Data from three waves of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (N= 2,111) was used to examine the prevalence and effects of mothers’ relationship changes between birth and age 3 on their children’s well being. Children born to single mothers show higher levels of aggressive behavior than children born to married mothers. Living in a single-mother household is equivalent to experiencing 5.25 partnership transitions.


A study of 1,977 children age 3 and older living with a residential father or father figure found that children living with married biological parents had significantly fewer externalizing and internalizing behavioral problems than children living with at least one non-biological parent.

A sample of 1,015 children from the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development revealed a strong connection between family instability and children’s externalizing behaviors. Of the sample, 80% were born into a married biological parent household, 12% were born to single mothers, and eight (8) percent were born to cohabiting parents. Moreover:

- 11% of respondents experienced one family transition by the age of 6, nine (9) percent experienced two, and six (6) percent experienced three or more.
- Children born into cohabiting parent households experienced the most familial instability, followed by those born into single-mother households.
- Teachers reported that children who experienced family transitions had higher externalizing behaviors than those living in a stable household.
- Fewer than 20% of children born into biological married parent households experienced family transitions, compared to more than half of those born into single-parent households and almost two-thirds of those born in cohabiting families.
- Sixty (60) percent of children born into cohabiting households spent time in single-parent homes during the first six years of their lives.


**Physical Health**

**What We Know**

Children who experience a lack of father involvement are at increased risk for adverse health outcomes. Father absence negatively affects birth weight and infant mortality rates. Father absence leads to a range of poor health outcomes, including a higher risk for obesity. Nontraditional family structure, and father absence in particular, is a strong indicator of poor physical health outcomes for children.

**The Data and Research**

Researchers, using a sample of 4,719 HIV positive mothers in Florida, found that women giving birth with an absent father were 87% more likely to have a baby with very low birth weight. Overall, father absence was shown to have adverse birth outcomes for HIV positive mothers.


Researchers examining health outcomes in a sample of 67,558 children under 18 years old from the National Survey of America’s Families suggests that health varies by family structure. Children living with a stepfather, grandparents, and those in foster care have the poorest health outcomes.


A study of 1,397,801 infants in Florida evaluated how a lack of father involvement impacts infant mortality. A lack of father involvement was linked to earlier births as well as lower birth weights. Researchers also found that:

- Father absence increases the risk of infant mortality, and that the mortality rate for infants within the first 28 days of life is four times higher for those with absent fathers than those with involved fathers.
- Paternal absence is also found to increase black/white infant mortality almost four-fold.

A study of health differences in a sample of 2,160 children from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing study indicates that children with stably married parents had a lower risk of having poor health than children from cohabitating homes as well as children from dissolved cohabitating homes. The probability of being in the lowest health category was highest for children whose cohabitating parents separated.


High-quality interaction by any type of father predicts better infant health.


Children living with their married biological or adoptive parents have better access to health care than children living in any other family type.


In a study using a sample of 2,537 boys and 2,446 girls, researchers investigated the relationship between Body Mass Index (BMI) status at ages 4 to 5 years and mothers’ and fathers’ parenting involvement and parenting styles. The results showed that:

- Only fathers’ parenting behaviors and styles were associated with increased risks of child overweight and obesity.
- Mothers’ parenting behaviors and styles were not associated with a higher likelihood of children being in a higher BMI category.
- Higher father control scores were correlated with lower chances of the child being in a higher BMI category.
- Children of fathers with permissive and disengaged parenting styles had higher odds of being in a higher BMI category.


Over 20% of unmarried women reported smoking during pregnancy, compared to seven (7) percent of married mothers.


A study of 68,418 children from the 2003 National Survey of Children’s Health revealed that inadequate sleep was associated with family conflict, parental emotional health, and parental anger.
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Poverty

What We Know

Father absence leads to poor economic outcomes for children. There is an intergenerational risk of father absence, with children from father-absent homes being more likely to either become absent fathers or raise children with absent fathers. These children are also socioeconomically at risk. Children living in father-absent homes are at greater risk for growing up in poverty, living in disordered neighborhoods, and experiencing food insecurity than are their peers in traditional family households.

The Data and Research

Nonresident father involvement is linked to lower food insecurity for children in early and middle childhood. A study using a nationally representative sample of 10,500 United States born children found that irregular cash support from nonresident fathers significantly increased food insecurity compared to no support. While irregular cash support has adverse affects on children, regular cash support, and frequent in-kind support were associated with lower food insecurity.


A study of 775 nonresident father families and 1,407 resident father families found that children of nonresident fathers were more likely to live in disordered neighborhoods. This study, using a representative sample from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, indicates that children in single-mother households are more likely to live in impoverished communities with unemployment, crime, low-quality housing, poor health systems, poor education, and scant resources.


A study of 386 socioeconomically at risk individuals in Montreal, Canada found that men who grew up with absent fathers were more likely to become absent fathers. The study also found that women who grew up with absent fathers are more likely to have children with absent fathers. Findings point to the intergenerational affects of father absent, including socioeconomic disadvantage.


In 2011, children living in female-headed homes with no spouse present had a poverty rate of 47.6%. This is over four times the rate for children living in married couple families.


In 2008, American poverty rates were 13.2% for the whole population and 19% for children, compared to 28.7% for female-headed households.


A study of nearly 5,000 children born to parents in 20 large US cities found that unmarried childbearing helped sustain high poverty rates due to multiple partner fertility and relationship instability.


In 2007, there was a significant difference in poverty rate between custodial mothers and custodial fathers. The poverty rate of custodial mothers was 27%, significantly higher than the poverty rate for custodial fathers, 12.9%.

Over the last quarter century, homeless families with children have grown to be a separate subgroup of the homeless population in the United States. In 2007, families with children accounted for between one-third and one-half of all homeless persons. Among homeless women, approximately two-thirds were living with minor children, 80% of whom were under eleven years of age. The increase in family homelessness has correlated with an increase in the number of single-parent families and limited social support for such families.


From 1970-1996, there was a 5% increase in child poverty that was nearly all attributed to the rise in single-parent families, especially never-married mothers.


Sexual Activity and Teen Pregnancy

What We Know

Growing up without a father has a significant impact on sexual activity for both young men and women. Because studies link earlier sexual debut and risky sexual behavior to father absence, links naturally occur between family structure and teen pregnancy. As a result, living in a father-absent home increases the likelihood of teen pregnancy. Father absence not only leads to earlier sexual debut and risky sexual behavior, but also increases the likelihood that young men and women will be vulnerable to sexual exploitation. Attitudes about childbearing and marriage also relate to father absence, as youth with absent fathers report a lower ideal age for childbearing than do their peers. Higher quality relationships with parents and time spent with parents also influences sexual activity in teens. Studies also point to the affect that father absence has on the age of menarche for young women. Overall, the affects of father absence on sexual activity in youth point to earlier and riskier sexual behavior for children who grow up in father-absent homes.

The Data and Research

A sample of 736 adolescents found that on average, adolescents in stepfamilies were less likely to delay sexual activity than those in nuclear families.


Researchers used data from a sample of 5,542 youth from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth to examine the relationship between father absence and sexual debut, age of menarche, and attitudes about childbearing and marriage. Results indicate:

- Nonresident fatherhood leads to earlier sexual debut for girls, but not for boys.
- Youth with fathers who were always absent had a younger age at first sex than all other youth.
- Youth whose fathers left after birth had younger ages at first sex than those with always-present fathers.
- Girls with always-absent fathers or fathers who left during early childhood had an earlier age at menarche than their peers.
- Youth with always-absent fathers reported a significantly lower ideal age at childbirth than their peers.
Sixty (60) percent of youth with always-absent fathers reported a younger ideal age at marriage than ideal age at childbirth compared to 87% of youth with always-present fathers.

For boys, father absence at any age was not associated with ideal childbirth age.


A study investigating the relationship between father involvement and daughter's age of menarche and sexual debut in 342 female undergraduate students indicated that father absence was significantly correlated with earlier age of menarche.


A study of 263 13- to 18-year-old adolescent women seeking psychological services found that the adolescents from father-absent homes were 3.5 times more likely to experience pregnancy than were adolescents from father-present homes. Moreover, the rate of pregnancy among adolescents from father-absent homes was 17.4% compared to a four (4) percent rate in the general adolescent population.


Researchers found that among a sample of 6,069 female participants from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, respondents were more likely to report teen pregnancy if they lived in a single-mother household or other nontraditional family structure.


A sample of 4,588 adolescents from the National Longitudinal Data of Youth was used to examine the association between family structure and transition to first heterosexual intercourse in both serious and casual relationships. The study found paternal monitoring to be a protective factor for engaging in sexual intercourse for both males and females. For females, better quality paternal-daughter relationships reduced the risk of first sex in a casual relationship.


A study of 101 sister pairs revealed that higher quality father daughter relationships is a protective factor against engagement in risky sexual behaviors. This study showed that lower quality relationships increased the likelihood for girls to engage in risky sexual behaviors.


Father absence impacted earlier onset of breast development in higher-income families as well as public hair development for higher-income African American families, indicating a relationship between father absence and earlier puberty among girls from higher-income families.


In a study examining how young adults perceive fathers as targets for attachment support, researchers found a relationship between higher levels of sexual activity and closeness to romantic partners with lower use of fathers as attachment figures. Only 10% of the young adults who participated in this study considered fathers a principal source of attachment support. Compared to the remaining 90% of young adults who did not rank fathers as a primary attachment figure, those who did were more likely to be male, younger than 20, not romantically involved, and less sexually active.

A study assessing the risk and protective factors associated with early sexual intercourse among low-income adolescents revealed that variables such as, age, gender, race, two-parent households, separated households, households where the mother formed a union, transitioning onto welfare, and delinquency increased the odds that adolescents were sexually active. The researchers found that:

- Maternal education and father involvement were the only protective factors for early sexual activity.
- The risk factors for early sexual contact were age, gender, race, two-parent households, separated households, and delinquency.
- Among all of the family processes, father involvement was the only factor that decreased the odds of engaging in sexual activity and none of the other family processes was found to be statistically significant.


A study using a sample of 3,206 adolescents aged 13-18 explored the relationship between sexual risk behaviors and parenting processes among adolescents and their residential parents. The findings revealed that:

- Adolescents who engaged more frequently in activities with their families and had fathers who were more knowledgeable about their friends and activities reported lower average levels of sexual risk behaviors in comparison to their peers whose parents were less engaged.
- Family structure characteristics were found to be strong predictors of differences in both sexual risk behaviors and parenting processes. Adolescents who lived with stepparents or who resided for some portion of the study time in a single-parent household showed significantly higher average levels of sexual risk behaviors than their peers in stable and biological-parent families.
- Youth in stepparent households reported less involved and engaged parenting than their peers in biological-parent families.
- Child gender was an important predictor of differences in both family processes and adolescent sexual behaviors. Girls reported lower sexual risk behaviors than boys and higher maternal knowledge but lower family activities and slightly lower paternal knowledge compared to boys.

The results suggest that paternal knowledge and family activities may be more protective for girls than for boys.


Child Trends used data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth to explore the relationship between parenting practices and the probability of adolescent sexual experience by age 16. The researchers found that:

- Parental involvement including positive parent-adolescent relationship quality, high parental awareness and monitoring, and family dinner routines is associated with delayed sex among teens.
- Adolescent girls who reported higher quality relationships with their mothers and fathers, and adolescent boys who reported that they ate dinner with their families every day were less likely to have sexual intercourse at an early age.
- Adolescent boys and girls who reported that their parents paid more attention to with whom they spend time when not at home were also less likely to become sexually active at an early age.
- Adolescent girls who reported higher levels of relationship quality with their fathers were less likely to have sex before age 16, compared with adolescent girls who reported lower levels of father-daughter relationship quality.

Adolescent boys who had dinner with their family every day were less likely to have had sex before age 16, compared with those who report they eat dinner with their family less than five nights a week. Thirty-one (31) percent of teen boys who reported having dinner with their family every day were estimated to have had sex before age 16, compared with 37% of teen boys who reported that they had dinner with their family fewer than five days a week.


A comprehensive review of 180 studies of the effect of family structure on adolescent sexual activity, conducted over a period of 25 years, concluded that:

- Adolescents from intact family structures are less likely than their peers from non-intact family backgrounds to engage in sexual activity. Moreover, when adolescents from intact families do become sexually active, they tend to do so at an older age than their counterparts from non-intact families.

- Family structure seems to matter more for the sexual behavior of young teens than for the sexual behavior of older teens. In addition, at any given age, the effects of family structure are stronger for White and Hispanic adolescents than for their Black counterparts.

- The delay in sexual debut by adolescents from intact families also appears to account for discrepancies in the effects of family structure on adolescents’ frequency of intercourse, number of sexual partners, contraceptive use, STD infection, and pregnancy and childbirth outcomes. In fact, the strong relationship between family structure and adolescent sexual debut explains most of the relationship between family structure and other sexual outcomes.

These results suggest that among sexually active and non-sexually active teens, the main effect of family structure is a reduction in previous sexual experience or, in other words, a delay in the age of sexual debut.


In a phenomenological study of adolescent mothers’ experiences of having become sexually active, it was revealed that teen mothers’ experiences of living without a strong father figure were an important factor for having become sexually active. Based on the study findings, the inability to bond in satisfactory ways with a father or father figure may result in earlier onset of sexual activity and the higher risk of teen pregnancy.


In a study exploring the perspectives of daughters who experienced father absence during their childhood and/or adolescent years, the researchers interviewed nine women aged 22-46. The researchers found that:

- Participants expressed difficulties forming healthy relationships with men and they associated these difficulties with their experiences of father absence.

- Participants revealed a strong need for attention and affection from men which was also associated by the participants with the lack of affection received from their fathers. The desire for affection made these females more vulnerable to male attention, which put them at higher risk of being exploited by any male who expressed any positive interest in them. Some of the participants’ poor relationship decisions were attributed to this vulnerability.

Using the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth and its Young Adult Supplement, researchers found that:

- An additional 5 years with the biological father decreases the probability of smoking by 5.3 percentage points, drinking by 1.2 percentage points, engaging in sexual intercourse by 3.4 percentage points, marijuana use by 2.2 percentage points, and conviction by 0.3 percentage points.

- Youth are less likely to participate in deviant behaviors if fathers were present at birth and the longer the biological father remains in the household.

- Youths whose fathers were never present are less likely to get involved in all forms of deviant behaviors compared to youths whose biological fathers were present when the youth was born until age 5. This research finding suggests that timing of the family disruption plays a role in addition to the disruption itself in the development of deviant behavior in youth.  
  

In two recent national surveys of adolescents aged 12-19 and of adults aged 20 and older (some of whom were parents of teens), respondents were asked about who they think is most influential when it comes to adolescents’ decisions about sex. The surveys revealed that:

- Parents underestimate their influence on their adolescents’ decisions about sex.

- Nearly one-half of adolescents aged 12-19 (47 percent) reported that their parents had the most influence on their decisions about sex.

- Only one-third of parents of adolescents (34 percent) reported that parents were the most influential.  
  

A study using data from two waves of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health investigated the influence of the parent-child relationship on adolescent virginity status. The researchers examined how adolescents’ perceptions of the quality of their parent-child relationships influence the likelihood of first sex among a sample of adolescent virgins living in biologically intact, two-parent families. The results indicated that girls with close father-child relationship were less likely to report first sex between study waves. The results did not indicate a direct relationship for boys or with the mother-child relationship.  
  

A study using a sample of 1,409 rural southern adolescents (851 females and 558 males) aged 11 to 18 years, investigated the correlation between father absence and self-reported sexual activity. The results revealed that adolescents in father-absent homes were more likely to report being sexually active compared to adolescents living with their fathers. The analysis indicated that father absence had a detrimental effect on adolescents’ lifestyle choices. This study also revealed a statistical significance between father absence and adolescent self-esteem.  
  
Researchers examined the impact of father absence on early sexual activity and teenage pregnancy in longitudinal studies in the United States (N= 242) and New Zealand (N= 520), in which community samples of girls were followed prospectively from early in life (5 years) to approximately age 18. The results showed that:

- Greater exposure to father absence was strongly associated with elevated risk for early sexual activity and adolescent pregnancy. This elevated risk was either not explained (in the U.S. study) or only partly explained (in the New Zealand study) by familial, ecological, and personal disadvantages associated with father absence.

- After controlling for covariates, there was stronger and more consistent evidence of effects of father absence on early sexual activity and teenage pregnancy than on other behavioral or mental health problems or academic achievement.


Suicide

What We Know

Suicide is linked to weak paternal bonds, including father-child conflict, and to father absence that results from military deployment. Lower perceived parental care and paternal support predict suicidal ideation, and men whose fathers committed suicide are more likely to commit suicide. While research is limited, there is some evidence pointing to the role of fathers and paternal care in predicting suicide risk.

The Data and Research

A study of 172 adolescents in acute psychiatric care found that those with a history of suicide attempts report lower quality maternal and paternal care than those with suicidal ideation.


A comprehensive review of children in military families examined the impact of deployment separation on parenting, and children’s emotional, behavioral, and health outcomes; the impact of parental mental health symptoms during and after reintegration; and current treatment approaches in veteran and military families. The researchers found that, across all age groups, deployment of a parent may be related to increased emotional and behavioral difficulties for children, including higher rates of health-care visits for psychological problems during deployment. They also found that symptoms of PTSD and depression may be related to increased symptomatology in children and problems with parenting during and well after reintegration.


A study of 1,618 Latina high school students found that lower perceived father support is a predictor of suicidal ideation and behavior.

A study of risk factors for suicidal ideation in a group of 462 female cocaine-users found a link between suicidal ideation and adverse childhood experiences, such as father absence. The study found that women with suicidal ideation were more likely to report the absence of a biological father (70% versus 50% of non-ideators) for a period longer than 6 months prior to the age of 15.


A study of Dutch residents who died between 1995 and 2001 found that men whose fathers died by suicide were more likely to commit suicide than those whose fathers died of other causes.


Father absence due to military deployment was associated to increased odds of lower quality of life and suicidal ideation, particularly for adolescent boys, in a sample from the Washington State Healthy Youth Survey.


Researchers studied suicide ideation (thoughts of suicide) in a sample of 1,249 first-year college students and found that father-child conflict was an independent risk factor in suicide ideation.

IV. Societal Costs of Father Absence

This new chapter in Father Facts provides important data on the societal costs of father absence. The impact of father absence is felt not only at the individual and community levels, it is also felt at the societal level.

What We Know

Research on government spending in assistance programs shows the societal costs of father absence. Government assistance programs spend a large amount of their total expenditures assisting single-mother households. National Fatherhood Initiative’s The One Hundred Billion Dollar Man study presents research on the direct and indirect costs of father absence on society, noting not only the number of single-mother households that rely on government assistance programs, but also the indirect health care and mental health costs caused by father absence. Additionally, a review of responsible fatherhood programs launched during the Obama administration shows the costs of investing in fatherhood programs nationwide.

The Data and Research

Research from The One Hundred Billion Dollar Man study outlines the direct and indirect societal costs of father absence. The study yields the following findings:

- The federal government spent about $99.8 billion dollars in assistance to father absent families in 2006. Means-tested programs that the Federal government spent money on that benefit father absent families include Earned Income Tax Credit, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), child support enforcement, food and nutrition programs, housing programs, Medicaid, and the State Children’s Health Insurance Plan (SCHIP).

- Higher poverty levels among single-mother households lead to greater use of federal assistance programs. There are 14 major federal programs that provide assistance to households based on their income. These include:
  - Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC)
  - Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
  - Child care subsidies for women in TANF
  - Federal funding for child support enforcement
  - Supplemental Security Insurance for low-income disabled children
  - Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
  - Subsidized school breakfasts and lunches
  - Women's, Infants and Children nutrition program (WIC)
  - Medicaid
  - State Children’s Health Insurance Plan (SCHIP)
  - Head Start
  - Heating and energy assistance
  - Public housing
  - Section 8 rental subsidies
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- There are indirect societal costs of father absence as well. Children of fatherless families use mental health services at higher rates than their peers from two-parent households, they have more behavioral issues at school and are more likely to be involved in the juvenile justice system. Higher usage of substances, alcohol, and tobacco in addition to poorer health outcomes for children from father-absent homes may increase the need for medical services as compared to their peers. Children from father absent families are more likely to be incarcerated, as well as earn lower wages.

- A calculation of federal expenditures on various assistance programs, as well as how many program participants live in fatherless homes provides an estimate of how much of what percentage of program costs go towards assisting children in fatherless homes.

- The programs with the greatest areas of expenses for fatherless families in 2006 include Medicaid ($22.6 billion), TANF ($15.0 billion), and EITC ($14.9 billion).

- Health care costs for fatherless homes were $24.2 billion in 2006. About one-fifth of the federal budget spent on safety net programs was spent on federal means-tested benefits programs for single-mother households. Nearly 4% of the total budget for 2006 was spent directly on assistance to single-mother households.

- Thirty-five (35) percent of SCHIP expenditures benefit single-parent households, 41% of EITC recipients are in father-absent homes, and 87.5% of TANF recipients are single mothers.

- Fifty-six (56.3) percent of children receiving SSI benefits live in single-mother homes, about 30% of SNAP recipients are from female-headed homes, and 69.2% of children receiving free school lunches have single mothers.

- Fifty-five (55.2) percent of WIC recipients are raised by single-mothers, 48.2% of all Head Start recipients are from father-absent homes, and 37% of public assistance and Section 8 housing are female-headed households.


