

Running head: INVOLVEMENT & PARENTING AMONG SINGLE CUSTODIAL FATHERS OF
ADOLESCENTS

Single Custodial Fathers' Parenting Styles and Involvement:
Implications for Outcomes in Emerging Adulthood*

Jacinta Bronte-Tinkew, Ph.D.
Child Trends
4301 Connecticut Ave
Suite 350
Washington D.C., 20008
Phone: (202) 572-6122
Fax: (202) 362-8420
jbronte@childtrends.org

Mindy E. Scott, Ph.D.
Child Trends
4301 Connecticut Ave
Suite 350
Washington D.C., 20008
Phone: (202) 572-6124
Fax: (202) 362-8420
mScott@childtrends.org

Emily Lilja, B.A.
Child Trends
4301 Connecticut Ave
Suite 350
Washington D.C., 20008
Phone: (202) 572-6120
Fax: (202) 362-8420
elilja@childtrends.org

*Do not cite without permission from authors

Abstract

Using data from rounds 1-7 of the National Longitudinal Study of Youth (NLSY97), this study documented the unique characteristics of single custodial father families, and examined the effects of single custodial fathers' involvement and parenting of adolescents on offspring outcomes during emerging adulthood. Findings suggest that single father families are distinct from both single mother families and two-parent families in terms of demographics and family context. The greatest number of offspring reported permissive parenting styles within single father families. Significantly more adolescents living with a single custodial father reported having an uninvolved parent compared to adolescents living in other family types. Single custodial fathers did not differ from fathers in two biological parent homes in their levels of closeness, support, or awareness. Results from a series of logistic regression models indicate that offspring that reside with a single custodial father during adolescence have reduced odds of completing high school and greater odds of being disconnected during emerging adulthood compared to offspring that reside with two biological parents. Findings suggest that residing in a single father household during adolescence continues to affect offspring well-being as they enter emerging adulthood.

Emerging Adults

Single Fathers

Parenting

Father Involvement

Adolescents

INTRODUCTION

Consistently high rates of divorce and increasing rates of nonmarital childbearing in recent years have resulted in children residing in a number of diverse family structures (Bianchi & Casper, 2000). These various family structures differ significantly in terms of the amount of social and economic resources available to children for their healthy development and well-being (Amato & Gilbreth, 1999; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994). One family type that has increasingly grown is single father families. There has been an increase in the number of single, custodial fathers who have primary responsibility for rearing their children (i.e., have sole custody). For example, in 1970, while 1.1% of children under age 18 lived in a single father home, this number climbed to 4.8% by 2005 (Current Population Survey, 2005). While much public and research attention has been paid to single, custodial mothers over the years, relatively little attention, of any kind, has focused on single, custodial fathers (Carlson, 2006; Carlson & Corcoran, 2001). In fact, to date, there are few detailed analyses of single fathers' involvement or parenting behaviors, especially with adolescent children. Early studies of single fathers focused mainly on the implications of children's separation from their mothers (Grief, 1985). More recent studies have compared outcomes for children in single father families to children of two-parent and single mother families (Downey, Ainsworth-Darnell & Dufur, 1998; Downey, 1993). However, few studies have described the ways that single custodial fathers' are involved with their adolescent children, or their parenting styles. Moreover, a consideration of how the involvement and parenting styles of single fathers overtime matters for youth outcomes in the emerging adult years has not been the subject of previous inquiry. In short, while there has been an increased awareness of the importance of the role of single fathers in the lives of their offspring, the involvement and parenting of *single fathers* and the effects of such involvement overtime on outcomes during emerging adulthood is a little researched or understood phenomenon.

This study addresses a number of limitations in existing research by using nationally representative longitudinal data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1997 (NLSY97)

(Rounds 1-7) to examine differences in outcomes during emerging adulthood between offspring growing up with a single father compared to offspring growing up in other types of family structures. We specifically address the following research questions: (1) What are the socio-demographic characteristics of single father households with adolescents?; (2) How are single fathers involved with adolescents, and what are their parenting styles?; and (3) Does living in single father household during adolescence influence outcomes during emerging adulthood (i.e. self-sufficiency and academic achievement)?

The existing body of research on single fathers has focused primarily on younger children during early and middle childhood (Lamb, 1987; Lamb, Pleck, Charnov, & Levine, 1985), to a lesser extent during adolescence (Bronte-Tinkew, Moore, & Carrano, 2006), and with a few exceptions during emerging adulthood (Amato, 1994; Aquilino, 1997; Schwartz & Finley, 2006). Given the relatively small numbers of single father households in the population, many studies of single fathers are limited to small, unrepresentative samples (typically white middle class samples) of men and their children (Breivik & Olweus, 2006; Coles, 2001). In addition, most studies of single fathers and offspring well-being do not consider the stage of the life course known as emerging adulthood. Therefore, studies using large nationally representative data that examine the processes of single father involvement throughout adolescence and during emerging adulthood are sparse. This dearth of information has resulted in a limited understanding of the longer term effects for older children of living in a single father family (Aquilino, 1997; Arnett, 2000). In short, progress in understanding *how*, and in what *ways* single fathers are involved parents and the implications of such involvement and parenting for development during adolescence and emerging adulthood has lagged behind other models of parenting (Erkut, Szalacha, & Coll, 2005; Lamb, 1997).