In 2010, President Obama signed the Claims Resolution Act which providing $150 million in grants to promote healthy marriage ($75 million) and responsible fatherhood ($75 million).


The Administration for Children and Families funded 55 organizations nationwide in providing responsible fatherhood activities to help fathers improve relationships with spouses, significant others, and the mothers of their children, become better parents, and contribute to the financial well-being of their children.

V. Causes of Father Absence

This chapter provides data on the causes of father absence. Cohabitation, divorce, and nonmarital childbearing are the three primary drivers of father absence. In the last 10 years, research has generated a substantial amount of data on cohabitating fathers, divorced fathers, and nonmarital childbearing. This chapter also provides data on another cause of father absence: the incarceration of fathers. Because of the growing body of research and statistics surrounding this population of fathers, incarcerated fathers is a new topic in Father Facts.

Cohabitation

What We Know

In 2014, more than three million children lived with cohabiting parents; nearly triple the number in 1996. Children born to cohabiting parents are much more likely than children born to married parents to experience their parents’ separation or divorce, which often leads to father absence. Despite that fact and that a much higher proportion of Americans believe that cohabitation is bad for society than believe it is good for society, there has been, since the 2000s, an increase in nonmarital birth rates to cohabitating, unwed parents. There is increased father involvement with children when fathers live with their children’s mothers, regardless of whether fathers are married to mothers. Additionally, some recent research finds unwed cohabitating fathers are equally as involved as married fathers.

The Data and Research

In 2014, more 3.1 million children lived with cohabiting parents, which is nearly triple the 1.2 million that lived in such families in 1996. Compared to married parents with children, these couples are younger, less educated, have lower incomes, and have less secure employment.


Researchers examined the difference in father-child involvement between Black married fathers and Black unwed cohabitating fathers. Using data collected at the 5-year follow-up of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, they found that there were similar levels of involvement between both Black married and unwed cohabitating fathers. They also found that unwed cohabitating fathers reported a slightly higher level of father-child involvement.


A study using the National Longitudinal Study of Youth (years 2008 and 2010) examined cohabitation expectations for single young adults (ages 18-24). Researchers found that:

- In 2008, 52.6% of the young adult participants had low or no expectations of cohabiting with a partner, and 47.4% had moderate to high expectations for cohabitation.

- In 2010, 38% of the young adults in the study were in unmarried cohabiting unions, with 30% of those in cohabitating unions originally in the “no expectation or low expectation of being in a cohabitating union” group.

Researchers concluded that unplanned cohabitation is important to consider when working with young adults regarding union formation and family change.

Forty-three (43) percent of Americans believe more people living together without getting married is bad for society compared to nine (9) percent who believe it good for society.

Survey data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study suggests that most cohabiting fathers are highly involved at birth.
- Ninety-seven (97) percent of cohabiting fathers visited the mother in the hospital, compared to 55% of non-resident fathers.
- Ninety-five (95) percent of cohabiting fathers provided financial support, compared to 64% of non-resident fathers.
- A third of non-resident fathers had no contact with their child five years after birth, while 43% had monthly contact.
- A non-resident father sees his child an average of 12 days per month.

The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (N= 1,350) revealed that positive involvement with children by cohabiting social fathers is equivalent to involvement of resident biological fathers.

Researchers used the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study to analyze the effects of family structure on parenting. They found:
- Marriage alone had little effect on mothers or fathers.
- Fathers that re-partnered had lower child involvement scores.
- Mothers reported cohabiting stepfathers to be more involved in family life than married biological fathers.
- Cohabiting fathers had higher family engagement scores than visiting fathers.
- Both cohabiting and visiting fathers had higher child involvement than single fathers.
- Divorced fathers with new partners reported lower positive engagement scores than married, cohabiting, visiting, and single fathers.

Half of all children are expected to live with their biological mothers and a social father at some point during childhood.

Research suggests that cohabitation with the mother and her male partner is associated with less externalizing behavioral problems in children.

Around half of unmarried women who give birth are cohabiting with the fathers of their children. The proportion of children born to cohabiting mothers has increased from 11% to 18%.
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In 2002, about 50% of American children born to cohabiting parents experienced separation or divorce by age 9, compared to about 20% of children born to married parents.


Cohabiting biological fathers are more trusted by mothers with children than cohabiting social fathers.


Cohabitation is becoming a prevalent union form in the twenty-first century. Data from the Add Health survey found that 59% of women cohabit with a partner at least once, compared to just 33% who marry before age 24. Approximately one in five cohabitations end in marriage.


A five-year follow-up study of the Fragile Families sample of urban births revealed that 26% of cohabiting couples at birth had married, 26% were still cohabiting, and 48% were no longer living together.


Divorce

What We Know

Divorce continues to be a significant driver of father absence despite the fact that the rate of divorce has plateaued in recent decades. In 2012 the divorce rate was 3.4 per 1,000 people in the United States. For families that experience divorce, it is a difficult transition and one that affects every member of the family. Divorced fathers have to overcome additional hurdles—including their view that the court system favors mothers—in order to have the level of involvement they want with their children. There is a split regarding how divorced fathers view their level of involvement with their children based on whether they identify as a full-time or part-time parent.

The Data and Research

The Center for Disease Control reports close to 2.2 million marriages occurred in 2012 and the marriage rate was 6.8 per 1,000 people. The CDC reports divorce rates at 3.4 per 1,000 people in the same year.


Using a national representative study from the Netherlands, the researcher found that:

- Divorce increases inequality between relationships children have with their father and mother.
- Previous research demonstrates that there can be a “decompensation” (deterioration) of parent-child relationships after parental divorce. This research supports that dynamic but adds divorce can also create inequality between parents. The inequality between parents can occur from loyalty conflicts, where parents force a child to choose between the two parents.
- There was no gender difference in parent-child conflict after the divorce. Parent-child conflict happens equally for both mothers and fathers.
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A qualitative study analyzing 20 newly divorced fathers, concluded that:

- Fathers identify themselves in three ways, full-time fathers, part-time full-time fathers, and part-time fathers.

- The distinguishing factors are how the fathers viewed their role with their children. Full-time fathers are raising their children and reported high levels of involvement with them. Part-time full-time fathers are fully involved with their children when they have them, but then focused on their own lives when they are apart from them. Part-time fathers felt that mothers are responsible for the involvement with the children, but they are financially responsible for their children.

The study supports previous data on father-child involvement post divorce and brings to light how divorce changes a father’s identity.


The majority of Americans who divorce remarry within four years.


Parental divorce and marital conflict increases the likelihood that children are close to neither parent in adulthood. Parental divorce increases the chances that children are close to only one parent.


An analysis of interviews with men focusing on fathers’ perspectives of the factors that influence their parental role after separation or divorce revealed that men often report tension experienced when desires for time with their children conflict with the time available to fathers. Many of the study participants described the court systems as being "pro-mom" because they experienced the courts as privileging mothers’ time with their children over fathers’ time.


Based on interviews completed 20 years after parents’ divorce with 173 grown children, the researcher found that:

- Children who reported that their parents were cooperative also reported better relationships with their parents, grandparents, stepparents, and siblings.

- One-third of those who experienced the remarriage of one or both parents over the course of 20 years reported remembering the remarriage as more stressful than the divorce.

- Two-thirds of those who experienced the remarriage of both of their parents reported that their father’s remarriage was more stressful than their mother’s.


A study with university students whose parents divorced before they were 16 revealed that the more time children lived with their fathers after divorce, the better their current relationships were with their fathers, regardless of the conflict between parents. Distant father-child relationships and more distress related to parents’ divorce predicted poorer health status. There was no correlation between exposure to parent conflict and time with father; therefore, more time with father was beneficial in both high- and low-conflict families.


Data from the 1996 and 2001 Surveys of Income and Program Participation revealed that the probability of divorce among married couples with college degrees has declined, while divorce probabilities are the same or slightly increased for less-educated couples.

Nonmarital Childbearing

What We Know

Slightly more than 40% of all births in the United States are to unmarried women. Antecedents of nonmarital fatherhood include race and ethnicity, education, and socioeconomic disadvantage. Additionally, females born to unmarried parents are statistically at higher risk for having a nonmarital birth than their counterparts. While there has been a decrease in nonmarital childbirth among teen mothers, there has been a rapid increase in the proportion of nonmarital births to women in their twenties and thirties. As children of unmarried fathers age, they experience declining involvement of their fathers.

The Data and Research

The National Center for Health Statistics reported that 40.6% of all births in the United States were to unmarried women in 2013. Specifically:

- 71.5% of unmarried births were to Black mothers
- 53.2% of unmarried births were to Hispanic mothers
- 29.3% of unmarried births were to White mothers

Moreover, in 2013 the proportion of unmarried births within the following age groups were:

- 99.2% for mothers under age 15
- 88.7% for mothers age 15-19
- 65.4% for mothers age 20-24
- 35.9% for mothers age 25-29
- 22.3% for mothers age 30-34
- 21.2% for mothers age 35-39
- 23.7% for mothers age 40 and older

Additionally:

- 58% of nonmarital births occur within a cohabiting union.
- Between 1960 and 1970, the fastest growth in the percentage of non-marital births was among 15- to 19-year-olds.
- Between 1970 and 2000, the fastest growth was among 20- to 29-year-olds.
- Between 2000 and 2010, the fastest growth has been among 30- to 35-year-olds.


In 2012, teenagers accounted for 17% of nonmarital births, continuing the decrease from 23% in 2007 and 50% in 1970.


Researchers found key antecedents of nonmarital fatherhood in the United States. Analyzing data gathered from two national studies, the National Survey of Family Growth and the National Longitudinal Survey of 1979, they found that the strongest predictors of nonmarital fatherhood are race and ethnicity, education, and socioeconomic disadvantage. When fathers have lower education and have socioeconomic disadvantage, they have a higher rate for nonmarital childbirth. The findings support a wide body of literature surrounding nonmarital births.

Using data from the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth, researchers found that children born to unmarried parents are at increased risk of having a nonmarital first birth. This risk is statistically higher for females (2.95) than for their male counterpart (1.48), even when controlling for parents education level and socio-economic status.


Using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, researchers examined whether unmarried mothers’ and fathers’ subsequent relationship and parenting transitions are associated with declines in fathers’ contact with their nonresident biological children. They found that:

- Father involvement dropped sharply after relationships between unmarried parents ended.
- Mothers’ transitions into new romantic partnerships and new parenting roles were associated with larger declines in involvement than fathers’ transitions.
- Declines in fathers’ involvement following a mother’s relationship or parenting transition were largest when children were young.


In the past, when births to unmarried women were mostly to teenagers, references to births to unmarried women and births to teenagers were considered one and the same. Moreover:

- In the years since the mid-1970s, there has been a drop in births to unmarried teenagers simultaneous with large increases in birth rates for adult unmarried women.
- 60% of nonmarital births in 2007 were to women in their twenties, significantly higher than the 42% level in 1970.
- About 1 in 6 births to unmarried women in 2007 were to women aged 30 years and over, significantly higher than the proportion in 1970 of 1 in 12.


Researchers used data from three waves of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (N= 2,111) to examine the prevalence and effects of mothers’ relationship changes between birth and age 3 on their children’s well being.

- Seventy-four (74) percent of children born to single mothers experienced at least one partnership transition by age 3 compared to 70% born to visiting mothers, 50% born to cohabiting mothers, and 13% of children born to married mothers.
- On average, children born to married mothers experience 0.22 transitions before age 3, compared to 0.92 for those born to cohabiting mothers, and 1.50 born to visiting and single mothers.
- Children who do not live with their biological fathers at birth are at risk for multiple partnership transitions. Over 20% of children born to visiting mothers and 30% born to single mothers experience three or more transitions before age 3 compared to fewer than 10% born to cohabiting parents and less than 3% born to married parents.


More than a fifth of children born to unmarried mothers will live with a social father by the age of 5.

A study of nearly 5,000 children born to both married and unmarried parents in 20 large US cities found that among all the couples giving birth, one or both spouses had a child by another partner in 36% of the cases. Among just unmarried couples, one or both parents had a child by another partner in 59% of the cases.


Multiple partner fertility is most common among African American mothers who had their first child at an early age and attended religious services less often.


**Incarceration**

**What We Know**

As of 2010, 1 in 28 children in the United States had an incarcerated parent. The number of incarcerated fathers has dramatically increased over the past 30 years, leaving children to be raised without their biological father, which creates additional challenges for parents and children. The number of children with an incarcerated father has risen 79% since 1991. Children with incarcerated fathers are at higher risk of antisocial behavior. When compared to children of absentee but not incarcerated fathers, children with incarcerated fathers showed more aggressive and inattentive behaviors.

**The Data and Research**

Researchers used the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study to show that paternal incarceration diminishes parenting behaviors and father-child relationships. The researchers found that paternal incarceration increases the likelihood of mothers seeking to re-partner. Findings show that there are additional collateral aspects to paternal incarceration.


One out of every 28 children in 2010 had an incarcerated parent. Of those children, 3.6% were White and 25.1% were Black. More than half (54%) of inmates had children under the age of 18, and 90% of the incarcerated parents were fathers. Incarceration caused a 30-50% reduction in visitation. On average, the number of days that fathers visited their children decreased by two to four days per month following release.


Researchers at the University of Cambridge, England used a systematic review and meta-analysis approach to review 40 studies on parental incarceration, specifically paternal incarceration and its relationship to children’s antisocial behavior, drug use, and educational performance. The study found that parental incarceration has a high correlation to antisocial behavior for the children, but could not conclude the link to drug use and educational performance.
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Using the data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, researchers found that children of incarcerated fathers show more aggressive and inattentive behaviors than children of absentee fathers who are not incarcerated.


The Pew Center estimated that in 2010 there were over 2.7 million children (or 1 in 28 children) in the United States with an incarcerated parent. Additionally, 1.1 million incarcerated individuals are fathers of children between the ages of 0-17.


According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the number of children with an incarcerated father grew 79% between 1991 and 2007. Black fathers accounted for nearly half (46%) of all children with an incarcerated father.

VI. Issues Related to Father Absence

This chapter includes data regarding four of the most important issues related to father absence: access and visitation, child custody, child support, and single-mother families. This new chapter in *Father Facts* provides data on how much time non-custodial, non-residential fathers spend with their children and the factors that influence time spent.

### Access and Visitation

**What We Know**

Access and visitation can be a particularly challenging and contentious subject between custodial and noncustodial parents. Approximately only half of separated parents have formal visitation or child support agreements. A non-residential father's income, living arrangements, and criminal record might influence access and visitation, as non-residential fathers with higher incomes, those who don't remarry or cohabit, and those lacking a criminal record are more likely to visit their children. Father-child visits, when fathers are non-residential, reduce material hardships for single mothers and their children.

**The Data and Research**

In 2011, slightly more than half of custodial parents (51.2%) had some type of visitation agreement or award for child support from the noncustodial parent.


In court, the father’s visitation rights increased when their annual income was above $20,000.


About 2 out of every 5 non-residential fathers visit their child (under the age of 18) only several times a year or less, approximately 1 out of 3 visit their child 1 to 3 times a month, and 1 out of four visit several times a week. Moreover:

- Non-residential fathers with a bachelor’s degree are more likely (39 percent) to visit their child several times a week than fathers with less than a college education (25 percent).

- Married non-residential fathers are more likely (54 percent), as are cohabitating fathers (48 percent), to report infrequent visitation with their child (several times a year or less) versus single fathers (at only 33 percent).

- Hispanic non-resident fathers reported the lowest rates of visitation. About 63 percent of Hispanic, 35 percent of black, and 34 percent of white non-resident fathers reported visiting their child only several times a year or less.


Using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, a study found that nonresident fathers’ formal cash support, informal cash support, and contact with their children reduced the number of hardships reported by single mothers.
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Child Custody

What We Know

Nearly 1 in 3 children live with only one parent. The vast majority of children whose parents don’t live together live with their mothers; however, the likelihood of a child living with his or her custodial father has increased at a faster rate than those living with his or her custodial mother. A father’s chance of having custody of his child is affected by a number of factors, including income, legal representation in court, criminal history, and history of mental illness. It is also affected by the father’s race, the child’s age, and the child’s sex, as fathers who are White, fathers with older children, and fathers with male children more likely to have custody. Custodial fathers are less likely than custodial mothers to have formal or informal custody agreements. Custodial fathers are less likely to live in poverty than custodial mothers.

The Data and Research


- In 2001, 81.7% of children lived with their mothers and 18.3% lived with their fathers.
- The number of custodial fathers increased from 2.18 million in 1993 (16%) to 2.64 million in 2011 (18.3%). This increase may be caused by an increase in joint custody.
- Between 1993 and 2011, the number of custodial mothers also increased but at a slower rate (13.69 million to 14.44 million).
- Shared custody is more likely with parents who have a higher income.
- As the mother’s income rises, her chances of sole custody increase.
- When the father has legal representation in court, his chances of joint or sole custody increase.
- The father’s custody of the child increases with the child’s age as well as if the child is a male.


Most states have stipulated parental factors are considered in determining child custody. Fathers with higher incomes, maturity, and education are more likely to be granted custody or visitation rights in family court. They are less likely to be granted parental rights if they have an arrest history, mental health concerns, low income, and questionable moral character. If the child has any special needs, the father is less likely custody as well.


In 2011, 28.1 percent of all children under the age of 21 lived with only one parent. Almost half (48.9%) of all custodial parents had either legal or informal child support agreements. Of those agreements, 88.8% were formal/legal documents while 11.1% were informal. Furthermore:

- Approximately 41.7% of the 3.7 million formal custody agreements included terms that the noncustodial parent provided the health insurance for the child.
- African American children who lived with their custodial parent while their other parent lived outside the household (50.6%) was more than twice as large as the proportion of White children (24%).
- Custodial mothers were more likely than custodial fathers to have two or more children living with them in 2012 (45.3% and 33.7%, respectively)
- Custodial fathers were more likely than custodial mothers to be non-Hispanic White (60.6%), less likely to be African American (16.3%) or Hispanic (18.8%).
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- The proportion of custodial mothers with incomes below poverty (31.8%) was about twice as high as that for custodial fathers (16.2%)

- Custodial mothers were more likely to have legal or informal custody agreements (53.4%) than custodial fathers (28.8%).


According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey, of the 7.9 million custodial parents in 2012 who did not have a formal/legal or informal custody agreement, the following reasons led to the absence of a legal agreement:

- The other parent provides what he or she can (36.8%)
- The other parent could not afford to pay (33.4%)
- No reason to make the agreement legal (32.6%)
- Do not want the other parent to pay (24%)
- Do not want to have contact with the other parent (19%)
- Child stays with the other parent part of the time (17.1%)
- Can’t locate the other parent (17%)
- Other/miscellaneous reasons cited (13%)
- Paternity not legally established (6.9%)
- Child is too old (0.3%)


In 2011, custodial mothers were less likely than custodial fathers to be employed full-time, year-round, as only 47% of custodial mothers were employed full-time compared to 65.9% of custodial fathers. On the other hand, custodial mothers were more likely than custodial fathers to be employed part-time or part-year (28.8% and 19.7%, respectively).


In 2007, there was a difference between mothers and fathers in terms of distribution of custodial parents by marital status:

- 34.2% of custodial mothers had never been married.
- 45.1% were currently divorced or separated.
- 19% were currently married (61.8% of them were divorced but remarried, and 1.7% were widowed).
- Custodial fathers were less likely than custodial mothers to report they had never married (20.9%) and more likely to be divorced or separated (37.8%).


A study examining the factors influencing men’s early parental roles revealed the importance of economic and educational disadvantages and nontraditional family structure on being a nonresident father. Youth growing up in a family with greater family income and with a father with more education are significantly less likely to be nonresident fathers. Parental education also plays a role, as young men from families with better-educated parents are more likely to rear their own children in case of the other parent’s absence. Low educational attainment increased the likelihood of being a nonresident father.

Child Support

What We Know

Nearly 90% of custodial parents owed child support are mothers. Non-custodial parents pay the majority of child support owed to custodial parents. Moreover, more than half of custodial parents receive noncash support from non-custodial parents. When fathers have custody, they are less likely to receive full or partial child support from the non-custodial mother compared to custodial mothers who receive full or partial child support from the non-custodial father. Provision of formal and informal financial support by non-residential fathers reduces material hardships for single mothers and their children.

The Data and Research

A study of 367 lower-income noncustodial fathers found that 46% of these fathers contributed in-kind support to a non-resident child. Children received on average $60 of in-kind support each month. Findings show that fathers with romantic ties to the mothers gave 52% of their total support from in-kind sources compared to those non-romantically involved fathers who gave 36% of their total support from in-kind sources. The study also found that fathers with multiple children gave less from in-kind support, and that children with more hours of visitation by their fathers received more in-kind support.


In 2011, of the $37.9 billion in due child support, 62.3 percent was received. Furthermore:

- A large majority (88.7%/6.3 million) of custodial parents were due child support payments in 2011.
- Child support payments averaged $3,770 per year or $315 per month per custodial parent.
- The average child support payment accounted for two-thirds (66.7%) of the mean annual income for custodial parents below poverty. The mean child support payment accounted for 16.1% of the mean annual personal income of custodial parents making over $31,520 annually if received.
- Nine out of every 10 (89.2%) custodial parents owed child support were mothers.
- Almost a quarter of custodial fathers (23.3%) received at least one form of public assistance.
- Over half (56.7%) of custodial parents received noncash support from noncustodial parents for the children. The most common type of noncash support was gifts for birthdays, holidays, or other occasions (53.5%), clothes (36.6%), food or groceries (27.3%), medical expenses other than health insurance (16.5%), and full or partial payments for child care/summer camp (eight (8) percent).
- A slightly larger percentage of custodial mothers received partial or full child support (63.2%) compared to custodial fathers (54.6%). Custodial mothers were given $19.5 billion of the $31.7 billion in support that was due, and custodial fathers received $2 billion of the $3.7 billion that was due.


Using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, a study found that nonresident fathers’ formal cash support, informal cash support, and contact with their children reduced the number of hardships reported by single mothers.

Single-Mother Families

What We Know

Because much of what we know about single-mother families is already included in previous chapters and earlier in this chapter, this portion of Father Facts focuses on the profile of single mothers. The vast majority of single parents are mothers, and there has been a rapid rise in the number of children born to unmarried mothers. Single mothers who have never been married vastly outnumber those who are divorced, separated, or widowed. Full-time employment for single mothers has been on the decline with 4 in 10 receiving some form of public assistance. The age and educational level/attainment of single mothers has been on the rise.

The Data and Research

In 2013, there were approximately 10 million single-mother households in the U.S. versus 2 million single-father households.


About 49.2% of the mothers were never married, 29.9% were divorced, 17.7% were separated, and 3.1% were widowed. Of the single mothers, 66.7% were employed, 10.1% unemployed, and 23.2% not in labor force. A large number of these single-mother families live below the poverty level (3.8 million families).


Full time, year-round employment for custodial mothers decreased from 52.3% in 2001 to 47.0% in 2011. The proportion of custodial mothers with incomes below poverty (31.8%) was about twice as high than for custodial fathers (16.2%). Furthermore:

- 42.9% of custodial mothers received at least one form of public assistance; 34.3% used SNAP benefits.
- Since 1994, the age of custodial mothers has increased. In 1994, 25.4% were over the age of 40, and in 2012, 39.1% were over the age of 40. On the other hand, the number of custodial mothers under the age of 30 has decreased where it was 30.9% in 1994 and was only 24% in 2012.
- Custodial mothers are increasing their education level. In 1994, 22.2% did not graduate high school and 17.1% had an associate’s degree or higher. In 2012, only 15.6% did not graduate from high school and 30.4% had at least an associate’s degree or higher.


Forty-one percent (41%) of babies were born to unmarried mothers in 2008, an eightfold increase from 50 years prior. Twenty-five (25) percent of children lived in a single-parent home, which was triple the number from 1960. Sixty-nine (69) percent of Americans believe more single women having children without a male partner is bad for society, compared to four (4) percent who believe it is good for society.


A national two-generation longitudinal survey revealed that approximately 8.3% of children spent at least 75% of their first four years living in a mother-only household.


Eleven (11) percent of non-Hispanic White family households were headed by a woman, compared to 18% of Mexican family households, 34% for Puerto Ricans, and 42% for Dominicans.

VII. Father Involvement

This chapter presents data regarding Americans’ attitudes about father involvement (and absence) and predictors of father involvement. It also provides data on the relationship between father involvement and father time spent with children, and data on family-work conflict. It also includes a new topic in Father Facts: the impact of marriage on father involvement.

Attitudes About Father Involvement

What We Know

Data has emerged around the concept of the “new” father. With this emergence, societal expectations and role strain for fathers is increasing. Fathers are still expected to be the breadwinner, but also an equal partner in caring for the home. Fathers are expected now more than ever to spend ample time with their children. There have been recent shifts among fathers in their attitudes on fatherhood with more fathers developing nontraditional attitudes. Studies on lower-income fathers indicate that while these fathers feel marginalized, they still want to provide financial assistance to their children. Most fathers, including lower-income fathers, place importance on the ability to financially provide for their children.

Mothers and fathers recognize that there is a crisis of father absence in the United States. When it comes to Americans in general, most Americans value fatherhood, believe children should grow up with a father, and believe that fatherhood is more difficult today than it was decades ago. Mothers also hold varying attitudes about fathers and fatherhood. Mothers who live with the fathers of their children have positive attitudes about the quality of their partners’ fathering, while women who live apart from fathers are less satisfied with the quality of fathering. Most fathers believe that being a father is an important part of their identity.

The Data and Research

Using a sample of 1,139 fathers from the Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income, researchers found that a there is a subgroup of new fathers who hold nontraditional attitudes and appear better able to spend more time with their children. These nontraditional attitudes include fathers’ expectations that they should be more involved with their children, spend more time at home, and form equal partnerships with one’s spouse. The study also found that:

- Younger fathers have more egalitarian attitudes towards fathering and work, and on average work nine less hours per work after the birth of their child versus traditional men who increase their work hours by 11 hours weekly.
- Fathers with nontraditional father attitudes spend an average of 17.3 hours per week with their children, compared to 13.9 hours per week among fathers with traditional father attitudes.
- Time spent at work does not affect the time fathers spend with children.
- African American fathers spend less time playing with children than White fathers, and Latino fathers take more responsibility, but spend less time in achievement related activities.
- Fathers who regularly attend religious services spend more overall time with children.
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A qualitative study of 39 nonresident fathers ages 24 to 52 found that these fathers experienced regret for not meeting their educational goals. These fathers attributed their inability to consistently support their children to their own educational failures. These fathers placed an emphasis on the importance of education to their children and intended to prevent this same regret in their children.


In 2002, there were 105,000 stay-at-home fathers. This number almost doubled to 189,000 in 2012. An increasing amount of fathers want to spend more time with their children but are in conflict with their financial obligations and workplace demands. Breadwinning continues to be a central attitude of fatherhood, but caregiving is now increasing.


A qualitative study of 47 low-income fathers explored how men balance their identities as fathers and providers, as well as barriers they face. The study found:

◆ All participants believed in the importance of being able to economically provide for their children.
◆ Participants noted that social ties, time spent, and emotional investments are just as important, if not more, than economic provisions.
◆ Lower-income fathers place more importance on non-economic means of providing for their children.
◆ Lower-income men felt marginalized as fathers due to an inability to create an emotional and social relationship with their children resulting from their responsibilities as a provider.


Data from a sample of 3,525 fathers from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study investigated the relationship between father type and presence as well as biological father involvement and attitudes of fathers on fathering. This study yielded the following findings:

◆ Majority of fathers (92.2%) believe providing consistent financial support is very important.
◆ Sixty (60) percent of fathers disagree or strongly disagree that fathers play a more influential role in raising sons than daughters.
◆ Men who have served in the military emphasize the father’s role as an authority figure.
◆ Men who did not have a co-resident biological father or father figure at age 15 are less likely to believe in the importance of direct physical care.
◆ Men growing up with an involved father are more likely to believe in the importance of financial support than their peers from father absent homes.
◆ Men in non-marital relationships are less likely to place importance on time spent with family over time at work.


Findings from a nationally representative sample of 932 men suggest that fatherhood is important to men. Findings indicate that valuing leisure time, career, religiosity, holding non-egalitarian values, being married, being a father, poorer health, and self-identifying as having fertility issues, are all associated with higher importance placed on fatherhood.

A Pew Research Survey examining attitudes on fatherhood found that among respondents:

- Sixty-nine (69) percent agreed that a child needs a father in the home in order to grow up happily.
- Men are more likely than women to say a child needs a father in the home, and a majority of men (77%) agree that a child needs a father at home in order to grow up happily.
- Most Americans believe fatherhood has become more difficult in recent years. Fifty-seven (57) percent of respondents say it is more difficult to be a father now compared to 20 or 30 years ago.
- Fathers are more likely than mothers to believe that fatherhood is harder currently.
- Nearly half (47%) of fathers say they are a better parent than their own father. Three (3) percent say they are worse, and 47% report doing about the same as their own fathers.


Ninety (90) percent of Americans believe being a good mother is a very important quality for a partner to have. Ninety-three (93) percent of Americans believe being a good father is a very important quality for a partner to have. Seventy (70) percent of Americans believe putting family before anything else is an important quality for a mother to possess, compared to (82) percent who believe the same quality is important for fathers to possess.


A recent study using a qualitative interview data collected from 36 low-income fathers explored how men define their role as fathers based on past experiences with their own fathers. Findings indicate that men who reported distant relationship with their fathers defined fathering primarily in terms of the breadwinner role as opposed to the nurturing role, which was more evident in the description of men who reported close relationship with their fathers.


A national survey of 1,533 American mothers aged 18 and older with at least one child in the home aged 18 or under, asked a series of questions concerning attitudes about fatherhood and the parenting performance of fathers, which yielded the following findings:

- Ninety-three (93) percent of the mothers agreed that there is a father absence crisis in the United States today, with 67% “strongly agreeing.”
- Mothers who lived with fathers, including those cohabiting but not married, gave overwhelmingly high marks of father performance, while mothers not living with the fathers reported, on average, extremely negative views.
- A majority of married and cohabiting mothers agreed that they could achieve a better work-family balance if the fathers provided more support.
- Mothers not living with the fathers reported very low satisfaction with the fathers who had taken on new romantic, marital, or stepfather relationships.
- African-American mothers reported lower satisfaction with fathers than white mothers.
- The survey revealed that religious beliefs, values, and commitments are conducive to good fathering whether or not the father lives with the mother.
- Mother respondents reported less satisfaction with the fathers of teenage children than with the fathers of younger children.
Aside from living status, the two strongest predictors of the mothers’ overall satisfaction with fathers were how close the mothers perceived the fathers to be to the child and how well they thought the fathers balanced work and family.

A majority of the mothers agreed that a mother or another man could be an adequate substitute for an absent or uninvolved father, with twice as large a percentage of the mothers not living with the fathers agreeing that fathers are replaceable.


A 2009 national telephone survey of 1,000 adults asked a series of questions about the role of fathers in America, which yielded the following key findings:

- Eighty-nine (89) percent of respondents agreed it is important for children to live in a home with both their mother and father.
- Ninety-two (92) percent agreed that fathers make a unique contribution to their children’s lives.
- Compared to those surveyed in 1999, Americans believe fathers have made significant improvements on a number of fronts, such as eating more meals with their family, knowing what’s going on in their children’s lives, and balancing the demands of work and family.
- Seventy-seven (77) percent of respondents believe fathers are doing a good job providing for and protecting their families, and 78% feel fathers care enough about their children’s feelings.
- Eighty-nine (89) percent of fathers are satisfied with themselves as fathers.
- Ninety-four (94) percent of fathers are satisfied with their ability to communicate with their children.
- Ninety-five (95) percent of fathers are satisfied with their relationship with their children.
- 7 out of 10 people surveyed believe physical absence of fathers is the most significant family or social problem currently facing America.
- Ninety-seven (97) percent of those surveyed believe fathers need to be more involved in their children’s education.
- Sixty-four (64) percent of respondents believe fathers understand what it takes to practice good fathering.


A National Marriage Project study interviewed a sample of never-married young men and discovered that a significant number viewed unplanned pregnancy as “trickery” by women and a burdensome financial responsibility. When asked their views on how their unmarried partner should resolve pregnancy, the percentage of male adolescents recommending the unmarried mother raise the child with financial support from the nonresidential father dramatically increased from 19% in 1979 to 59% in 1995. Consequently, the percentage of young men recommending abortion, adoption, or marriage substantially decreased from 1979 to 1995.

A telephone survey of 701 American men aged 18 and older with at least one biological or adopted child under the age of 18 yielded the following findings:

- Ninety-one (91) percent of fathers agreed there is a father-absence crisis in the country, but strong agreement varied considerably among the different kinds of respondents, being relatively low among the very young, the less religious, and those in high-income households.

- Eighty-one (81) percent of respondents agreed that men are more effective as fathers if they are married to the mothers of their children.

- Slightly more than half of the fathers agreed, and less than a fourth “strongly agreed,” that they felt adequately prepared for fatherhood when they first became fathers.

- Seventy-eight percent agreed that they now have the necessary skills and knowledge to be good fathers.

- Fathers who perceived the greatest obstacles to fathering were those not married to the mothers of their child, those who did not live with their child, those who had one or more stepchildren, and older fathers in low-income households.

- Among the respondents as a whole, “work responsibilities” was the most frequently given as an obstacle to being a good father—47% of respondents cited it.

- Sixty-seven (67) percent of fathers agreed that the government should do more to help and support fathers.

- Fifty three (53) percent of those surveyed agreed that fathers are replaceable by mothers and 57% agreed fathers are replaceable by other men.

- Ninety-nine (99) percent of fathers agreed that being a father was a very important part of who they are, and 94% “strongly agreed.”


Predictors of Father Involvement

What We Know

Some factors—including divorce, lack of work flexibility, depression, substance abuse, poor mother-father relationships (e.g. intimate partner violence and low marital satisfaction), maternal re-partnering, and restrictive maternal gatekeeping—decrease father involvement. By contrast, social support, encouragement from the mother, and effective co-parenting increase the level of father involvement. Fathers who are involved with their children when their children are infants tend to remain involved as their children age compared to fathers who aren’t involved at that stage of their children’s lives. Participation in a parenting or fathering program at this stage may also increase father involvement.

The Data and Research

Researchers compared 43 fathers with co-occurring substance abuse and intimate partner violence to 43 fathers who did not have those co-occurring issues (control group). They found the fathers with the co-occurring issues had less positive co-parenting and more negative parenting behaviors than the community of control fathers. Those fathers also reported more emotional and behavioral problems in their children.

Researchers studied a group of 393 European-American and Mexican-American married couples with children as their children moved from 7th to 10th grade to examine the effects of and interaction between marital problems and maternal gatekeeping on father involvement. The families included those in which the father was the biological father and others in which the father was a stepfather. The researchers found:

- Mothers’ marital problem behaviors lead to gatekeeping behaviors to decreased father-child interaction.
- This dynamic was not moderated by child gender, family structure, or family ethnicity; suggesting that maternal gatekeeping has substantial generality in its negative impact on father-child relationships.
- There was direct spillover from fathers’ marital problem behaviors to adolescents’ decreased perceptions of how much they mattered to their fathers.


Maternal gatekeeping is associated with father involvement. These behaviors can be restrictive or facilitate father’s interaction with their child. The three aspects of the behavior include: control (managing the flow of resources, information and boundaries), encouragement (positive feedback), suggesting the father is important, participating in cooperative parenting, and discouragement (interrupting father time with child and complaining about the father).


Drawing from fathers who participated in the Yale Comparative Study on Fathering, researchers interviewed a sample of 40 fathers with histories of substance abuse and intimate partner violence (i.e. physical violence toward their partners) to example their level of empathy toward their children. The researchers found:

- These fathers had a very limited capacity to think about the thoughts and feelings of their children.
- The desire to spend more time with their child and an inability to provide financially were two common themes.
- Anger toward the child’s mother for not providing adequate care and a focus on shielding the child from his anger were also reported frequently.
- Fathers did not report feelings of guilt related to their substance use or aggression in their relationships.


The increase in divorce rates and out-of-wedlock births negatively impacts father involvement. In 1960, there were 393,000 divorces compared to 8,444,000 in 2008. In 2008, 40.6% of all newborns (1,727,950 children) had unmarried parents, which was the highest rate ever reported.


A lack of work flexibility for nonresident fathers is associated with lower levels of father involvement. Fathers with less income and education, who are unemployed, and who are in poor physical or emotional health, have lower levels of involvement as well. Moreover:

- Nonresident fathers who pay child support and have low levels of parental conflict are more involved with their children. This results in positive effects on the relationship with the custodial mother, who usually dictates access to the child.
- Fathers who live with their child, are married to their child’s mother, or have a positive or romantic relationship with their child’s mother have higher levels of father involvement.
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- Supportive social networks of family, friends, community members and institutional policies have also shown to positively influence father involvement.
  

Rates of father involvement increase when unmarried parents have a cooperative co-parenting style. This is more difficult when parents separated after the child’s birth, were never a couple, if the nonresident father is unemployed, or if the child has a difficult temperament.


Non-residential fathers were more involved with their child when they had formal and informal instrumental support. The informal social supports included family and friends; which provided emotional, financial and child care support. The formal support included organizations and community resources.


Researchers used data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth to examine associations of maternal re-partnering (through cohabitation or marriage with a new partner) and new-partner births with nonresident father visitation and child support payments. Results suggested that maternal re-partnering is associated with a decrease in both yearly father-child contact and child support received by the mother. New-partner fertility for mothers who are co-residing with a partner is associated with an additional decrease in monthly father-child contact, but does not have an additional influence on yearly father-child contact or child support receipt.


A study of 1,746 fathers using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study examined the associations between depression in fathers of 1-year-old children and specific positive and negative parenting behaviors discussed by pediatric providers at well-child visits. The study found that depressed fathers were more likely than non-depressed fathers to report spanking their 1-year-old children in the previous month. Depressed fathers were also less likely to report reading to their children at least 3 days in a typical week.


An analysis of 586 married resident fathers, their wives, and their first-grade child participating in the NICHD Study of Early Child Care demonstrated that father parenting beliefs, child language skills, child social skills, maternal employment, and dyadic mother-child interaction quality each contribute to positive father-child interaction.


Several studies demonstrated that fathers who are involved when their child is an infant tend to still remain engaged as parents years later. Allowing new fathers to be involved in caring for their child in the first days of a child’s life can have positive long-term benefits.


A longitudinal study of 157 married couples found that lower marital satisfaction was associated with lower levels of father involvement.


In an evaluation study of a program for couples during the transition to parenthood it was revealed that the group of fathers that were part of the Welcome Baby new-parent, home-visiting program were more involved in child care than the fathers who did not participate in the program.

CHAPTER VII • Father Involvement

Results of a study examining the role of maternal gatekeeping behavior in relation to fathers’ involvement suggest that greater maternal encouragement was associated with higher parent-reported father involvement. These findings indicate that mothers may shape father involvement through their roles as “gatekeepers.”


A study using a sample of 2,139 resident fathers with infants in the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing 12-Month Father Survey examined how depression is associated with father involvement. Results indicate that major depression is negatively associated with father-child activities, positively associated with paternal aggravation/stress in parenting, and negatively associated with both the quality of the mother-father relationship and co-parental relationship supportiveness. The results suggest that depressive symptoms reduce the frequency of fathers’ engagement with young children.


Impact of Marriage

What We Know

Most research indicates that married fathers are more involved with their children than are non-resident or cohabiting fathers. Marriage may matter more for the involvement of “social” (e.g. cohabiting father figures) than biological fathers. Some recent research suggests that cohabiting fathers might be as involved as married fathers. The involvement of married fathers varies based on whether they live with their children. Married and cohabiting fathers can be less involved with the children they don’t live with (i.e. noncoresidential children) than are fathers who are unmarried and not cohabiting. Nevertheless, children born to single or cohabiting parents are more likely to experience father absence at some point in their lives than are children born to married parents.

The Data and Research

From the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, fathers who either were married to the mother or cohabitating, demonstrated the highest levels of father involvement. Furthermore:

- Involvement also increased when there was a positive co-parenting relationship present between the mother and father.
- Children born to cohabiting parents were five times more likely than their counterparts born to married parents to experience the separation of their parents.
- Eight (8) percent of the sample experienced a transition from cohabitation to marriage over a five-year period after the child’s birth.
- Thirteen (13) percent of co-habitators saw the dissolution of their unions, and four percent of married couples experienced a divorce over the five-year period.
- Fathers who transitioned to marriage increased their level of involvement over time at a faster rate than the continuously married fathers.

Researchers used the National Survey of Family Growth to examine the differences between different types of fathers and their involvement in several areas/activities of their children’s lives as measured by fathers’ behavior within the past four weeks. They found several differences when comparing married fathers’ involvement to that of cohabiting and unmarried fathers regarding the children they lived with (i.e. coresidential children), including:

- 82% of married fathers played with their very young coresidential children (under age 5) every day compared to 68% of cohabiting and unmarried fathers.
- Cohabiting fathers were twice as like to not have read to their very young coresidential children (within the past 4 weeks) than married fathers (32% and 12%, respectively).
- Married and cohabiting fathers (68% and 64%, respectively) were more likely to have eaten a meal with their older coresidential children (age 5 to 18) every day than fathers who were unmarried and not cohabiting (47%).
- A larger percentage of married fathers (21%) took their older coresidential children to or from activities every day compared to cohabiting fathers (15%).
- A smaller percentage of married fathers (13%) did not take their older coresidential children to or from activities every day compared to cohabiting fathers (21%).
- A larger percentage of cohabiting fathers (20%) did not help their older coresidential children with homework at all compared to married fathers (13%).

There were, however, several interesting findings based on whether fathers also had children they did not live with (i.e. noncoresidential children), including:

- Three quarters of married fathers (77%) and cohabiting fathers (76%) did not take their older noncoresidential children to or from activities at all compared to fathers who were unmarried and not cohabiting (63%).
- A larger percentage of fathers who were unmarried and not cohabiting (71%) talked with their noncoresidential children every day compared to married (66%) and cohabiting fathers (58%).
- Married (47%) and cohabiting (43%) fathers were nearly twice as likely to not have talked with their older noncoresidential children at all compared to fathers who were unmarried and not cohabiting (23%).
- Larger percentages of married (78%) and cohabiting (71%) fathers had not helped their older noncoresidential children at all with homework compared to fathers who were unmarried and not cohabiting (58%).
- A smaller percentage of fathers who were not married or cohabiting (38%) did not eat a meal at all with their noncoresidential children compared to married (61%) and cohabiting (61%) fathers.