Considering the growing awareness of the importance of single fathers in the lives of their offspring from childhood into adulthood, and the importance of the period known as emerging adulthood, it is imperative to clarify how single fathers' involvement overtime influences emerging

adult outcomes, since it is a period characterized by considerable development and multiple transitions (Furstenberg, Rumbaut, & Settersten, 2005).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Our analyses will be informed by two theoretical frameworks; a *life course theory of family development* (Elder, Liker, & Cross, 1984; Roberts & Bengtson, 1993), as well as *social capital theory* (Bourdieu, 1985; Coleman, 1988). As it relates to parenting among single fathers, the life course theory of family development posits that both recent and past experiences, as well as interactions and relationships with family members and others, contribute to current conditions and roles. For the present analyses, this theory allows us to understand the single father family in terms of its structural characteristics and the shifting nature of both father as well as adolescent relationships as they develop over the life span, as well as the changes and adaptations - i.e. the plasticity that may constitute family relationships over time (Bengtson & Allen, 1993). This theoretical framework allows us to conceptualize the ways in which youths' experiences with single fathers during adolescence are related to their experiences and relationships with their fathers in emerging adulthood.

The *social capital framework* relates to the strength of ties and levels of involvement between single fathers and their adolescent offspring. As it relates to the present analyses, the amount of time single fathers spend with their children, the quality of relationships between single fathers and offspring, and the level of single father involvement in offspring's activities all contribute to family social capital (Amato, 2000; Palkovitz, 2002; Parcel & Dufur, 2001; Parcel & Menaghan, 1993). The social capital that offspring gain from single fathers may be especially important in providing resources used for socialization (Schoen, Young, Nathanson., Fields, & Astone, 1997; Starrels & Holms, 2000), the development of social skills, and the development of preferences for prosocial behavior that aid in social adjustment (Parcel & Menaghan, 1993). Social capital aids in the development of two additional forms of capital, financial (economic resources) and human

(education and work skills) capital that are important in shaping offspring's well-being during emerging adulthood (MacMillan & Copher, 2005; Teachman, Paasch, Day, & Carver, 1997). The extent to which single fathers are able to provide social capital to adolescents has implications for outcomes in emerging adulthood. Both the life course theory of family development and social capital theory provide frameworks for the current analyses.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Socio-Demographic Context of Single Father Families

Overall, the demographic portrait that emerges of single father families is that they are distinct from both married families and single mother families. However, we know little of the specific socio-demographic characteristics of single father families with adolescents. Previous research suggests that single father families are less likely to be poor and more likely to be in the paid labor force than female-headed families and single-mothers (Hilton & Devall, 1998; Downey, Ainsworth-Darnell, & Dufur, 1998; Demuth & Brown, 2004). However, single father families tend to be poorer and have lower labor force participation than married fathers (Eggebeen, Snyder & Manning, 1996). Single fathers tend to be younger (under 30) than married fathers, but not as young as single mothers (Eggebeen, Snyder & Manning, 1996). Single fathers have fewer children than married fathers, but more than single mothers. Single fathers are more likely than married fathers to live in households with relatives or other unrelated adults, but significantly less likely than single mothers. Hispanic, African-American, Asian, and Native American children are more likely than Euro-American children to reside in single father families (Eggebeen, Snyder & Manning, 1996). On the basis of prior research, we hypothesize the following.

Hypothesis 1: Single custodial father families will be distinct from single mother and two-parent families in terms of socio-economic status, race/ethnicity, and family composition.

Involvement and Parenting Styles in Single Father Families

Parent-child relationships constitute important influences on child well-being, and may influence the long-term trajectory of child well-being into adulthood (Biller & Lopez Kimpton, 1997; Videon, 2005). Because parents influence their children in many and multi-faceted ways, the mechanisms that may explain the effect of different family configurations on adolescent and young adult well-being are numerous. With regard to single father households, two primary mechanisms are likely factors: *parenting styles*, and the quality of *father involvement*. These mechanisms are neither exclusive nor exhaustive and could be operating simultaneously to influence young adult outcomes.