A study of 5,407 married and unmarried cohabiting couples with a two-year-old child revealed that unmarried, cohabiting parents displayed higher levels of father involvement than married parents. Unmarried cohabiting fathers were engaged and accessible nearly half a day more per week than fathers married before pregnancy. The study indicates that unmarried cohabiting fathers and fathers who married in response to pregnancy may have a greater child focus than fathers married before the pregnancy.

Married fathers are more likely than unmarried fathers to help parent their children, and subsequently increase their chances of long-term well-being and success. Fathers who are cohabiting or married earn nearly 20% more than nonresident fathers at their child’s birth, a gap that widens over time. This increased income associated with marriage “may induce men to maximize their earning capabilities, benefitting the entire family.”


Researchers used data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study to examine why children born into single-mother and cohabiting households fare worse than children born into married-couple households. By age five, nearly two-fifths of children with nonresident parents had no regular contact with their fathers for the past two years. Single parent and cohabiting households are more susceptible to family instability, which subsequently hinders early child cognitive development, than married households.


An analysis of the first two waves of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (n= 2,303) found that 33% of the sample couples ended their union within the year following their child’s birth, 15% married within the year, and 52% remained in a stable unmarried union. Cohabiting couples had a higher frequency of marrying, while nonresident couples more frequently ended their relationships. Additionally, the more fathers participated before and at the birth (as perceived by the mother), the less likely the couple was to end their union.


A study of 2,098 resident fathers using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study examined differences in the parenting practices of four types of resident fathers, defined by their biological relationship to a focal child and their marital status with regard to the focal child’s mother. Results found that biological and social (i.e. stepfathers or mothers’ cohabiting partners) fathers differ significantly, and in some unexpected ways, on most measures of parenting. Moreover, there is a stronger link between marriage and higher quality parenting practices among social fathers than among biological fathers. Specifically:

- There was limited variation in the parenting practices of married and unmarried biological fathers.
- Married social fathers displayed higher quality parenting than cohabiting social fathers.

The findings suggest that, for social father families compared to biological father families, these marriage is an institution linked to increased investment in children.


A study using the first two waves of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study investigated the effects of child gender on parents’ marital status and father involvement.

- Married parents were more likely to stay together during the first year of birth if their child was a boy.
- Sons born to unmarried parents are more 20% likely than daughters to receive the father’s surname.
- Hispanic children born to unwed parents are more likely to be given their father’s surname than non-Hispanic children.
- Higher parental education increased the likelihood that children received their unwed father’s last name.
- Fathers married at the time of their child’s birth were more likely one year later to live with a son than with a daughter.
- There is little evidence one year after birth that a child’s gender is related to parents’ relationships status or the father’s financial or emotional support.
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Father Time

What We Know

Fathers in the United States lead the developed countries in the time they spend daily with their children, with the majority of the time spent during the weekend. Nevertheless, American fathers think they don’t spend enough time with their children. Once married or never married fathers report higher quality relationships with and more time spent with their children than do once married or never married mothers.

The Data and Research

Fathers spend more time with their children on the weekends than the weekdays. The number of father childcare minutes per day ranged from 66 minutes in France in 1998 to over 104 minutes in the United States in 2003. Below is the average number of childcare minutes per day fathers spend with their children in ten industrialized countries between 1998 and 2005:

- USA 2003: 104.45 minutes
- Canada 1998: 102.10 minutes
- Finland 1999: 83.45 minutes
- UK 2000: 82.77 minutes
- Netherlands 2005: 82.05 minutes
- Norway 2000: 75.36 minutes
- Italy 2001: 74.19 minutes
- Germany 2001: 72.25 minutes
- France 1998: 66.65 minutes


The Australian Bureau of Statistics found that father’s time with their children has increased since 1992. Fathers spend more time engaged in play, talk based care, educational, supervisory, and leisure activities with their children. Fathers spent nearly an hour more a week on talk-based care, nearly two hours more a week on routine care, and three hours more on secondary care in 2006 compared to 1992. However, this father time increase is most prevalent with young children (age 1-4) and decreases with age.


A study of 1,630 mothers and 1,047 fathers from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study investigated the circumstances of both previously married and never married parents 5 years after the child’s birth. The study found differences in reports of father involvement between mothers and fathers with fathers reporting higher quality relationships and more time spent with their children than mothers for both previously married and unmarried parents.

Researchers examined the data on how the division of labor around the roles of fathers and mothers has converged in recent years. They found in comparing data from 1965 to 2011 that:

- The proportion of time fathers spent in unpaid work (housework and childcare) has increased from 14% to 31%, whereas mothers’ proportion of unpaid work decreased from 81% to 59%.
- Fathers spent twice as much time doing housework in 2011 as they did in 1965 (10 hours vs. 4 hours), whereas mothers cut their amount of housework in half during that time (18 hours vs. 32 hours).
- Fathers have tripled the amount of time per week they spent with their children (7.3 hours vs. 2.5 hours). Mothers increased their time as well, albeit by a smaller amount (10.2 hours vs. 13.5 hours).
- Twice the amount of fathers (46%) say they spend too little time with their children compared to reports from mothers (23%). One in four (25%) working dads spend less than one hour with their kids each day and 42% spend less than two hours a day.


In 2006, 36% of children younger than six years old had 15 or more outings with their father in the last month.


On average, fathers read six times a week to their children who were three to five years old, as of 2006.


In 2006, 53% of children younger than six years old ate breakfast with their father every day, and 71% of children ate dinner with their father every day. The corresponding percentages of children who ate with their mother were 58% (breakfast) and 80% (dinner).


In 2006, 66% of children under six years old were praised three or more times a day by their fathers.


A 2009 national telephone survey of 1,000 adults over the age of 18 assessed the degree of involvement and support that fathers provide to their school-age children. Compared to a similar survey conducted in 1999, fathers have made significant gains over 10 years in child relationships.

- In 1999, 38% of fathers walked or took their child to school, compared to 54% in 2009.
- Twenty-eight (28) percent of fathers attended class events in 1999, compared to 35% in 2009.
- Sixty-nine (69) percent of fathers attended parent-teacher conferences in 1999, compared to 77% in 2009.
- The single largest gain over the past ten years was a 20-percentage point gain in fathers meeting with other dads for support.
- In 2009, 39% of fathers never read to their child, 32% never visited their child’s classroom, and 54% never volunteered at their child’s school.
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Using a sample of 55 dual-earner families with children ages 8 to 14 years, researchers found that fathers whose wives work evenings versus days spend more time with children, know more about children’s activities, receive more disclosures from children, and have better parenting skills. All of those variables are negatively related to children’s internalizing, externalizing, and risk-taking behaviors.


Family-Work Conflict

What We Know

The increase in time fathers spend with children has, ironically, contributed to an increase in family-work conflict among fathers. Fathers now report more family-work conflict than do mothers. Moreover, greater family-work conflict leads to lower quality father-child relationships. Half of fathers report difficulty balancing work and childcare responsibilities. Full-time employment negatively affects father time. On the other hand, a supportive work environment reduces family-work conflict. And yet very few companies offer paid paternity leave. Nearly 9 in 10 fathers take leave after the birth of their child, but most of them take a week or less of time off. Nontraditional work schedules may have a negative effect on unmarried fathers’ family-work balance compared to married fathers who work such schedules.

The Data and Research

Fathers’ full-time employment reduced time with their children in Canada by 20 minutes daily, 25 minutes in France, 16 minutes in Germany, 50 minutes in the United Kingdom, and 32 minutes in the United States.


Fathers who work where there is a lack of organizational support, lack of family culture, and requirement of long hours report that such an environment has a negative impact on their father-child relationship. There is also an emotional spillover that happens from his work stress and effects the family.


Forty-eight (48) percent of working fathers have missed a significant event in their child’s life due to work at least once in the last year and nearly one in five (18 percent) have missed four or more. Furthermore:

- More than one in four (27%) working dads say they spend more than 50 hours a week at work and nearly 1 in 10 spend more than 60 hours.

- Thirty-six (36) percent of working dads say their company does not offer flexible work arrangements.

- Fifty (50) percent of working fathers find it difficult to balance work and childcare responsibilities.

- Married fathers work more hours per week than cohabitating fathers.


A study from the Families and Work Institute showed that men now experience more work-family stress than women due to their role overload and conflicting societal and personal expectations. With fathers’ responsibilities changing in society, some cope by working more hours at work, which may explain why fathers work more on average than non-fathers. When fathers perceive that they have work-life balance, they show higher levels of positive attitudes, increased work performance, higher quality of life, satisfaction in their jobs and greater community commitment.

A study used a sample of 167 undergraduate students in order to investigate perceptions of parents who take temporary work leave after the birth of a child. The researchers assessed participants’ reactions to scenarios involving a mother or a father who went back to work immediately, took a 12-week leave, or stayed at home with the child for a longer period of time. Interestingly, the results showed that:

- Parents who took leave were rated more positively than stay-at-home parents and working parents.
- Those who took work leave were also rated as more competent than stay-at-home parents and more affectionate than working parents.
- Overall, the study participants had a more favorable impression of parents who took leave when that parent was of the same gender as themselves.
- Female participants were more favorable about mothers and fathers breaking traditional gender roles than were male participants.


A study using data from the 1997 and 2002 National Study of the Changing Workforce explored the differences between cohabiting and married parents in terms of the relationship between non-standard work schedules and parental well-being. The results suggested that:

- The impact of non-standard work on parental well-being was different for married and cohabiting families.
- In contrast to married parents who experienced some positive associations of non-standard schedules and parental well-being, cohabiting parents were more likely to experience a negative relationship between non-standard work schedules and parental well-being.
- Moreover, for cohabiting parents only, the non-standard work schedules were related to increased work–family conflict, which in turn, was associated with lower levels of parental well-being.
- For married parents, however, non-standard work schedules were not related to additional work-family conflict.


A study conducted in Hong Kong used a sample of 556 pairs of working fathers and their school-aged children in order to examine the impact of work and family conflicts on the quality of father-child interactions. The results indicated that:

- Fathers’ work-to-family conflicts had a negative effect on the quality of father–child interactions, which in turn were related to the children’s low self-esteem level.
- Mothers’ involvement and the complexity of the fathers’ occupation were significant predictive factors of the quality of father-child interactions.
- Low monthly income could also negatively affect the quality of fathering in terms of emotional stability, availability, knowledge about children, and condition of stimulating activities.
- A higher income level was not associated with better quality of fathering and the father-child relationship.
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A study of 1,404 men and 1,623 women in dual-earner families revealed that fathers were more likely than mothers to respond to family demands and work overload through scaling back at home. Mothers were more likely to utilize the coping strategy of workplace restructuring.


In a study exploring predictors of father involvement among 98 dual-earner, working-class couples experiencing the transition to parenthood, it was found that fathers were more involved during the first year of parenthood when parents worked opposite shifts, mothers were employed full-time, and mothers engaged in less gatekeeping.


According to a study done in 2008 by the Society of Human Resource Management, only 16 percent of United States companies offer paid paternity leave benefits. Federal law mandates unpaid paternity leave for employees of companies with more than 50 employees through the Family Medical Leave Act. This mandate allows for up to 12 weeks of unpaid time off in case of the birth or adoption of a child or to care for a sick family member.


Researchers using a sample of 179 employed fathers examined the association between the trait emotional intelligence (Trait EI) and fathers’ work–family relations. Researchers found that those fathers who have high Trait EI find it easier to regulate emotions, which in turn decreases the level of work-family conflict.


A study using data from two national surveys of 2,050 participants examined what accounts for the increase in work-family conflict among employed parents between 1977 and 1997. Results indicated that:

- With the same amount of time spent with children, parents felt greater work-family conflict in 1997 than in 1977, and fathers in dual-earner marriages experienced a particular increase in work-family conflict.
- Factors contributing to the work-family conflict included the increase in women’s labor force participation, college education, time pressure in completing one’s job, and less leisure time.
- The increases in intrinsic job rewards, time with children, and egalitarian gender attitudes, contributed to a decline in work-family conflict.


A study of 446 fathers living in low-income rural counties in North Carolina and Pennsylvania revealed that a less supportive work environment lead to lower levels of father-infant interaction. Simultaneously a stressful workplace, especially those requiring high levels of care work, was linked to lower quality parenting by fathers.

In a study using data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (Birth Cohort), a nationally representative panel study of over 10,000 children born in 2001, researchers examined the determinants, circumstances and consequences of paternal leave-taking. They found that the majority of fathers take at least some leave after the birth of a child; however the length of that leave varies significantly. Eighty-nine (89) percent of fathers took some time off work after the birth of their child. Of those fathers who took any time off:

- Sixty-four percent took one week or less.
  - Twenty-two percent took less than one week.
  - Forty-two percent took one week.
- Thirty-six percent took two or more weeks off work.

The researchers also found that fathers who took longer leave were more involved in child care-taking activities nine months later.

- About 50% of the fathers in the sample reported diapering and feeding the child more than once per day and dressing the child at least once per day.
- Fifty-six (56) percent reported bathing the child a few times or more per week.
- Thirty-nine (39) percent reported getting up with the child at night always or often.
- Fathers who took leave were significantly more likely to regularly diaper the child than fathers who did not take leave.

Fathers who were currently employed reported working 33.7 hours per week. Ninety-four (94) percent of fathers reported being present in the delivery room when the child was born. Forty-two (42) percent of fathers reported attending birth classes with the mother. Fathers who attended birth classes were more likely to be involved in dressing and bathing the child, but less involved in feeding and getting up at night.
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VIII. Benefits of Father Involvement

Much of the data and research on the benefits of father involvement can be found in Chapter II: The Consequences of Father Absence. The data and research in that chapter, while placed within the context of consequences of father absence on child well-being, also include the benefits of father involvement on child well-being (e.g. lower levels of alcohol and drug use/abuse and child abuse) as much of the data and research compares children from father-absent homes to father-present homes. Consequently, this chapter does not repeat that data and research. Instead, this chapter presents additional compelling data and research on the wide-ranging benefits of father involvement for children not contained in Chapter II. It also includes the benefits of father involvement for fathers and two new topics in Father Facts: the benefits of father involvement for mothers and on marital satisfaction.

Children’s Well-Being

What We Know

Father involvement is associated with a range of physical, emotional, and mental benefits related to child well-being.

The Data and Research

Father involvement (high levels of engagement and responsibility) was associated with lower rates of infant distress, newborn’s activity to limitations, and maternal depression. It may be a protective factor for children born to teen mothers suffering from postpartum depression.


A sample of 1,523 toddlers found that sons experienced fewer attention and behavioral problems when the level of father involvement in responsibility orientated tasks was high. Fathers who demonstrated high levels of engagement with their sons also had lower scores of being anxious or depressed. Father involvement was not helpful, however, for either sons or daughters with decreasing withdrawn-like behaviors.


Adolescent girls who perceived their fathers to be distant or angry reported experiencing more emotional and behavioral problems. The risk level increased the younger the girl was when the father became absent. On the other hand, daughters were less likely to engage in risky sexual behaviors when their fathers were involved (i.e. consistent contact, engaged with their children, and had a sense of closeness). This outcome was true for all races, but less significant for Caucasian girls in the national sample.


A meta-analysis of 52 studies looking at nonresident father involvement and child well-being found that positive forms of father involvement (involvement in child-related activities, engagement in multiple forms of involvement and developing a positive father-child relationship) were associated with children’s social and emotional well-being as well as behavioral adjustment and academic achievement. On the other hand, the quantity of father-child contact and financial support was not found to be associated with child well-being in the study.

Children with negative attitudes about school and their teachers experienced avoidance and ambivalence with their fathers. On the other hand, children with a secure attachment to their father and whose father was involved had a higher academic self-concept. The father-child attachment was more associated with the child’s social-emotional school outcomes than their academic achievement.


A study using data from the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development tested the hypothesis that fathers’ supportiveness has a significant impact on children’s school readiness in families where the level of mothers’ supportiveness is relatively low. Results of the study suggest that fathers may influence child development as the data indicates that paternal supportiveness was associated with school readiness when mothers scored at or below the mean on supportiveness.


Children whose fathers are stable and involved are better off on almost every cognitive, social, and emotional measure developed by researchers. For example, high levels of father involvement are correlated with sociability, confidence, and high levels of self-control in children. Moreover, children with involved fathers are less likely to act out in school or engage in risky behaviors in adolescents.


A study of 4,663 nonresident fathers and their children found that sons and daughters reported equal paternal involvement. However, sons reported more overnight visits, movies, and sports trips, as well as feeling an average of 3.27 on a closeness scale of 1 to 5, compared to daughters’ average of 2.91. Although sons and daughters responded equally to father involvement quality in terms of grades and externalizing problems, daughters were found to have less internalizing problems from feeling close to their fathers than sons do.


There is evidence supporting the positive influence of father engagement on children’s social, behavioral, and psychological outcomes. Father involvement seems to reduce the occurrence of behavioral problems in boys and psychological problems in young women, as well as enhancing cognitive development, while decreasing delinquency and economic disadvantage in low-income families.


Using a sample of resident fathers in the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort (9-month Father Study), researchers examined the connection between father involvement and infant cognitive outcomes in two domains (babbling and exploring objects with a purpose). Results indicate that aspects of father involvement, such as cognitively stimulating activities, physical care, paternal warmth, and caregiving activities are associated with lower chances of infant cognitive delay. Findings indicate that early positive father-child interactions reduce cognitive delay.


Research provides evidence that fathers can encourage the development of their children’s literacy skills. Fathers can promote children reading skills by reading books to them, engaging their children in discussions about books they read, and encouraging their children to read more books.


A study of 294 adolescents who live with a biological father and stepmother and have a nonresident mother investigated each parent-child role and their subsequent effects on child health. Results found that children reported being closest to their biological fathers (M= 4.57), followed by stepmothers (M= 3.89), and nonresident mothers (M= 3.56).

Children have the highest level of well-being when they are raised in a low-conflict married household, acknowledging the importance of strong maternal as well as paternal relationships.


In a study examining father involvement with 134 children of adolescent mothers over the first 10 years of life, researchers found that father-child contact was associated with better socio-emotional and academic functioning. The results indicated that children with more involved fathers experienced fewer behavioral problems and scored higher on reading achievement. This study showed the significance of the role of fathers in the lives of at-risk children, even in case of nonresident fathers.


A study using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Youth looked at father-child relationship and father’s parenting style as predictors of first delinquency and substance use among adolescents in intact families. The results indicate that:

- More positive father-child relationships are associated with reduced risk of engagement in multiple risky behaviors.
- Even though having a father with an authoritarian parenting style is associated with an increased risk of engaging in delinquent activity and substance use, the negative effect of authoritarian parenting is reduced when there is a positive father-adolescent relationship.
- Permissive parenting style also predicts less risky behavior when the father-child relationship is positive.
- The positive influence of the father-child relationship on risk behaviors appears to be stronger for male than for female adolescents.


A study with 205 young adult participants investigating the association between recollections of their childhood experiences with parents with their reported feelings and behavior in romantic relationships revealed that those who reported having more positive and loving relationships with fathers were more likely to seek comfort from their romantic partners and were more comfortable relying on their partners.


Father involvement is related to positive cognitive, developmental, and socio-behavioral child outcomes, such as improved weight gain in preterm infants, improved breastfeeding rates, higher receptive language skills, and higher academic achievement.


A study of 453 adolescents in the National Survey of Families and Households found that a strong maternal relationship had greater impact on adolescent well-being than a nonresident paternal one. However, when there was a weak mother-child bond, children who had strong ties to their nonresident fathers exhibited fewer internalizing and externalizing problems than adolescents with weak relationships with both parents.

The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (N= 2,733) was used to examine the benefits of biological father involvement in adolescent lives.

- Nonresident biological fathers that provided continuous emotional support and social interaction greatly reduced their children's behavioral problems.
- The benefit of each unit of biological father involvement was two to three times greater when the father lived with his children compared to elsewhere.
- There is no substantial difference in how father involvement affects sons versus daughters.


**Men's Well-Being**

**What We Know**

Although father involvement causes some strain for men (particularly for new fathers) in terms of finances, employment, and changes in sleep and housing, it also increases men’s sense of responsibility, their mental/emotional health, and their confidence.

**The Data and Research**

Fatherhood increased the responsibility for new fathers to find stable, secure employment. Fatherhood within marriage was also associated with a strengthening of family ties, an increased participation in civic organizations and more involvement in organized religion. Fathers who were involved were found to be healthier than other men and had better longevity because of the reduction in risky behaviors (only for married or residential fathers).


Low-income fathers are at higher risk for depression. The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study showed major depressive episodes for married fathers at 13.3 percent, cohabitating fathers at 14.7 percent, and nonresident fathers at 18 percent. Moreover:

- Father involvement decreased depressive symptoms in resident and non-resident fathers during the preschool years (age 3-5 of the child).
- Non-resident fathers with high levels of father involvement actually reported higher levels of depression for children aged 1-3.
- A father’s self-esteem was also positively impacted as their frequency of involvement during middle childhood increased.
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Over 200 Canadian fathers reported in a study that multiple changes occur after becoming a father: new priorities, a change in masculinity, reorientation of time, increased responsibility, a shift in values, altered sense of purpose, increased problem solving abilities, and emotional regulation. These fathers also reported becoming more mature, confident, secure and empathic. Furthermore:

- Fathers involved with their children were more likely to show care for others and be more active in their communities.
- Children also had an influence on the father’s perception of masculinity. Fatherhood resulted in a greater range of expression, increased authenticity and confidence.
- These new fathers also reported increased work-related stress, financial difficulties, change in social activities and pressure on the parental relationship after the child’s birth.
- A decrease in their sleep, increased importance of proper housing and saving habits for the future as well as a need for more stable employment was also noted among the sample.


Researchers discovered that the men’s testosterone levels dropped by about one third in the first few weeks after their children were born. This change in testosterone level may make men less aggressive and more nurturing.


A sample of 2,494 new fathers was drawn from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study and revealed that paternal commitments positively affected men in terms of health and religious participation. However, increasing interaction with their new child negatively affected fathers in terms of changes in paid labor hours.


Using data from the first two waves of the National Survey of Families and Households, the researchers found that new children lead to changes in men’s well-being and social participation. The findings indicate that the transition to parenthood and the addition of subsequent children have an impact on men’s lives, particularly when they become co-resident fathers. Fatherhood encourages men to increase intergenerational and extended family interactions, participation in service-oriented activities, and hours in paid labor.


A national study of 5,089 two-parent families found that 14% of mothers and 10% of fathers exhibited postpartum depression. In both mothers and fathers, depressive symptoms were negatively associated with positive engagement activities with children such as reading and singing.


A sample of 18 to 65 year old adults was taken from the German Health Interview and Examination Survey and its Mental Health Supplement (N= 2,801). Overall, mental disorders were significantly less frequent in parents compared to non-parents (29.7% vs. 34.2%). Depressive and substance use disorders were also less frequent among parents. Moreover:

- 34.3% of parents with one child reported a mental disorder, compared to 28.5% of parents with more than two children, and 25.4% of parents with two children.
- 27.1% of parents with children under six years old reported mental disorders compared to 29.7% of parents with older children.
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- 51.6% of parents without partners reported mental disorders compared to 27.9% of parents with partners.

Results also affirmed positive associations between parental status and mental health for men, but not for women.


Women’s Well-Being

What We Know

Women (mothers) receive a number of benefits when fathers are involved with their children. These benefits include more leisure time, a healthier birth, lower rates of postpartum depression (and depression and stress generally), and a higher quality mother-father relationship. Interestingly, the likelihood of a mother remarrying (potentially good for her well-being) is higher when the non-resident father is involved in the lives of her children.

The Data and Research

Paternal involvement during pregnancy was shown to positively influence health outcomes for the mother, child, and father. However, the father’s role and level of involvement during the pregnancy may be limited by the focus on the mother during the prenatal period. New parents described how attending ultra-sound appointments together strengthened their relationship. Mothers found the father’s presence soothing and reassuring during the pregnancy. Mothers also cited the father as the best source of support during the nine months.


Twenty-seven (27) to 45% of minority teen mothers experience postpartum depression, and father involvement was linked to decreasing depressive symptoms in adolescent mothers.


Father involvement helped women experience a greater division of labor, more leisure time for themselves, and higher rates of marital satisfaction. Having the father present during labor was important to help the mother through the painful and significant experience.


In a national sample of mothers aged 10-19, paternal support was shown to decrease the pregnant mother’s stress as well as adverse birth outcomes. Furthermore:

- Pregnant women with father support experienced less low birth weights (7.7%) compared to 11.67% for other mothers as well as a lower prevalence of pregnancy loss (22.2%) compared to 48.1%.
- Teenage mothers-to-be with partner support were also less likely to have a preterm birth.
- Paternal support was also shown to have effects on maternal behaviors prenatally: they experienced less stress, indicated a desired pregnancy, and were more likely to enter prenatal care.
- Married women reported higher levels of father involvement during the pregnancy.
- Partner support was highest among White women and mothers over the age of 13.
- No significant differences were shown in partner support by income or living situation.

Maternal remarriage is more likely when nonresident father involvement is high. It was not associated with receiving child support. Specifically:

- Two (2) percent of mothers remarried with the first year after the divorce, but this rate increased with years since the divorce as well as the level of father involvement.
- The annual probability of remarriage doubled from .028% when there was no contact to .057% when nonresident father contact occurred almost every day.
- Remarriage is least common for African American, poor mothers who conceived prior to marriage and most common for non-Hispanic, employed, young mothers living in the South.
- Father involvement was higher when mothers were older, Caucasian, employed, and when fathers lived close to their children. However, the rates of visitation declined with years after the divorce.
- Unlike visitation, child support after the first year of divorce increased and was more common when mothers were older, did not have a premarital birth, were high school graduates, non-Hispanic White, and were employed full time.

These results suggest that frequent paternal contact, but not the payment of child support, increased a mothers’ chances of remarriage.


Results from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study showed that approximately 10-15% of mothers in the United States experience depression, but the rate is much higher for single mothers (20%). The study also found that:

- In-kind support from nonresidential fathers reduces the risk for maternal depression and that infrequent visitation increases the risk.
- There was a positive correlation between economic strain and depression for mothers.
- Education is a protective factor for mothers who experience a divorce or departure from a cohabiting relationship.
- The age of the child, mother’s income, religious attendance, and social support are also negatively associated with maternal depression.
- Mothers who had children with more than one father were at higher risk for developing maternal depression.
- Father involvement and fiscal support were shown to lower material stress and hardship.


Researchers used a small scale longitudinal approach to look at protective factors associated with nonresident father presence with single mothers and their preschool aged children. The sample included 99 Black mothers, assessing them over a two-year period of time with two times for data collection. Protective effects were found in relationship to nonresident father presence and mothers’ parenting stress along with depressive symptoms. Nonresident fathers’ presence in the first data collection also showed a decrease in behavioral problems and negative aspects of child development at the second data collection. Results showed that nonresident fathers’ presence had positive influence for their children and for their co-parent.
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Marital Satisfaction

What We Know

When fathers are involved in the lives of their children, mothers and fathers report higher levels of marital satisfaction.

The Data and Research

Researchers found that the quality of the father-child relationship had the strongest impact on marital quality for both men and women. Moreover:

- The division of labor also had a large impact on marriage ratings with wives more satisfied when the couple worked together rather than the actual division of tasks.
- Wives scored higher on marital satisfaction when they perceived that fathers were engaged in child rearing.
- On the other hand, wives' satisfaction decreased when there was problematic fathering.
- When fathers were perceived to perform high levels of family work, wives thought the father-child relationship suffered.


Father involvement helped women experience a greater division of labor, more leisure time for themselves, and higher rates of marital satisfaction. Having the father present during labor was important to help the mother through the painful and significant experience.


Researchers found that anxious parents' marital satisfaction decreased when they perceived their partners to be less supportive after the birth and behaved negatively. Furthermore:

- For avoidant parents, marital satisfaction lowered when work-family conflict increased.
- Conversely, when partners were more support, individuals reported higher marital satisfaction across both genders.
- One third of new parents experience high levels of relational distress during the first year of the child’s birth.
- Mothers tended to experience this faster and more often that fathers due to the physical and hormonal changes as well as a larger responsibility of the care taking.


A longitudinal study of 165 couples examined the relationship between fathers’ marital satisfaction and involvement with children. The results revealed a positive correlation between fathers’ marital satisfaction and their involvement with children. In other words, the study suggests that fathers who are more satisfied with their marriage tend to spend more time actively interacting with their children not only to fulfill their own parenting role but also to show love and partnership with their wives. In contrast, fathers who are not happy with their marriage are more likely to withdraw from the family and as a result spend less time with their children.

IX. Biological Connection Between Fathers and Children

Researchers have examined to a great degree the biological connection between mothers and their children. In contrast, beyond fathers’ genetic contributions to their children, much less is known about the biological connection between fathers and their children. Thanks to advances in technology, however, there is an emerging body of research that reveals changes in fathers’ biology during the pre-natal and post-natal periods that have implications for preparing men for their fatherhood role. This new chapter in Father Facts provides the data and research on this fascinating area of study.

What We Know

During the pre-natal and post-natal period, men experience changes in hormone levels and in their brains that have an impact on their fatherhood role, suggesting that nature prepares men to become fathers. Men experience a decline in testosterone, and an increase in oxytocin accompanies the transition to fatherhood. The decline in testosterone allows fathers to have increased empathy toward their children and oxytocin helps with father-child bonds. Additionally, there are changes in the brain and which parts of the brain react when fathers hear the cries of their children or see their children’s faces.

The Data and Research

A study with 20 primary-caregiving mothers, 20 secondary-caregiving fathers, and 47 primary-caregiving fathers looked at brain reactions, oxytocin, and parenting behavior associated with raising infants. Findings showed that:

- Primary-caregiving mothers showed greater activation within the emotional processing and cortical circuits, both associated with social understanding.
- Similar to the primary-caregiving mothers, primary-caregiving fathers exhibited high amygdala activation similar to mothers, alongside high superior temporal sulcus (STS) activation, and functional connectivity between amygdala and STS.
- Additionally, time spent in childcare correlated with amygdala-STS connectivity for all fathers.

These findings demonstrate mechanisms in the brain associated with caregiving experiences in fathers.


Researchers found that there are hormonal and brain differences between fathers and non-fathers. The study compared 88 heterosexual fathers with children between the ages of 1 and 2, with 50 of their non-father counterparts. They found that:

- Fathers had significantly higher levels of plasma oxytocin and lower levels of testosterone when compared to non-fathers.
- Fathers showed higher activation within key regions of the brain known for face emotion processing and reward processing when compared to their non-father comparison group.
- Non-fathers showed higher activation with key regions of the brain associated with sexual stimulus.

Researchers investigated structural changes in 16 fathers’ brains during the first 4 months postpartum using voxel-based morphometry analysis. Biological fathers with full-term, healthy infants were scanned at 2–4 weeks postpartum and at 12–16 weeks postpartum. Fathers exhibited increase in gray matter (GM) volume in several neural regions involved in parental motivation, including the hypothalamus, amygdala, striatum, and lateral prefrontal cortex. The findings provide evidence for neural plasticity in fathers’ brains.


A study looking at 44 fathers and their interactions with their toddler children found that salivary progesterone (P4) increases when fathers spent time with their children, and suggested P4 as a possible mood enhancer that may support paternal investment in interacting with their children.


This study utilized brain imagery of fathers listening to the cries of their infant children. The results showed that fathers had an increased activation in multiple brain areas such as, hypothalamus, hippocampus, midbrain, and anterior cingulated when they heard their infants cry.


Researchers studying fathers in Georgia found variation in the ventral tegmental area of the brain was associated with positive parental behaviors. However, ventral tegmental activation was negatively associated with testis size, suggesting that fathers with smaller testis tended to engage in more paternal behaviors. Implications of this study are that a decline in testosterone associated with the transition to fatherhood may be important for increased father empathy toward their children.


A laboratory study of 35 fathers and their infant children found that administered intranasal oxytocin determines parental proximity to the infant. Oxytocin is a hormone that is associated with childbirth and milk production for females and promotes parental-infant bonding. The speed at which fathers turned their gaze to their children was calculated to show that oxytocin increased the proximity and, therefore, the bond with their infant children.


Researchers found that baseline plasma oxytocin levels predicted infant-father interaction styles and social engagement for fathers with infants 4-6 months. The study suggests that men with higher oxytocin levels have higher levels of social engagement with their infant child.


A longitudinal study using data from 624 fathers participating in the Cebu Longitudinal Health and Nutrition Survey (CLHNS) found that fathers who reported three or more hours of childcare activities daily had lower testosterone. The researchers suggested that there are biological tradeoffs that happen when a man becomes a father. Ultimately there is a tradeoff between mating and parenting in humans.
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X. Types of Fathers

There are many types of fathers. Indeed, “type” of father can be defined in many ways (e.g. based on demographics, behavior, knowledge, and attitudes). Nevertheless, research has provided us with insights into fathers based on certain characteristics. This chapter provides data and research on some of the most common types of fathers studied (e.g. non-residential and divorced). It also provides data and research on types of fathers not well studied but that are, nonetheless, emerging groups in studies (e.g. military, stay-at-home, and stepfathers). The inclusion of divorced fathers and military fathers are new topics in Father Facts.

Non-Resident Fathers

What We Know

Non-residential fathers have to balance responsibilities to be with their children with the level of access they have to their children. Involved non-residential fathers are a positive influence on their children, but many of them report barriers to being involved with their children, such as lack of visitation with their child, financial barriers, and depression. On the other hand, positive social support (e.g. from the custodial mother) increases the involvement of non-residential fathers. When a non-residential father establishes a new union (e.g. marriage or cohabitation arrangement), his level of involvement in the life of his child may lower in specific circumstances.

The Data and Research

In a qualitative study, researchers conducted interviews with 39 nonresident fathers discuss the fathers’ regret about not obtaining their educational goals. Because of their personal educational experiences and financial hardships, fathers maintained that they wanted and continue to be present in their children’s lives as advisors, teachers, and investors when it comes to education. Some fathers viewed their role as advisors encouraging their children to stay in school. Those fathers who viewed their role as teachers provided cognitive support and help with homework responsibilities, while those fathers who viewed their role as investors focused on saving money to help their children continue their educational path.


A study of 486 mothers from the Survey of Wisconsin Works Families found roughly 44% of low-income mothers of children with nonresident fathers receive some form of child care from either the father or the father’s relatives. Mothers who had children with more than one nonresident father were more likely to receive childcare than those who had children with only one nonresident father.


Researchers used a small scale longitudinal approach to look at protective factors associated with nonresident father presence with single mothers and their preschool aged children. The sample included 99 Black mothers, assessing them over a two-year period of time with two times for data collection. Protective effects were found in relationship to nonresident father presence and mothers’ parenting stress along with depressive symptoms. Nonresident fathers’ presence in the first data collection also showed a decrease in behavioral problems and negative aspects of child development at the second data collection. Results show that nonresident fathers’ presence has a positive influence for their children and for their co-parent.

CHAPTER X • Types of Fathers

About 2 out of every 5 non-residential fathers visit their child (under the age of 18) only several times a year or less, approximately 1 out of 3 visit their child 1 to 3 times a month, and 1 out of 4 visit several times a week. Moreover:

- Non-residential fathers with a bachelor’s degree are more likely (39%) to visit their child several times a week than fathers with less than a college education (25%).
- Married non-residential fathers are more likely (54%) as well as cohabitating fathers (48%) to report infrequent visitation with their child (several times a year or less) versus single fathers (at only 33%).
- Hispanic non-resident fathers reported the lowest rates of visitation.
- About 63% of Hispanic, 35% of Black, and 34% of White non-resident fathers reported visiting their child only several times a year or less.


Research using data collected from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study looked at nonresident fathers’ and their social networks. The study wanted to go beyond previous research evaluating the nonresident fathers’ involvement with their children and the relationship with the mother of their children. Results showed that a nonresident fathers’ perceptive social support positively influences their involvement with their children and the relationship with their child’s mother.


Using data collected from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, researchers examined 596 families to identify the relationship between non-residential fathers’ depression level and their involvement with their children. Results showed that:

- Higher levels of depression for both the non-resident father and the mother negatively affected parental involvement with the child.
- The level of depression in both the father and the mother mediated relationship quality between the parents.

Researchers concluded that depression has an association with parent relationship quality and parent-child involvement.


Based on data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, researchers examined levels of father involvement with children between married and cohabiting couples post-separation. Results revealed that previously cohabitating fathers were more involved with children than previously married fathers.


A study used survey data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study to investigate nonresidential father visitation and maternal relationships. Results included that:

- 28% percent of fathers did not visit their children at either follow-up.
- 18% of fathers visited their children at the first but not the second follow-up.
- Nine (9) percent of fathers saw their children at the second follow-up after not visiting their children during the first follow-up.
- 48% of partnered mothers reported that the father did not see his child at either follow-up, but 51% of stably single mothers reported visitation at both follow-ups.
- Fathers visited their children an average of 5.3 days during the month prior to the second follow-up.
The frequency of visitation was lowest when mothers had a stable relationship (2.3 days), especially if the relationship was co-residential (1.6 days) and involved a partner who engaged with their children (1.4 days).

Between the first and second follow-ups, the frequency of paternal visitation declined an average of 2 days.

Father visitation increased by an average of 1.6 days when birth mothers initially partnered became single.

When mothers were in stable relationships, fathers were 4.1 times more likely to not see their children at either follow-up.

Compared to White fathers, Black fathers were about half as likely to have not seen their children at either follow-up.

Fathers with any college experience were about 1.6 times as likely to have not seen their children at all relative to those who had only a high school or GED.

Unemployed fathers had an increased risk of not seeing their children at either follow-up.


In a study of 650 cases, researchers found that African American children are more likely than White children to reside with their biological mother only. Moreover:

- Almost 24% more White children than African American children lived with both biological parents, where 21% more African American children lived with only their biological mother.

- African American nonresident fathers were more likely to visit their children more frequently than did nonresident White fathers.

The results of this study indicate that African American adult children with nonresident fathers reported feeling significantly closer to their fathers compared to their White peers. More African American adult children compared to White adult children reported that their mothers supported their relationship with their nonresident father.


A study of 893 nonresident fathers revealed that half of fathers displayed low involvement when children were 1 and 3 years old, one fourth maintained high involvement, and the remaining fluctuated over time. Researchers also discovered that stronger romantic and extended family relationships were associated with higher paternal interactions with children.


A study of 1,686 unwed fathers from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study found increased prenatal involvement greatly affected higher involvement at years 1 and 3. Simultaneously, unmarried fathers who transitioned to residential status and unemployed fathers who transitioned to employment were more engaged in their children’s lives after birth.
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Using longitudinal data, researchers examined whether and how changes in the family trajectories of both biological parents affect the nonresident father-child frequency of contact. Results indicated that:

- Half of fathers experienced a change in contact frequency.
- Fathers’ new union formation reduces visits to nonresident children, but only when it closely followed separation, before fathers and children have established the structure of their post-separation relationship.
- The results did not indicate that the birth of a child in fathers’ new union significantly reduced their level of contact with nonresident children.
- Nonresident fathers reduced the frequency of visits when their children gained a stepfather.


The 1995 and 1996 waves of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (N= 3,394) revealed that the higher the levels of adolescent well-being, the more nonresident biological fathers had positive interactions with their children.


Single Fathers

What We Know

Single fathers make up a relatively small but rapidly growing 16.4% of the population of single parents. Single fathers enter into single parenting for different reasons, but the largest proportion of them become single parents as a result of divorce. An increasing proportion, however, are never-married fathers. They tend to spend, on average, more time each day with their children than fathers in other family forms but less time each day with their children than do single mothers. Little is known, however, about the specific struggles and adaptations single fathers may make when raising their children.

The Data and Research

There were about 2.0 million single fathers in 2014 with single fathers making up 16.4% of single parents. Moreover:

- 43.5% were divorced.
- 33% of were never married.
- 18.8% were separated.
- 4.7% were widowed.

In 2011, 15% of all single parents were fathers. Of the 70.1 million fathers across the nation, 1.7 million were single fathers. Ten (10) percent of the 1.7 million were raising three or more children under the age of 18. Thirty-eight (38) percent had an annual family income of $50,000 or more. Moreover:

- 45% were divorced.
- 31% were never married.
- 19% were divorced.
- 5% were widowed.


Using data from the National Survey of America's Families, including 62,193 children ages 0–17, research results revealed that children in single-father families have poorer access to health care compared to children in two-parent families.


Using data from the American Time Use Survey, a study found that single fathers spend approximately 22 minutes more per day on child interaction than married fathers, 11 minutes less than married mothers, and 10 minutes less than single mothers.


A study of 1,977 children age 3 and older living with a residential father or father figure revealed that single fathers spent the greatest amount of engaged time with their children at 22 hours. Married biological fathers spent an average of 15 hours, unmarried biological fathers spent 12 hours, resident fathers spent 11 hours, and stepfathers spent 9 hours per week engaged with their children.


### Divorced Fathers

#### What We Know

Divorced fathers work both within and outside of the family unit. Unfortunately, not much is known about the well-being of divorced fathers. Divorce is a difficult transition for families and one that affects every member of the family. Divorced fathers, however, must often overcome additional hurdles, such as the court system, to have the level of involvement they want with their children. Additionally, there is a split regarding how divorced fathers view their involvement with their children (e.g. based on whether they identify as part-time, full-time, or part-time full-time fathers). Higher levels of involvement by divorced fathers in the lives of their children mitigate some of the risky, unhealthy behavior of some divorced fathers.

#### The Data and Research

The Center for Disease Control reports close to 2.2 million marriages occurred in 2012 and the marriage rate was 6.8 per 1,000 people. The CDC reports divorce rates at 3.4 per 1,000 people in the same year.
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One researcher examined the published literature on divorced men's well-being since 1900. The review of the literature included fathers’ experience of depression after the divorce, their self-esteem, the adjustment period, and anxiety level. The researcher found that the large majority of divorce literature about men is limited when it comes to factors of well-being and thus suggested that more primary research needs to be conducted on men’s well-being after the divorce.