Parenting Styles

Parenting styles may be characterized as permissive, authoritarian, authoritative, neglectful, and indulgent (Baumrind, 1967). Permissive parents respond to their children's desires and behavior in an accepting, affirmative, and non-punitive manner (Baumrind, 1967). In both the neglectful and indulgent parenting types, parents exert little control and show limited warmth toward their children (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). However, neglectful parents are disengaged from their children and their parenting responsibilities while indulgent parents are responsive to their children, and allow their children to regulate themselves (Darling, 1999). Authoritarian parents hold their children to an absolute standard of conduct, and use punitive and/or forceful measures to ensure children abide by the approved code of conduct. Authoritative parents value both the allowance of children's self-will and discipline. They encourage parent-child discussion, offer explanations for rules, seek children's opinions on policies they find unfair, and rely on reason and parental power to achieve desired child behavior (Baumrind, 1967).

McLanahan and Booth (1989) report that single parents are more likely to use ineffective parenting practices, provide less supervision, parental involvement, and control than married parents. However, some research suggests that single fathers' parenting is different from the way single mothers raise their children. Hilton and Devall (1998) found there was no difference between how

single fathers and married mothers rewarded, comforted, communicated, disciplined, encouraged, and allowed their child independence. Unlike their single mother counterparts, however, single fathers were more likely to allow their children to participate in the activities of their peers and try activities on their own. Some qualitative research on single fathers also suggests that divorced single fathers are significantly less permissive and less likely to allow children to control them compared to divorced single mothers (Santrock & Warshak, 1979; Santrock, Warshak, Lindbergh, & Meadows, 1982). This study also suggested that authoritative parenting in single-father homes was associated with healthier adjustment of children and authoritarian parenting was linked to poor child outcomes (Santrock & Warshak, 1979). As a whole, this body of research suggests differences in parenting behaviors across different family configurations.

Hypothesis 2: On the basis of available research, we hypothesize that single fathers will exhibit less authoritative methods of parenting, and more permissive and uninvolved methods, compared to parents in two parent families, but will be less permissive and uninvolved than single mothers.

Father Involvement

Father involvement is a multidimensional concept that defines the ways in which fathers participate in their children's lives. Father involvement has been theorized as having three main components: engagement, accessibility, and responsibility (Lamb, Pleck, Charnov, & Levine, 1987). During adolescence, father involvement consists of direct involvement with adolescents including both behavioral and emotional domains such as supportiveness, closeness, and shared interactions (Harris, Furstenberg, & Marmer, 1998).

Among the handful of studies that exist on the topic of single custodial father involvement, one analysis of family structure and family processes using the 1995 National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health) found that adolescents report greater levels of single father involvement than do adolescents of fathers from other family types (Demuth & Brown, 2004).

Compared to married biological fathers and stepfathers, single fathers spend significantly more time with their children engaging in activities such as leisure activities, talking, and reading, or helping with homework (Cooksey & Fondell, 1996; Nord, Brimhall, & West, 1997). However, adolescent reports from the Add Health show that single fathers' levels of involvement, supervision, monitoring and closeness are still less than that of single mothers (Demuth & Brown, 2004). Similar research using the Add Health also suggests that single fathers participate in more traditionally mother-led activities such as shopping and talking about social life and problems. While single fathers were still less involved in the lives of their adolescent children than were single mothers, they were more like mothers in their levels of involvement than they were like fathers from other family types (Hawkins, Amato, & King, 2006).

Hypothesis 3: Based on previous research findings, we hypothesize that single fathers will have higher levels of involvement compared to resident fathers in intact families. Levels of single father involvement will be more similar to mother involvement across all household types, but single father involvement will not be greater than single mother involvement.

Single Father Involvement, Parenting Styles and Offspring Outcomes

There is only a relatively small body of research specifically on single father families and the effects of such family structure on outcomes during adolescence. Most of the research on fathers in general has focused on younger adolescents (Bronte-Tinkew, Moore, & Carrano, 2006; Harris & Morgan, 1991; Palkovitz, 2002; Videon, 2005). Though there is no empirical evidence on the effects of father involvement on outcomes in emerging adulthood, we expect that any beneficial effects of single fathers' involvement on adolescent outcomes will continue to be beneficial during emerging adulthood. Father involvement and parenting styles may be crucial for offspring residing in single father families, and may reduce some of the negative consequences of residing in a single parent family.

Academic Achievement. A study using the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth from 1979-1989 found that children that had been in single father families their entire childhood had significantly lower probability of graduating high school when compared to children that had spent their entire childhood in mother only and two-parent family structures. Additionally, an analysis of the 1990 National Education Longitudinal Study by family structure found that teachers were more likely to report that adolescents raised in single father homes put less effort into their schoolwork than their peers raised by single mothers (Downey, Ainsworth-Darnell, & Dufur, 1998). However, these observed effects of family structure may be attributed to less parental involvement relative to two-parent families (Cooksey & Fondell, 1996; Demuth & Brown, 2004; Hawkins et al., 2006). Father involvement by single fathers may mitigate some of the negative effects of living in a single parent home. The majority of studies on father involvement have found that positive relationships between fathers and children are associated with positive academic outcomes in late adolescence (Herman, Dornbusch, Herron, & Herting, 1997). Other studies conducted with adolescents indicate that father involvement also positively influences children's academic achievement (Harris et al., 1998). In a study of a small sample of college students in the U.S., analyses showed that perceptions of low parental closeness were negatively related to reported "scholastic competence" (Fass & Tubman, 2002).