Using a national representative study from the Netherlands, a researcher found that divorce increases inequality between relationships children have with their father and mother. Previous research demonstrates that there can be a “decompensation” (deterioration) of parent-child relationships after parental divorce. This research supports that process and adds that divorce can also create inequality between parents. The inequality between parents can occur from loyalty conflicts, where parents force a child to choose between the two parents. Additionally, the researcher found that there is no gender difference in parent-child conflict after the divorce.


A qualitative study analyzing 20 newly divorced fathers concluded that fathers identify themselves in three ways: full-time fathers, part-time full-time fathers, and part-time fathers. The distinguishing factors are how the fathers viewed their role with their children. Specifically:

- Full-time fathers reported high levels of involvement with their children.
- Part-time full-time fathers are fully involved with their children when they have them, but then focused on their own lives when they are apart from them.
- Part-time fathers felt that mothers are responsible for the involvement with the children, but they (part-time fathers) are financially responsible for their children.
- The study supports previous data on father-child involvement post divorce and brings to light how divorce changes a father’s identity.


Researchers examined health status and substance use trajectories over 18 months for a sample of 230 divorced fathers of young children aged 4 to 11. One third of the sample was clinically depressed. They found:

- Health problems, drinking, and hard drug use were stable over time for the sample, whereas depression, smoking, and marijuana use exhibited overall mean reductions.
- Fathering identity predicted reductions in health-related problems and marijuana use. Father involvement reduced drinking and marijuana use.
- Being antisocial was the strongest risk factor for health and substance use outcomes.

Teen Fathers

What We Know

Teen fathers are a unique type of father because of their young age and transitions from adolescence to adulthood. Sixty-six (66) percent of teen fathers have their first child between the ages of 18 and 19. Nearly half (48%) of teen fathers are White, which far outpaces the proportion of Black and Hispanic teen fathers. Teen fathers have many risk factors associated with their transition into fatherhood—including depression, lack of education, and unemployment—that affect these young fathers and their children. Risk factors associated with becoming a teen father include experiences before and after pregnancy, societal treatment of adolescent fathers, and specific, difficult challenges, such as paying for children’s needs. Adolescent fathers generally want to be better fathers than were their own fathers. Unfortunately, they may be at increased risk for depressive symptoms during their transition to fatherhood. On the other hand, teen fathers can have a positive impact on teen mothers and their children when teen fathers are involved before and immediately after the birth of their children. These teen fathers have a protective effect by reducing the risk of depression in teen mothers and distress in infants.

The Data and Research

Two researchers examined previous research on teen fathers and compiled a comprehensive analysis of adolescent males who became teen fathers. The researchers reviewed literature about risk factors associated with becoming teen fathers, experiences before and after pregnancy, societal treatment of adolescent fathers, and the specific challenges associated with being a young father. The researchers suggested that more must be done to understand this specific group of fathers, their experiences, and the services that could benefit them.


Using data collected by the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health of 10,623 men, researchers found that there are increased depressive symptoms associated with young fathers’ transition to fatherhood, specifically during the child’s first 5 years of life. Nonresident fathers scored higher than nonfathers. Resident fathers showed a decrease in depressive symptoms during late adolescence, but it increased during the transition to fatherhood. The researchers concluded that identifying risk factors associated with the young father population will be key for future interventions.


Researchers examined the role of father involvement on infant distress among children born to teen mothers, particularly those who are depressed. The study found that:

- Mothers reported that 78% of fathers were engaged with their children, typically seeing them a few times per month, and 71% took financial responsibility for their children.

- Father responsibility predicted lower infant distress.

- Maternal depression predicted higher infant distress, and there was a significant interaction in which father engagement buffered the effect of maternal depression on infant distress.

The researchers concluded that fathers may be a protective resource for children born to teen mothers, even as early as the first 6 months of life, potentially mitigating the heightened risk associated with maternal depression in the postpartum period.

In this study, the researcher used data collected from the Adolescent Father Involvement Intervention Project (AFIIP) to evaluate parental conflict, parental alliance, father prenatal involvement, and father engagement with infants. The sample included 127 adolescent mothers and their adolescent male partners who completed both the pre and post interviews. The results showed the mothers’ perceptions of parental alliance during pregnancy greatly influence fathers’ engagement. Additionally, fathers' and mothers’ perceptions about fathers during the prenatal period had a direct correlation to a father’s engagement with his infant child. The research suggested that adolescents’ perceptions of father involvement and parental alliance have an effect on the fathers’ engagement during child’s infancy.


Researchers looked at 91 young fathers (average age 21) with young children under the age of 2 to assess predictors of parental involvement. Results included:

- The strongest predictor of father involvement was parental cognitions about parenthood. Parental cognition refers to the level of thought and insight about being a father.
- Fathers with limited responses that lacked insight were given the lowest score for parental cognition.
- Barriers to father involvement included occupation or school and the child’s mother.
- Young fathers often saw children’s mothers as either “gatekeepers,” preventing their involvement with children, or as “gateopeners,” supporting the fathers’ involvement with the children.
- Young fathers often viewed their own mothers as facilitators of father involvement.


Researchers identified the following demographics surrounding adolescent fathers:

- 48% are White
- 29% are African American
- 19% are Hispanic
- Four (4) percent come from other ethnic–racial groups
- 66% father their first child at age 18 or 19, 17% at age 17, 9% at age 16, and seven (7) percent at ages 13 to 15

Moreover, teen fathers who live with their children at the time of their children’s births are more likely to live with their children when these fathers become adults.


A study using data collected from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort assessed how teen fathers matter to children. The sample included 150 teen fathers and about 4,700 adult fathers. Researchers found that:

- Teen fathers were less often married and more often were cohabitating or nonresidential than adult fathers.
- Teen fathers’ children often experienced a variety of social disadvantages within the household context.
- Teen fathers’ children at age 2 tended to have lower scored on cognitive and behavioral measures than the adult fathers’ children.
- The father-child relationship did not differ between teen fathers and their adult father counterparts.
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The researchers suggested policy interventions to help children reduce development gaps in preschool.

Utilizing a qualitative approach, researchers interviewed seven adolescent and young adult fathers (ages 16-22) expecting their first child from an unplanned pregnancy regarding their experiences and expectation about being a father. Researchers found that:

- The experience of becoming father resulted in mixed emotions for the adolescents.
- The young fathers expressed concern about being ill-prepared to raise a child and about being a co-parent.
- The experience of becoming a father, however, provided a reflective opportunity to think about their experiences growing up with or without a father and the quality of fathering they experienced.
- All the young fathers interviewed wanted to provide a better fathering experience than they had experienced.


A study using a sample of 1496 young fathers who were interviewed annually from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth revealed that sons of adolescent fathers were 1.8 times more likely to become adolescent fathers than were sons of older fathers.

A study using a sample of 50 teenage father-mother dyads examined the relationship between adolescent fathers’ parenting stress, social support, and fathers’ care giving involvement with their infant children. Findings revealed that fathers’ parenting stress was significantly and negatively correlated with fathers’ care giving as perceived by both fathers and mothers. The results also showed that social support from both teenagers’ parents buffered the negative influence of parenting stress on fathers’ involvement with the baby.
Incarcerated Fathers

**What We Know**

More than 90% of parents in prison are fathers. Incarcerated fathers have to work especially hard while they are in prison to stay connected with their children, and, yet, nearly 8 in 10 of them report having some contact with their children since their imprisonment. Incarceration leads to decreased father involvement. The number of incarcerated fathers has increased over the past 30 years, leaving children to be raised without these biological fathers and creating additional challenges for both parents and their children. As of 2010, 1 in 28 children in the United States had an incarcerated parent. Black fathers disproportionately represent incarcerated fathers. Children with incarcerated fathers are at higher risk of antisocial behavior. When compared to children of absent but not incarcerated fathers, children with incarcerated fathers show more aggressive and inattentive behaviors. Incarceration leads to greater distrust among mothers of fathers’ ability to care for their children.

**The Data and Research**

Researchers using the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study showed that paternal incarceration diminishes parenting behaviors and father-child relationships. The researchers found that paternal incarceration increases the likelihood of mothers seeking to repartner. Finding show that there are additional collateral aspects to paternal incarceration.


Researchers at the University of Cambridge, England used a systematic review and meta-analysis approach to review 40 studies on parental incarceration, specifically paternal incarceration and its relationship to children’s antisocial behavior, drug use, and educational performance. The study found that parental incarceration had a high correlation to antisocial behavior for the children, but could not conclude the link to drug use and educational performance. The researchers suggested additional research to be done in those categories.


Using the data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, researchers found that children of incarcerated fathers show more aggressive and inattentive behaviors than children of absentee fathers who are not incarcerated. The researchers concluded that more support services need to be provided to the children of incarcerated fathers.


Researchers used data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing study to examine the effects of incarceration on fathers’ financial support for their children while fathers were incarcerated and after their release. They found that incarceration not only reduces financial support while fathers are incarcerated but that formerly incarcerated men are less likely to contribute to their families, and those who do contribute provide significantly less. The negative effects of incarceration on fathers’ financial support are due not only to the low earnings of formerly incarcerated men but also to their increased likelihood to live apart from their children. Men contribute far less through child support (formal or informal) than they do when they share their earnings within their household, suggesting that the destabilizing effects of incarceration on family relationships place children at significant economic disadvantage.

The Pew Center estimated that in 2010 there were over 2.7 million children or 1 in 28 children in the United States with an incarcerated parent. Additionally, 1.1 million incarcerated individuals are fathers of children between the ages of 0-17.


According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 92% of parents in prison were fathers. Moreover:

- 42% were Black, 32% were White, and 26% were Hispanic.
- Nearly 9 in 10 of these fathers reported that the mother of their child was currently their child's primary caregiver.
- More than half of these fathers (54%) reported that they provided the primary financial support for their children prior to incarceration.
- Nearly 8 in 10 incarcerated fathers (78.1%) reported having some contact with their children since their imprisonment, with nearly 4 in 10 (38.5%) saying that they had contact weekly or more frequently.


Paternal incarceration is likely to decrease family income by 12%, and increase material hardship by 18%, parenting stress by six (6) percent, and maternal depression by almost 25%. Research findings show that father’s incarceration has no direct effect on cognitive development, internalizing or social problems, however it increases externalizing behavior by 20% and attention problems by 22%.


One in four African American children born in 1990 had a parent imprisoned by the time he or she was 14, compared to 1 in 25 White children.


There has been an increase in the prison population in the past three decades. The per capita rate of imprisonment has increased by more than 400%, from 110 per 100,000 in 1973 to 470 per 100,000 in 2000. More than half of those imprisoned are parents, and approximately 1.5 million children have a parent in prison. The odds of fathers’ imprisonment differ significantly by race and ethnicity, and incarceration is most prevalent among men of color at lower educational levels.


Using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, researchers examined the consequences of incarceration for nonresident White, Latino, and African American father-child contact and their formal and informal child support agreements. The results suggested that:

- Fathers’ current incarceration presented serious obstacles to maintaining contact with children and hindered the establishment of informal financial support agreements with mothers.
- Past incarceration was strongly and negatively associated with the frequency of contact of non-Latino White fathers and their children but had a considerably smaller effect for African American and Latino fathers.
- Father incarceration had an impact on mothers’ level of trust of fathers’ ability to take care of their children.
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- Currently incarcerated White fathers scored 1.48 standard deviations higher on mother’s distrust compared to never-incarcerated Whites.

- The effect of incarceration on mothers’ distrust was considerably weaker for African American and Latino men.


Research involving 102 children (50% male and 89% Black) from urban, low-income homes investigated whether children of incarcerated fathers are more likely to report or exhibit behavioral symptoms than their peers whose fathers were not incarcerated. The findings revealed that children of incarcerated fathers reported more depressive symptoms and their teachers noted more disruptive externalizing behaviors.


Military Fathers

What We Know

Military fathers are motivated to be involved in their children’s lives but struggle during deployment and post deployment to stay connected to and reunify with their families. Recent interventions for the family pre-deployment, deployment, and post-deployment can help the family plan for the potential hurdles they may face. With the recent wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, more research has been conducted on military fathers. That research has focused on the connection between fathers and their children during deployment and reunification with children after deployment. Struggles for military fathers on deployment include fathers missing developmental milestones, nurturing, and staying involved with their children. Struggles reunifying with their children include fathers’ difficulty expressing their emotions, transitioning from military life to family life, and managing their tempers. Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) has a negative effect on military fathers’ parenting.

The Data and Research

Researchers analyzed the participation of 42 families, in which at least one parent was a member in the National Guard or Reserves, randomly assigned to an intervention group to participate in a 14-week parenting program, called ADAPT, that used support groups and web-based tools. The researchers found participation rates of fathers was high and did not differ from those of mothers. The researchers concluded that:

- Military fathers are willing to engage in services that strengthen families.
- Providing parenting tools to fathers can pay off.
- Once engaged, fathers follow through with high rates of participation in attending support groups and completing home-based assignments.
- It might be helpful to promote parenting programs as preventive or health promotion programs (rather than as mental health treatments).

A study used a small sample of fathers serving in the Michigan Army National Guard (participating in the 10 week multifamily group intervention STRoNG Military Families) deployed within the past two years. Using questionnaires and a parent interview, researchers found common themes associated with deployment and parenting. Specifically:

- The increased level of parenting stress, specific challenges surrounding reconnecting with children, adapting expectations of the military to family life, and co-parenting.
- Fathers expressed concern about missing developmental milestones or periods in their children’s lives and indicated a strong desire to learn more and improve their parenting skills.
- Fathers expressed a need for education about expressing emotions, nurturing, and managing their tempers.

The researchers suggested that more needs to be done pre and post deployment with fathers and their families, as well as, working on helping father understand age-typical responses regarding separation and reunion of their children.


Researchers used a semi-structured interview with military fathers deployed within the past 2 years with children ages 6 and under. Researchers found:

- A trend with families that did not prepare strategies for maintaining father-child relationship during deployment and higher parenting stress upon return from deployment.
- Demonstrating the planning and strategizing for deployment is important in decreasing parenting stress.
- Upon looking at a communication method between parents and their children in relationship to parenting stress found the communication method was not associated with parenting stress.
- A focus on attachment was key for reunification post deployment and allowing fathers to take time off to be with their families.


Researchers conducted focus groups with 39 fathers in the United States Air Force, most with children 3 years old or younger, to examine their access to parenting information during the transition to parenthood, and to determine methods for engaging the military fathers in intervention. Results revealed that:

- Fathers were motivated to develop and maintain positive relationships with their partners and children despite substantial challenges, including multiple deployments, family moves, and demanding work responsibilities.
- Fathers emphasized the importance of information in facilitating the transition to parenthood, especially in the key domains of effective co-parenting and communication, children’s developmental milestones, and appropriate use of discipline.
- Fathers tended to rely more on informal sources of parenting information (e.g., spouse/partner, family members, friends) than on formal sources of information (e.g., pediatricians, social workers).


According to the United States Department of Defense (DoD), in 2012:

- Nearly 44% (43.9%) of active duty U.S. service members in the four main branches of the military (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines) were parents, with the majority being fathers.
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- Nearly 50,000 of those fathers were single fathers (48,463).
- There were 1,220,941 children with at least one parent serving in one of the four main branches of the military, and more than half (54.1%) were age 7 or younger.

Because close to half of all U.S. service members were parents, and the trend in several deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan since 2001, many families were affected by parents’ deployments in a variety of different ways.


Using a focus group approach, researchers met with groups of military fathers to discuss perspective on father involvement. Researchers found common themes of the father perceptions, which were not affected by fathers’ deployment status, the age of their children, or the service branch in which they were members. Moreover:

- All of the military fathers found that responsibility, evaluation of parenting, developmental awareness, planning, monitoring, warmth/acceptance, anxiety/distress, emotional withholding, and observable engagement activities as common themes of father involvement.

- Reintegration challenges were specifically noted with post deployment and important regardless of children’s ages and what type of service branch.

These common themes provided by the fathers allow for future research on how to support military fathers maintain effective parent-child involvement.


A longitudinal study of 468 fathers in the National Guard who served in Iraq found that, one year after returning home, PTSD predicted parenting challenges independently of the impact of PTSD on couple adjustment.


Stay-at-Home Fathers

What We Know

The rate of stay-at-home fathers is rising. The kinds of questions asked by researchers to estimate the number of stay-at-home fathers may, however, greatly underestimate their number. Most stay-at-home fathers do so for the benefit of their children. These fathers tend to have progressive beliefs; specifically, less traditional attitudes surrounding gender roles when compared to fathers employed full-time outside the home. Unfortunately, stay-at-home fathers can suffer from the societal stigma associated with being a male stay-at-home parent.

The Data and Research

In 2011, the U.S. Census Bureau estimated that 176,000 of fathers are stay-at-home dads. These 176,000 fathers are married with children under 15 years old and have been out of the workforce for at least one year. The primary reason for leaving the workforce is to care for their children. Stay-at-home fathers were responsible for caring for 332,000 children.

A study looked at two cohorts of fathers, one stay-at-home father and the other full-time employed fathers, and their gender role attitudes and characteristics. Stay-at-home fathers had less traditional attitudes surrounding gender roles, but reported traditional masculine and feminine characteristics. Wanting to be a stay-at-home father was the most important reason stay-at-home fathers reported for their decision to stay at home to raise their children.


Using a mixed method approach, the researcher interviewed 40 fathers and used data from the American Community Survey 2005-2007 to better understand the role of stay-at-home fathers. Findings suggested that the number of stay-at-home fathers is greatly underestimated due to questions asked by evaluators. The in-depth interviews supported the findings and suggested that stay-at-home fathers take on a variety of workforce responsibilities such as part-time work or educational pursuits outside of their fatherhood responsibilities.


Over the last half a century, fatherhood has undergone some significant change. In 1965, fathers spent 2.6 hours a week caring for their children; by 2000 the number of hours spent on childcare had increased to 6.5. The number of stay-at-home fathers has increased three times in the past decade, and single-father families are the fastest-growing household type in the United States.


In 2009, the estimated number of stay-at-home fathers was 158,000. These married fathers with children younger than 15 years old were absent from work for at least one year mostly so they could care for the family while their wives worked outside the home. These fathers cared for 290,000 children. Among the 158,000 stay-at-home dads, 59% had two or more children, and 57% had an annual family income of $50,000 or more.


Fathers regularly cared for 24% percent of the nation’s 11.2 million preschoolers whose mothers were employed during their mothers’ working hours. The number of preschoolers cared for by fathers was estimated at 2.7 million children in 2006.


Stepfathers

What We Know

There is limited research on stepfathers. What we do know, however, suggests that while stepfathers have to work diligently to create a supportive environment for their stepchildren, there is little difference between stepfathers’ involvement with children when compared to that of biological fathers. One key element in supporting the role of stepfathers in the household is mothers’ support and parental cohesiveness to help build relationships between children and their stepfathers.

The Data and Research

The researchers used a sample from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth that included over 1,000 children ages 10-16 living in households with a mother and stepfather. Results showed that open communication between children and their mothers, low amount of arguing between mothers and stepfathers, parental agreement, and gender of child all had an effect on the children’s reports of closeness with their stepfathers. Therefore, parental cohesiveness is a key aspect in creating a close relationship between the child and the stepfather. Interventions with families working with a stepfather should focus on the parent relationship in relation to children.

Researchers assessed a small group of stepfathers attending a research-based stepfamily education course. The course was taught over one day that lasted about 12 hours. Results showed that while stepfathers were reluctant to attend, they found benefit in attending and learning. The stepfathers explained that they gained knowledge and skills in increasing family bonding, relationship skill building with their partner and their stepchildren, and enhancing fathering practices. Findings suggested that stepfamily education has beneficial results.


Using data from the NICHD Study of Early Child Care, researchers examined father involvement for 68 stepfathers and 68 biological fathers of first-grade children. The findings suggested that:

- Stepfathers and biological fathers don’t differ in their involvement in childrearing activities or in the quality of their engagement with their children.
- Stepfathers’, but not biological fathers’, marital satisfaction was positively correlated with the involvement in child-rearing activities.
- In the case of biological fathers, but not stepfathers, higher number of hours of maternal work was related to a lower quality of father engagement.


A study using the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health explored the relationship between stepfather involvement and adolescent well-being and whether these relationships depend on maternal involvement or amount of time in the household. Results indicated that a close, non-conflictual stepfather–stepchild relationship improves adolescent well-being, however it is most beneficial when the adolescent also has a close, non-conflictual mother-child relationship. Moreover, the study found that engaging in shared activities with the stepfather decreases adolescence depression in cases when the stepfather has been in the household for a longer period of time.


A study of 2,954 parents living without a partner examined the role of children in stepfamily formation. Men with children had higher chances to marry coresident mothers. Women’s coresidential children decreased their odds of marrying men without children and increased them for men that do.


A sample of 1,149 adolescents in the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health found that teens had better positive outcomes when they maintained strong relationships with both a stepfather and nonresident biological father. Due to stepfathers’ resident status, adolescents had closer relationships with them, compared to their nonresidential biological fathers.

XI. The “Newest” Fathers: Millenials

What We Know

Who are the Millennials? The Millennial generation includes people born after 1980 and is the first generation to come of age in the new millennium, hence the name. The Pew Research Center provides some of the most comprehensive information about views and identifying factors of this generation, including views on parenting and marriage. Millennials identify technology use, music/pop culture, liberal beliefs and tolerance, being smarter, and clothes as unique aspects of their generation. This generation tends to be more educated than the previous generations. While there are fewer Millennials having children, these parents prioritize being a good parent as one of the most important aspects of their lives. Millennials place parenthood and marriage above career and financial success.

The Data and Research

An update of data collected in 2010 of 50 million Millennials by the Pew Research Center showed that:

◆ This generation is going down a distinct path when it comes to adulthood. While this generation is the most educated, it is also burdened with high levels of student loans, and a job market coming out of the Great Recession of 2007-2009.

◆ Thirty-two (32) percent of Millennials state that they are making enough money right now, 53% say that they do not earn enough right now, but they will in the future, and 14% say they do not earn enough now and will not in the future.

◆ With these economic barriers, Millennials are less likely to get married and start a family when compared with the previous generations. However, they prioritize marriage and family over career and remain optimistic about the future.


A study using the National Longitudinal Study of Youth (years 2008 and 2010) examined cohabitation expectations for single young adults (ages 18-24). Researchers found that:

◆ In 2008, about 52.6% of the young adult participants had low or no expectations of cohabiting with a partner, and 47.4% had moderate to high expectations for cohabitation.

◆ In 2010, 38% of the young adults in the study were in unmarried cohabiting unions, 30% of those in cohabitating unions were originally in the no expectation or low expectation of being in a cohabitating union group.

The researchers concluded that “unplanned cohabitation” is important to consider when working with young adults regarding union formation and family change.

Utilizing data collected on 50 million 18 to 29 year olds, the Pew Research Center found that:

- Millennials were less likely to say that a child needs a home with both a father and mother to grow up happily. However, they were more likely to say that single parenthood and unmarried couple parenthood is bad for society.

- Forty-four (44) percent of Millennials said that marriage is becoming obsolete, and 46% said the growing variety in family arrangements is a good thing.

- When it comes to getting married, 70% of Millennials said they want to get married, 20% said they were unsure, and five (5) percent did not want to get married.

- Similarly, 74% of Millennials wanted to have children, 19% did not, and seven (7) percent were unsure.

- The incidence of parenthood within the Millennial generation had declined to 36% in 2010 from 41% in 1998.


Utilizing a qualitative approach, researchers interviewed seven adolescent and young adult fathers (ages 16-22) expecting their first child from an unplanned pregnancy regarding their experiences and expectation about being a father. Researchers found that the experience of becoming father resulted in mixed emotions for the adolescents. The young fathers also expressed concern about being ill-prepared to raise a child and about being a co-parent. However, the experience of becoming a father, provided a reflective opportunity to think about their experiences growing up with or without a father and the quality of fathering they experienced. All the young fathers interviewed wanted to provide a better fathering experience than they had experienced.


In an initial report completed in 2010, the Pew Research Center analyzed data from 50 million Millennials, ages 18 to 29. Some defining factors about Millennials included:

- 37% were unemployed or out of the workforce
- 60% were raised by both parents (fewer than previous generations)
- 52% said “being a good parent” is a top priority
- 30% said “having a successful marriage” is a top priority
- 21% were currently married
- 34% were parents
- 39.6% were enrolled in college as of 2008

Moreover, a higher proportion of Millennials (59%) believed that more single women deciding to have children is a bad thing for society than do Generation Xers (54%). But this proportion is lower than that of the next two older generations, Boomers (65%), and the Silent Generation (72%). Millennials were more accepting of people living together without getting married (22%) compared with Generation Xers (31%), Boomers (44%), and the Silent Generation (58%).

XII. Grandfathers Raising Grandchildren

This new chapter in Father Facts presents research on a new topic of research related to father absence: grandparents raising grandchildren and the impact of raising grandchildren on grandfathers’ well-being. As rates of father absence have increased, many grandparents have become involved in raising their grandchildren from father-absent homes. Although this edition presents some data on grandfathers raising grandchildren, the data remain limited as research continues to focus on grandmother-maintained households because of the prevalence of grandmother-maintained compared to grandfather-maintained households.

Grandparent- and Grandfather-Maintained Households

What We Know

The number of custodial grandparents in the United States has doubled since 1970 to almost three million. Today approximately 10% of children live with a caretaker grandparent. The factors that lead to grandparents raising their grandchildren include their children’s (parents of their grandchildren) divorce, substance abuse, incarceration, child abuse, unemployment, and death. Twenty-three (23) percent of grandchildren raised by grandparents (with no parent present) live with their grandfathers, while more grandchildren live with their grandmothers only than with their grandfathers only. A large majority of these grandparents are between the ages of 50 and 69 and have had custody of their grandchildren for more than five years. The highest rates of custodial grandparenting are in the South and among Black and Asian populations.

The Data and Research

Custodial grandparenting is usually associated with parental divorce, substance abuse, incarceration, child abuse, unemployment or death.


In 2012, 4.2 million households (three percent) contained both grandparents and grandchildren. The grandparent maintained 60 percent of those homes. Approximately 2.7 million grandparents were considered “custodial grandparents.” The number of children living with a grandparent has more than doubled since 1970. In 2012, 10 percent of all children (7 million) lived with a grandparent. Grandmother-maintained households had the highest prevalence of poverty compared to grandfather or two grandparent-maintained homes. Furthermore:

- 32% of grandchildren lived with their grandparents and at least one of their parents
- 29% of grandchildren lived with their grandmother and at least one of their parents
- 17% of grandchildren lived only with both grandparents (no parent present)
- 15% of grandchildren lived only with their grandmother (no parent or grandfather present)
- Six (6) percent of grandchildren lived only with their grandfather (no parent or grandmother present)
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Almost forty three percent of children living in grandparent-maintained homes were under the age of six, 30.9% were ages 6-11, and 26.3% were ages 12-17. Moreover:

- 10.5% of grandparents had custody of their grandchildren for less than 6 months, 10.6% for 6-11 months, 23% for 1-2 years, 16.6% or 3-4 years, and 39.9% for five or more years.
- More than half of grandparent-maintained households were on public assistance (52.1%).
- Twenty-five (25) percent of children living with a grandparent caregiver lived in poverty, but this doubled to 48% when they lived with the grandmother only.
- Children living with the grandfather only had the highest rates of no health coverage at 26%.


More than half of younger custodial grandparents in Australia (under age 55) were more likely to obtain their income from a full or part-time job (52%) compared to older grandparents (over age 65) where only 38% of them worked. Furthermore:

- 72% of those age 65 and over relied on government income support.
- Two-thirds of grandparents raising their grandchildren said that they were “just getting along,” “poor,” or “very poor” with finances.
- 70% of older grandparents in the same sample owned their home compared to 41% of the middle age group and 10% of the youngest age group.
- 55% of custodial grandparents modified their homes by adding bedrooms and furniture, fencing the yard for child safety, or moving altogether.


Researchers found that grandparents who lived with their grandchildren were younger, had less education, and were more likely to be widowed or divorced. Furthermore:

- Co-resident grandparents were also more likely to live in poverty and unable to work due to illness/disability.
- White (7%) and Hispanic (12%) children had the largest increase in living with grandparents but continued to be less likely than Black (14%) or Asian (14%) children to live with a grandparent.
- Counties in the South (4%) and Southwest (5%) of the U.S. had the highest percentages of grandparent-maintained homes; Alabama having the highest rates in the country. The Midwest and upper Northeast counties had the lowest rates.
- In 2011, 22% of custodial grandparents had incomes below poverty level, and the grandparent-maintained households in the South had the highest proportion at 24%.
- Black grandchildren living with a grandparent were more likely to live with a grandmother and mother or grandmother only compared to other children. Twenty-eight (28) percent of Black children lived with a grandparent and no parent present; the highest rate for all children. They also had the highest rate for children living with a coresident grandparent and no father present.
- The majority of custodial grandparents were age 50-59, but 3.6% of grandparents responsible for their grandchildren were ages 30-39, 22.1% were age 40-49, 39% were age 50-59, 25.9% were age 60-69, 7.9% were age 70-79, and 1.5% were over the age of 80.
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Approximately 270,000 children live with their grandfathers, and 79.7% of these grandfather-maintained homes are White. Fifty-four (54) percent of American Indian grandparents cared for their grandchildren, 48% of Black, 43% of White, 31% of Hispanic, 30% of Native Hawaiian and 15% of Asian grandparents cared for theirs. Only 11% of grandparent caregivers worked full time in 2012. Approximately seven (7) percent of grandfather caretakers worked full time, 42.1% worked less than full time and over half (50.6%) did not work.


A study of 1,698 African American, Caribbean Black and non-Hispanic White men who had been raised by their grandfathers examined the correlates of socio-demographic, psychosocial, and retrospective measures for depressive symptoms and non-specific psychological distress among those men. Findings revealed:

◆◆ Racial and ethnic group differences by age, employment status, education, and household income on depressive symptoms and non-specific psychological distress.

◆◆ That being raised by a grandfather placed both African American and Caribbean black men at greater risk for depressive symptoms and non-specific psychological distress under certain socio-demographic conditions.


Custodial Grandfathers' Well-Being

What We Know

Custodial grandfathers, and custodial grandparents in general, experience an increase in poor physical and emotional health, finances, strained relationships, and decreased role satisfaction as a consequence of being the primary caregivers for their grandchildren.

The Data and Research

In 2012, grandfather caregivers self-reported their health as excellent (8.8%), very good (29.6%), good (34.5%), fair (19.9%), and poor (7.1%).


Grandparents caring for their grandchildren commonly experience poor physical/emotional health, less satisfaction with grand parenting, and strained relationships with spouses and friends. Specifically:

◆ They are more likely to experience poor health when they have little role satisfaction and less satisfying relationships with their grandchildren living in the home.

◆ The longer the duration of care, the less likely custodial grandparents will take preventative health measures.

◆ Regarding grandmothers, they are more likely to engage in risky health behaviors and have higher rates of depression and anxiety.

◆ Caregiving grandparents with greater resilience, less parental strain, and less grandchild difficulties had better overall health outcomes.

Sixty-two (62) percent of caretaking grandparents in Australia stated that their health had somewhat or greatly deteriorated due to raising their grandchildren. Moreover:

- More than half (53%) of grandparents stated that at least one of the grandchildren they were raising had a physical health problem and 82% had emotional or behavioral issues.
- About one-half of Australian custodial grandparents with a partner said their romantic relationship had deteriorated, due to the strain of raising young children, tension about the care taking, and disappointment at having to forego retirement plans.
- Approximately 40% of custodial grandparents also stated that their family relationships worsened due to custody battles.


In a sample of 200 custodial grandparents in Hawaii, needs regarding grandparent rights (35%), healthcare (29.5%), computers (26.5%), and programs for children (25%) were most frequently needed and unmet. The study also found:

- Service use was low compared to the rates of unmet needs.
- Those caretaker grandparents with unmet needs were younger and more likely to be an ethnic minority.
- Grandmothers were more likely to use services than grandfathers, and those using services were more likely to be on public assistance and live in a rural area.
- Grandparents caring for their grandchildren with medium levels of socioeconomic disadvantage reported more stress, anxiety, and depression than those with low or high levels of disadvantage.


Researchers found that Australian custodial grandparents usually experienced feelings of anger, frustration, resentment, loss, guilt, anxiety, and self-doubt due to their unexpected role of provider. Additionally:

- They expressed fear of the future: retirement issues, grandchildren’s education and what might happen if they can no longer care for their grandchildren.
- These grandparents also discussed financial issues, physical and emotional health concerns, legal battles, conflict with their grandchildren’s parents, and lifestyle changes.
- The topic of grief and loss was common among custodial grandmothers, while grandfathers were more vocal about legal and financial matters as well as concerns for the future.
- These grandparents believed services were more geared toward foster care than kinship providers.
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XIII. Differences in Maternal and Paternal Behavior

This chapter depicts differences in maternal and paternal behavior as well as the impact both parents have on their children.

What We Know

The different ways in which mothers and fathers interact with their children benefits children. Compared to mothers, fathers engage in twice as much play with their children. The play tends to be exploratory and physical. Because fathers’ play with children tends to be at a “high level,” child injury rates increase under fathers’ supervision. That risk, however, is mitigated to a degree when fathers engage in a high level of supervision of their children during play. Fathers’ lack of hostility toward their children, positive parenting of their children, and use of more complex language with their children positively influences child development. Black and Hispanic fathers may engage more in caregiving and physical play with their infant children than White fathers. The emergence of paternal gatekeeping behaviors has begun to surface in the research.

The Data and Research

Paternal hostility in the form of criticism, insults, arguments, shouting, hitting, threatening, and anger predicted increases in youth delinquent behavior more than the effects of maternal hostility. These results were similar among the gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and the age of the child. Mothers in the sample averaged higher scores of hostility compared to fathers; African Americans mothers had the highest rates.


Girls more than boys reported talking to their mothers regarding sexual topics. Boys felt more comfortable talking to their fathers, however, than did the girls. The researchers found that boys discussed a greater range of sexual topics with their fathers compared to girls with their mothers. The greater a mothers’ and fathers’ levels of psychological control on the adolescent child, the more likely they were to associate with peers who were more accepting of sex and engage in risky sexual behaviors.


Maternal gatekeeping is associated with father involvement. These behaviors can be restrictive or facilitate father’s interaction with their child. The three aspects of the behavior include: control (managing the flow of resources, information and boundaries), encouragement (positive feedback), suggesting the father is important, participating in cooperative parenting, and discouragement (interrupting father time with child and complaining about the father). These behaviors were more common among women; however, new evidence suggests that fathers also engage in gatekeeping behaviors (paternal gatekeeping).


Researchers found that mothers’ supervision was linked to lower rates of toddler unintentional injuries compared to paternal supervision. Moreover:

- Children were more likely to engage in high activity levels with their fathers, which have been linked to higher risks for injury.
- Higher supervision was a strong predictor for lower injury among both mothers and fathers.
Fathers promoted more physical play and exploratory behaviors than mothers.

Fathers were more likely than mothers to support the idea that minor injuries ‘toughen up’ a child and allow them to learn from mistakes. On the other hand, fathers supervised their daughters more during play, while mothers monitored both sons and daughters equally.


Researchers examined differences in parenting behavior in 112 two-parent families with preschool aged children. They found:

- Mothers were more involved than fathers in socialization, didactic, and caregiving, whereas fathers were more involved than mothers in physical play.
- Mothers’ greatest engagement was in caregiving, whereas fathers were about equally engaged in didactic, caregiving, and physical play.
- Mothers who contributed more to family income were less engaged in socialization and caregiving, whereas fathers with nontraditional beliefs about their roles were more engaged in didactic and caregiving.
- Children with greater temperamental effortful control received more didactic and physical play engagement from mothers.
- Fathers were more likely to engage in socialization activities with earlier-born children, whereas mothers were more likely to engage in socialization with girls high in effortful control.


In a sample of 644 second graders, a study showed positive parenting reduced the incidence of child deviant behavior. Researchers classified parenting as either supportive/positive (warmth, involvement, and synchrony) or inconsistent/negative (criticism and punitive discipline). The study found:

- Parental negativity was linked to greater levels of child deviant behavior.
- Significant decreases in paternal positive parenting predicted a much higher level of child deviant behavior, specifically among 5 to 9-year-olds.
- Significant relationships were more frequent between maternal parenting and child deviant behavior. The deviant behavior between kindergarten and second grade shifted depending on the mother’s parental involvement, positive reinforcement, and hostile parenting whereas paternal inconsistency was the only significant predictor of child deviance.


Using data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study—Birth Cohort, researchers examined father engagement (verbal stimulation, caregiving, and physical play) in a sample of 5,089 infants. After including controls, they found that father engagement differed in caregiving and physical play with White fathers having lower levels of engagement in those areas compared to African American and Latino fathers.


Two parents complement each other as mom functions as a “lifeguard” and dad plays the role of a “cheerleader.” Fathers influence their children in different ways than mothers do. Dads boost children’s cognitive development and encourage their children to take risks in order to prepare them for facing future life challenges. In most two-parent households, mothers are more likely to provide most of the care and comfort to infants, while fathers tend to engage in active play with them. Research showed that Australian mothers spend 22% of their time with children in interactive activities such as reading, playing, or drawing, while fathers spend 40% of their child care time engaging in interactive activities with children.
A study of a sample of 1,029 couples from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study found discrepancies in father and mother reports of father involvement. Biological fathers reported spending 17.6% more time engaging their children in 11 specific activities than mothers reported. Paternal emotional involvement (hugging, showing physical affection, verbally telling the child they are loved) was reported to occur 6.6 days per week by fathers and 6.4 days per week by mothers.


Father respondents in 2002 were 47% more likely than their 1997 counterparts to solely provide urgent childcare. Contrastingly, mothers in 2002 were 34% less likely than their 1997 counterparts to assume this responsibility. When their wives worked 10 hours per week, fathers had a 7% chance of solely providing urgent childcare, increasing to 18% and 25% when their wives worked 40 and 70 hours per week respectively. Mothers were more likely than fathers to miss work to provide urgent childcare.


Researchers investigated parents' expectations about their infants' crawling ability and crawling attempts in a physical task involving parenting choices about ensuring infants' safety and providing appropriate challenges. The researchers presented the parents of 34 infants with an adjustable ramp and asked to create the steepest slope that they would allow their infants to crawl down independently. The results showed that both mothers and fathers overestimated their children's abilities and expected their infants to try very steep slopes. Mothers more than fathers, however, tended to adopt safety-oriented parenting choices. More fathers (41%) than mothers (14%) displayed parenting choices emphasizing challenge by allowing their infants to attempt slopes beyond their ability.


A study examined differences in how mothers and fathers talk to their 24 month-old children and how parent education, childcare quality, and mother and father language contributed to children's expressive language development at 36 months. Specifically:

- Fathers were less verbal with their children as they spoke fewer words and were taking fewer conversational turns than the mothers.

- Even though fathers were less verbal with their children, the results showed that fathers' language use independently predicted their children's language development at 36 months.

- The larger the variety of word roots used by fathers when talking to their children, the higher the children's scores on a standard test of expressive language a year later.

- Mothers' language use was not a significant predictor of children's language development.

Appendix A

National Father Absence Tables

Number of Children Under 18 Years Living with Mother Only, by Marital Status, 1960 to 2014 (in thousands)

Percentage of Children Under 18 Years Living with Mother Only, by Marital Status, 1960 to 2014
### Number of Children in Various Family Arrangements, 2014 (in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic*</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73,692</td>
<td>53,881</td>
<td>11,080</td>
<td>17,871</td>
<td>3,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Two Parents</td>
<td>50,602</td>
<td>39,918</td>
<td>4,319</td>
<td>11,601</td>
<td>3,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with One Parent</td>
<td>20,257</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>6,085</td>
<td>5,482</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Single Mother</td>
<td>17,410</td>
<td>10,062</td>
<td>5,624</td>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Single Father</td>
<td>2,848</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Neither Parent</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Grandparents</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Other Relatives</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Nonrelatives</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arrangement</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race.
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## Children Under 18 Years Living with Mother Only, by Marital Status, Data Table, 1960 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Never Married</th>
<th>Married, Spouse Absent</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>1,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>7,678</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>1,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>11,406</td>
<td>4,766</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>1,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>13,081</td>
<td>5,280</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>13,874</td>
<td>5,118</td>
<td>4,365</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>15,396</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>16,334</td>
<td>5,799</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,838</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>16,993</td>
<td>6,039</td>
<td>6,365</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>16,634</td>
<td>5,704</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>3,558</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>16,162</td>
<td>5,655</td>
<td>6,591</td>
<td>3,224</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>16,472</td>
<td>5,593</td>
<td>6,872</td>
<td>3,287</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17,072</td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>7,218</td>
<td>3,281</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17,161</td>
<td>5,769</td>
<td>7,443</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>16,888</td>
<td>5,578</td>
<td>7,236</td>
<td>3,432</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17,283</td>
<td>5,316</td>
<td>7,543</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>17,990</td>
<td>5,383</td>
<td>8,356</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>17,409</td>
<td>5,181</td>
<td>8,355</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers in thousands (percent distribution beneath).
Number of Children Living in Father-Absent Homes, 1960 to 2014 (in thousands)

Percentage of Children Living in Father-Absent Homes, 1960 to 2014
## Children Living in Father-Absent Homes, Data Table, 1960 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>7,126</td>
<td>4,444</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>9,475</td>
<td>5,638</td>
<td>3,702</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>13,743</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>5,239</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>15,641</td>
<td>9,249</td>
<td>5,885</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>19,517</td>
<td>11,489</td>
<td>7,097</td>
<td>3,236</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19,159</td>
<td>11,531</td>
<td>6,642</td>
<td>3,546</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>20,516</td>
<td>12,265</td>
<td>6,782</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>20,324</td>
<td>12,211</td>
<td>6,444</td>
<td>5,134</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>20,524</td>
<td>12,073</td>
<td>6,440</td>
<td>5,488</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>20,242</td>
<td>11,856</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>5,709</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes children living in homes without a biological, adoptive, or step-father. Numbers in thousands.

## Living Arrangements of White Children Under 18 Years, Data Table, 1960 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Living with Two Parents</th>
<th>Living with One Parent</th>
<th>Living with Mother Only</th>
<th>Living with Father Only</th>
<th>Living with Other Relatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>55,077</td>
<td>50,082</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>3,381</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>58,970</td>
<td>52,624</td>
<td>5,109</td>
<td>4,581</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>52,242</td>
<td>43,200</td>
<td>7,901</td>
<td>7,059</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>51,390</td>
<td>40,593</td>
<td>9,870</td>
<td>8,321</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>52,493</td>
<td>40,635</td>
<td>10,971</td>
<td>9,250</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>54,795</td>
<td>41,766</td>
<td>11,433</td>
<td>9,724</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>1,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>55,714</td>
<td>41,069</td>
<td>12,335</td>
<td>10,239</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>56,124</td>
<td>41,547</td>
<td>12,772</td>
<td>10,210</td>
<td>2,562</td>
<td>1,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>56,455</td>
<td>42,497</td>
<td>12,192</td>
<td>9,765</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>1,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>56,276</td>
<td>41,944</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>10,052</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>1,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>55,902</td>
<td>41,550</td>
<td>12,518</td>
<td>10,050</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>1,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>56,332</td>
<td>41,599</td>
<td>12,693</td>
<td>10,050</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>56,482</td>
<td>42,930</td>
<td>11,905</td>
<td>9,863</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>1,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>56,416</td>
<td>42,242</td>
<td>12,279</td>
<td>10,316</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>1,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>54,259</td>
<td>40,040</td>
<td>12,641</td>
<td>10,496</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>1,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>53,881</td>
<td>39,918</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>10,062</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>1,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number in thousands (percent distribution beneath).

Living Arrangements of Black Children Under 18 Years, by Number, 1960 to 2014 (in thousands)

Living Arrangements of Black Children Under 18 Years, by Percentage, 1960 to 2014
## Living Arrangements of Black Children Under 18 Years, Data Table, 1960-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Living with Two Parents</th>
<th>Living with One Parent</th>
<th>Living with Mother Only</th>
<th>Living with Father Only</th>
<th>Living with Other Relatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>8,650</td>
<td>5,795</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>9,422</td>
<td>5,508</td>
<td>2,995</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>9,375</td>
<td>3,956</td>
<td>4,297</td>
<td>4,117</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>10,018</td>
<td>3,781</td>
<td>5,484</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>10,427</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>5,934</td>
<td>5,607</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>11,177</td>
<td>3,722</td>
<td>6,384</td>
<td>5,967</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>11,434</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td>6,560</td>
<td>6,056</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>11,414</td>
<td>4,137</td>
<td>6,254</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11,412</td>
<td>4,286</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>5,596</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>11,646</td>
<td>4,481</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>5,605</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11,424</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>6,415</td>
<td>5,758</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>11,225</td>
<td>3,886</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>5,743</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11,342</td>
<td>4,256</td>
<td>6,167</td>
<td>5,791</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11,272</td>
<td>4,424</td>
<td>6,006</td>
<td>5,601</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11,166</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td>6,160</td>
<td>5,687</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>11,080</td>
<td>4,319</td>
<td>6,085</td>
<td>5,624</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Living Arrangements of Hispanic Children Under 18 Years, Data Table, 1970 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Living with Two Parents</th>
<th>Living with One Parent</th>
<th>Living with Mother Only</th>
<th>Living with Father Only</th>
<th>Living with Other Relatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>4,116</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7,174</td>
<td>4,789</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7,619</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>9,496</td>
<td>6,022</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>10,251</td>
<td>6,381</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>10,863</td>
<td>6,909</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>2,15</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11,613</td>
<td>7,651</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>2,919</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>12,817</td>
<td>8,338</td>
<td>3,853</td>
<td>3,212</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13,752</td>
<td>8,886</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>3,489</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>14,697</td>
<td>9,686</td>
<td>4,227</td>
<td>3,674</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>15,644</td>
<td>10,902</td>
<td>4,132</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16,941</td>
<td>11,345</td>
<td>4,919</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>17,570</td>
<td>11,542</td>
<td>5,465</td>
<td>4,926</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>17,871</td>
<td>11,601</td>
<td>5,482</td>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers in thousands (percent distribution beneath). Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race.
Living Arrangements of Asian Children Under 18 Years, by Number, 2003 to 2014 (in thousands)

Living Arrangements of Asian Children Under 18 Years, by Percentage, 2003 to 2014
### Living Arrangements of Asian Children Under 18 Years, Data Table, 2003 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Living with Two Parents</th>
<th>Living with One Parent</th>
<th>Living with Mother Only</th>
<th>Living with Father Only</th>
<th>Living with Other Relatives/Nonrelatives Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,869</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>3,086</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,621</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers in thousands (percent distribution beneath).

### State Father Absence Tables

#### Own Children Under 18 Years Living in Single Mother Homes by State and Most Populated Cities, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Single Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alabama</strong></td>
<td>944,395</td>
<td>290,357</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>34,159</td>
<td>21,021</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>42,011</td>
<td>19,444</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Alaska**  | 164,217 | 27,397                  | 16.7%      |
| Anchorage   | 67,522  | 10,933                   | 16.2%      |
| Fairbanks   | 8,406   | 2,348                     | 27.9%      |

| **Arizona** | 1,401,491 | 350,826                  | 25.0%      |
| Phoenix     | 344,389   | 106,031                   | 30.8%      |
| Mesa        | 101,858   | 27,754                     | 27.2%      |
| Tucson      | 97,889    | 37,555                     | 38.4%      |

| **Arkansas** | 615,954 | 161,733                  | 26.3%      |
| Little Rock  | 39,694   | 11,020                     | 27.8%      |
| Fort Smith   | 19,424   | 6,807                      | 35.0%      |

| **California** | 7,886,443 | 1,736,470                  | 22.0%      |
| Los Angeles   | 719,418   | 204,230                     | 28.4%      |
| San Diego     | 259,785   | 61,050                      | 23.5%      |
| San Jose      | 206,234   | 34,753                      | 16.9%      |
| San Francisco | 97,072    | 18,465                      | 19.0%      |

| **Colorado** | 1,120,756 | 228,386                  | 20.4%      |
| Denver       | 116,954   | 33,610                     | 28.7%      |
| Colorado Springs | 98,681 | 21,215                     | 21.5%      |
| Aurora       | 81,766    | 24,230                     | 29.6%      |
## Own Children Under 18 Years Living in Single Mother Homes by State and Most Populated Cities, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Single Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>712,082</td>
<td>174,195</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>31,388</td>
<td>12,523</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>25,314</td>
<td>11,565</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>173,859</td>
<td>47,046</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>13,936</td>
<td>9,122</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>6,828</td>
<td>3,163</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>93,250</td>
<td>38,807</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>3,486,360</td>
<td>982,596</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>167,245</td>
<td>56,416</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>26,536</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>63,413</td>
<td>24,704</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2,159,059</td>
<td>614,518</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>73,441</td>
<td>34,668</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>43,752</td>
<td>18,007</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>238,847</td>
<td>40,433</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Honolulu</td>
<td>48,329</td>
<td>7,902</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl City</td>
<td>7,829</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>393,529</td>
<td>62,790</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise City</td>
<td>46,325</td>
<td>9,123</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>25,098</td>
<td>5,098</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Own Children Under 18 Years Living in Single Mother Homes by State and Most Populated Cities, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Single Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illinois</strong></td>
<td>2,674,467</td>
<td>616,858</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>493,093</td>
<td>171,784</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>52,087</td>
<td>11,227</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indiana</strong></td>
<td>1,406,547</td>
<td>333,369</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis City</td>
<td>180,135</td>
<td>66,775</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Wayne</td>
<td>57,753</td>
<td>17,933</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iowa</strong></td>
<td>664,259</td>
<td>134,362</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>45,008</td>
<td>14,627</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Rapids</td>
<td>26,649</td>
<td>6,976</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kansas</strong></td>
<td>652,717</td>
<td>132,457</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>92,106</td>
<td>23,948</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>40,962</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kentucky</strong></td>
<td>879,014</td>
<td>217,101</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government</td>
<td>119,602</td>
<td>38,510</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington-Fayette</td>
<td>58,185</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Louisiana</strong></td>
<td>946,127</td>
<td>325,259</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>65,425</td>
<td>31,417</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>39,572</td>
<td>20,683</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Single Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>231,375</td>
<td>50,458</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>10,833</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>6,615</td>
<td>2,915</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1,173,941</td>
<td>297,973</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>103,898</td>
<td>54,135</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>19,567</td>
<td>5,530</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1,256,138</td>
<td>299,018</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>94,816</td>
<td>44,468</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>35,660</td>
<td>13,851</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>2,004,349</td>
<td>516,517</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>136,085</td>
<td>86,147</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>42,532</td>
<td>14,458</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1,186,850</td>
<td>235,847</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>69,448</td>
<td>23,464</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>67,471</td>
<td>22,756</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>609,977</td>
<td>220,576</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>35,849</td>
<td>20,451</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulfport</td>
<td>12,307</td>
<td>6,104</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>200,900</td>
<td>43,688</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>21,315</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>10,599</td>
<td>3,839</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Single Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nebraska</strong></td>
<td>425,338</td>
<td>86,006</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>97,781</td>
<td>25,982</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>58,009</td>
<td>10,678</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nevada</strong></td>
<td>583,149</td>
<td>147,367</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>128,229</td>
<td>36,234</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>51,185</td>
<td>12,918</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Hampshire</strong></td>
<td>245,683</td>
<td>50,039</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>19,977</td>
<td>6,393</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashua</td>
<td>15,971</td>
<td>4,706</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Jersey</strong></td>
<td>1,814,348</td>
<td>384,453</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>57,620</td>
<td>28,868</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City</td>
<td>48,532</td>
<td>16,821</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Mexico</strong></td>
<td>435,777</td>
<td>127,194</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>117,872</td>
<td>37,190</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
<td>22,666</td>
<td>7,604</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York</strong></td>
<td>3,713,796</td>
<td>948,468</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1,510,284</td>
<td>470,096</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>53,260</td>
<td>24,213</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Carolina</strong></td>
<td>2,003,331</td>
<td>543,415</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>174,710</td>
<td>50,415</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>92,050</td>
<td>30,346</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Own Children Under 18 Years Living in Single Mother Homes by State and Most Populated Cities, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Single Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>147,029</td>
<td>21,165</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fargo</td>
<td>18,909</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bismarck</td>
<td>12,589</td>
<td>3,329</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2,354,631</td>
<td>620,671</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>171,939</td>
<td>62,768</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>73,654</td>
<td>42,765</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>55,829</td>
<td>31,300</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>827,225</td>
<td>200,495</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>134,134</td>
<td>36,352</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>86,043</td>
<td>29,233</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>769,404</td>
<td>166,719</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>99,725</td>
<td>24,395</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>37,633</td>
<td>9,896</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2,411,410</td>
<td>590,786</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>279,879</td>
<td>131,904</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>43,251</td>
<td>16,919</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>678,019</td>
<td>289,502</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>62,220</td>
<td>34,779</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>190,121</td>
<td>57,881</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>37,190</td>
<td>18,192</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>14,167</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Single Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>916,220</td>
<td>275,841</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>20,793</td>
<td>8,154</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>22,159</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>185,451</td>
<td>39,719</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>35,931</td>
<td>7,575</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid City</td>
<td>15,382</td>
<td>5,315</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1,291,880</td>
<td>347,752</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>137,238</td>
<td>70,873</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville-Davidson Metro</td>
<td>119,002</td>
<td>42,614</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>6,097,487</td>
<td>1,511,821</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>474,764</td>
<td>148,880</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>298,443</td>
<td>94,389</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>286,995</td>
<td>98,334</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>171,762</td>
<td>41,195</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>813,570</td>
<td>93,244</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>36,758</td>
<td>6,619</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley City</td>
<td>33,690</td>
<td>5,053</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>113,015</td>
<td>24,220</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>4,766</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Single Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia</strong></td>
<td>1,650,452</td>
<td>369,446</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>94,458</td>
<td>25,507</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>42,419</td>
<td>17,543</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Single Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington</strong></td>
<td>1,440,700</td>
<td>288,202</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>91,896</td>
<td>16,814</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>40,069</td>
<td>11,752</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Single Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Virginia</strong></td>
<td>330,487</td>
<td>82,142</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>9,335</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>7,596</td>
<td>3,661</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Single Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wisconsin</strong></td>
<td>1,197,730</td>
<td>257,501</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>135,811</td>
<td>69,486</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>38,857</td>
<td>9,267</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Single Mother Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wyoming</strong></td>
<td>127,095</td>
<td>23,152</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne</td>
<td>13,310</td>
<td>3,621</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper</td>
<td>12,602</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B

Additional Resources

The following list provides information on some of the best sources for research on father absence, father involvement, and related issues. NFI drew on many of these sources for this edition of *Father Facts*.

**U.S. Census Bureau (www.census.gov)**

Not surprisingly, the U.S. Census Bureau is an excellent source of national data on the proportion of children growing up without their fathers. The census data include the proportion of children growing up without a biological, step, or adoptive father at the state, community, and zip code levels.

**Fatherhood Research and Practice Network (www.frpn.org)**

A new resource as of the writing of this edition of *Father Facts*, the Fatherhood Research and Practice Network (FRPN) is a five-year national project funded through the US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. The goals of the FRPN are to:

- Promote rigorous evaluation of fatherhood programs that serve low-income fathers. FRPN will fund the evaluation of programs that aim to increase paternal engagement and parenting skills; improve fathers’ ability to provide economic support; and increase parenting time, father-child contact, positive co-parenting, and healthy relationships.
- Expand the number of researchers and practitioners collaborating to evaluate fatherhood programs through in-person and virtual trainings.
- Disseminate information, including new evaluation findings, that leads to effective fatherhood practice and evaluation research.

The FRPN provides links to outside sources and data sets you might find valuable in conducting research on fatherhood and related issues.

**Child Trends (www.childtrends.org)**

Child Trends is a nonprofit, nonpartisan research center that provides valuable information and insights on the well-being of children and youth. Its mission is to improve the lives and prospects of children and youth by conducting high-quality research and sharing the resulting knowledge with practitioners and policymakers. Child Trends uses a blog, research briefs, complete reports, and conference presentations to disseminate a wide range of data, original, and secondary research on fatherhood and related issues.

**Pew Research Center (www.pewresearch.org)**

The Pew Research Center, a subsidiary of The Pew Charitable Trusts, is a nonpartisan fact tank that informs the public about the issues, attitudes, and trends shaping America and the world. It conducts public opinion polling, demographic research, media content analysis, and other empirical social science research. The center uses research briefs and complete reports to disseminate a wide range of data, original, and secondary research on fatherhood and related issues.
National Center for Family and Marriage Research
(www.bgsu.edu/ncfmr.html)

Housed at Bowling Green State University, the National Center for Family and Marriage Research improves understanding of how family structure is linked to the health and well-being of children, adults, families, and communities and to inform policy development and programmatic responses. The center uses research briefs, complete reports, and conference presentations to disseminate a wide range of data, original, and secondary research on fatherhood and related issues.

Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study
(www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu)

Operated jointly by Princeton University and Columbia University, this website disseminates analyses of data gathered during the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, an ambitious and ongoing national study of fragile families (unmarried parents and their children). The original core study followed a cohort of nearly 5,000 children born in large U.S. cities between 1998 and 2000. (These unmarried parents and their children are referred to as “fragile families” to underscore that they are families and that they are at greater risk of breaking up and living in poverty than more traditional families.) The core study primarily addressed four questions of great interest to researchers and policy makers:

◆◆ What are the conditions and capabilities of unmarried parents, especially fathers?
◆◆ What is the nature of the relationships between unmarried parents?
◆◆ How do children born into these families fare?
◆◆ How do policies and environmental conditions affect families and children?

The website uses fact sheets, research briefs, and complete reports to disseminate data and analyses from the study related to fatherhood.

Families and Work Institute (www.familiesandwork.org)

The Families and Work Institute is nonprofit center dedicated to providing research for living in today’s changing workplace, changing family, and changing community. It conducts and disseminates original research that includes the challenges and changes fathers face in family-work balance.
About the Researchers

National Fatherhood Initiative partnered with researchers at Temple University (Philadelphia, PA) to update the data and research for this seventh edition of *Father Facts*.

**Christopher A. Brown, MA**, president of National Fatherhood Initiative, directed the production of and identified new research to include in this edition of *Father Facts*. He is an applied anthropologist who has been with NFI since 2000, having previously served as executive vice president. Chris oversees NFI’s strategy and business model development and implementation, operations, and fundraising. He is responsible for the development, implementation, evaluation, and improvement of NFI’s products, programs, training, and services. Chris has played a critical role in shaping NFI’s focus as the leading provider of fatherhood skill-building resources in the country and the leading trainer of practitioners seeking to offer fatherhood programs in their communities. He is the author of several journal articles and book chapters on issues related to child health and well-being, has studied masculinity cross culturally, especially as it applies to fatherhood and men’s health and well-being, and has appeared as a fatherhood expert in media outlets, including the L.A. Times, New York Times, Nick Jr. Magazine, and CNN.

**Jay Fagan, PhD**, professor of social work at Temple University, coordinated the work of Temple University students for this edition of *Father Facts*. Jay’s research focuses on interventions with at-risk fathers (nonresident, Head Start, adolescent fathers), effects of nonresident fathers on young children, parent education and co-parenting interventions for fathers, fathers and early childhood programs, and fathering in the context of family processes. He conducts studies on nonresidential fathers with children in foster care and the effects of mother-father co-parenting relationships on at-risk fathers’ involvement with children. He is the publisher of the textbooks, *Fathers and Early Childhood Programs* (Delmar Publishing, 2004), with Dr. Glen Palm, and, *Clinical and Educational Interventions with Fathers* (Haworth Press, 2001), with Dr. Alan J. Hawkins. Jay has published more than 60 research papers on responsible fatherhood in peer-reviewed journals and served as the founding editor of the journal, *Fathering*.

**Adina Freedman, MA**, identified new research to include in this edition of *Father Facts*. She obtained her degree in social work from Temple University in 2015. Her research experience began in the summer of 2014 with her work for the Building Capacities/Making Connections research project for Temple University’s school of social work. Adina’s areas of interest and expertise include education, HIV/AIDS, and medical social work.

**Jessica DeMarchis, MA**, identified new research to include in this edition of *Father Facts*. She obtained her degree in clinical social work from Temple University in 2015. She has a rich background in working with undocumented Latin families in the Philadelphia area as well as international social work. She completed internships in both Ecuador and Mexico providing services to homeless women and children.

**Mollie Jill Cherson, MA**, identified new research to include in this edition of *Father Facts*. She obtained her degree in social work from Temple University in 2015. While at Temple, she served as a research assistant working on a range of issues including fatherhood and suicide prevention. Her experience with research began as an undergraduate at Ursinus College where she studied the consistency of children’s legal testimony over time. Mollie also attended the University of Cambridge (United Kingdom) where she earned a master of social and developmental psychology degree and studied factors in rapport building during investigative interviews with children and adolescents reporting sexual abuse.
About National Fatherhood Initiative®

NFI was founded in 1994 to reverse our nation’s destructive trend towards father absence. NFI’s mission is to improve the well-being of children by increasing the proportion of children with involved, responsible, and committed fathers in their lives.

Accordingly, we accomplish our mission by:

- Educating all Americans, especially fathers, through public awareness campaigns, research, and other resources.
- Equipping fathers and developing leaders of national, state, and local organizations with resources, training, and technical assistance.
- Engaging all sectors of society through strategic alliances and partnerships.

In recent years, NFI has focused our efforts on the following core competencies, which drive our current activities.

Capacity-Building at the Organization Level

NFI builds the capacity of community-based, corrections, and military organizations seeking to begin or enhance fatherhood programs to benefit fathers, families, and especially children in their communities. Our services build capacity through father-friendly assessments, skills training, technical assistance, strategic planning, and community mobilization around fatherhood. Specifically:

- NFI is the nation’s #1 trainer of organizations and practitioners on how to effectively engage fathers in the lives of their children. NFI’s 24/7 Dad® program is the most widely used fathering program in the country among community-based organizations.
- NFI is the nation’s #1 provider of fatherhood programs and resources for incarcerated fathers with half of the nation’s state departments of corrections choosing NFI’s InsideOut Dad® program as their standard fathering program across all of their facilities for men.
- NFI is the nation’s #1 provider of fatherhood programs and resources for military fathers. NFI’s programs and resources are used in every branch of the military (on installations in the U.S. and abroad) and by many reserve and most National Guard units. We have distributed our programs and resources to installations in all 50 states, U.S. territories, and in many countries overseas (e.g. Japan, Turkey, Okinawa, Germany, Portugal, Spain, Korea, and the Netherlands).

Capacity Building at the State and Local Government Levels

NFI has extensive experience in executing state and local government contracts, subcontracts, and projects related to building and implementing sustainable fatherhood programs and services in a high-quality manner. NFI works with state and local agencies and programs to build their capacity in father engagement and the capacity of their grantees and partners.

Cultural Commentary

NFI continues to be a leading voice in the public square on the importance of involved, responsible, and committed fatherhood through disseminating research on the causes and consequences of father absence, conducting interviews with national media outlets, publishing commentaries on NFI-owned and third party media properties, and partnering with major entertainment media and consumer brand companies.

To find the latest developments with NFI, visit www.fatherhood.org.
Contact National Fatherhood Initiative®

Web: www.fatherhood.org and www.fathersource.org
Email: info@fatherhood.org
Phone: (301) 948-0599
Follow us on Twitter
Like us on Facebook
Add us on Google+
Connect with us on LinkedIn

Get Tips for Fathering at The Father Factor Blog.
Sign Up for Weekly emails with NFI's FatherSOURCE™ eNewsletter.
Support our Important Work: Become a Monthly Donor.