Hypothesis 4: Based on limited research, we hypothesize that offspring from single father families will have lower levels of academic achievement compared to offspring from intact families, but, higher levels of father involvement will be associated with higher levels of academic achievement in emerging adulthood among offspring living with single fathers.

Self-Sufficiency (Disconnected). Exactly how *father* involvement is associated with self-sufficiency in emerging adulthood is not known. The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth reports adolescents from single-father households are increasingly likely to be idle (i.e., neither employed nor in school). Their idleness could be attributed to the low levels of academic achievement, labor

force attachment, and poor work habits associated with youth from disrupted and/or single parent homes (McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994). However, studies have also found fathers, including single custodial fathers, that are active in their child's life can produce positive behaviors in their adult children. Sons of active fathers are likely to have high academic achievement (Morman & Floyd, 2006). In addition, some studies suggest that parent involvement (that of both mothers and fathers) is associated with self-sufficiency in late adolescence (Ryan & Deci, 2000). For example, positive parental involvement including closeness, autonomy, and support are positive predictors of healthy individuation, non-dependence on parents, and self-regulation, which are all critical tasks for developing self-sufficiency in adolescence and beyond (Brack, Gay, & Matheny, 1993; Nelson & Barry, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Other aspects of parent involvement, including over-monitoring and restriction, or alternatively, indulgence, have been found to have negative effects on self-sufficiency, as they are often associated with continued dependence on parents and general irresponsibility (Steinberg, 2001). Some studies have also found an association between positive relationships with parents and performance of workplace tasks (Mortimer, Finch, Ryu, Shanahan, & Call, 1996). Fathers may be important given that they themselves may work and have relevant contact that may be useful during the search for jobs. This has however not been a widely explored topic.

Hypothesis 5: We hypothesize that offspring growing up with single fathers will have higher levels of disconnectedness, but father involvement and more positive parenting will reduce the negative effects of living with a single father by improving offspring's self-sufficiency.

The Influence of Other Socio-Demographic Factors

Although single father involvement during adolescence is likely to influence young adults' outcomes, additional father characteristics, mother characteristics, child characteristics, family context, and prior behaviors in early adolescence are likely to influence both father involvement and young adult outcomes. To better isolate the relationship between father involvement and these

outcomes, we account for several potentially confounding factors, which we expect to be correlated with father involvement and parenting styles, as well as the range of outcome domains considered during emerging adulthood.

Parental Education. A measure of parental educational attainment is considered, as research suggests that fathers with higher levels of educational attainment are more involved with their children than are less educated fathers (Griswold, 1993; Marsiglio & Cohan, 1997; Nord et al., 1997). This pattern has been found among resident as well as nonresident fathers with adolescent children (King, Harris, & Heard, 2004). Most research suggests that children of more highly educated parents have more positive outcomes (Xie, Gilliland, Li, & Rockett, 2003).

Family Context. We account for family context including household income, as research indicates that lower household income has negative implications for both parental involvement and outcomes for youth (Coley & Hernandez, 2006; Crosnoe, 2001) through adolescence (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002), and possibly emerging adulthood. Low SES has also been found to be associated with increased risky behaviors in adolescence (Williams, Currie, Wright, Elton, & Beattie, 1997). We also include a measure of family routines, as family routines have been found to be protective for adolescent females in households with higher levels of cumulative risk (Loukas & Prelow, 2004).

We account for the number of children in the household as research suggests that the number of children fathered is negatively associated with father involvement (Harris & Morgan, 1991; Hofferth, 2003; Marsiglio, 1991a). Larger family sizes have also been found to be associated with more negative outcomes for children (Blake, 1981).

Child Characteristics. We also include a measure of child's age. Some studies suggests that fathers are more involved with older children than with younger children (Nord et al., 1997; Seltzer, 1991), while others suggest no association between father involvement and age (Cooksey & Craig, 1998), and others suggest a decrease in father involvement as adolescents age (Harris & Morgan, 1991). We also control for offspring's gender and race. Research on two-parent families with

adolescents suggests that fathers are more involved with sons than with daughters (Bronte-Tinkew, Moore et al., 2006; Bronte-Tinkew, Moore, Capps, & Zaff, 2006; Harris & Morgan, 1991), and that adolescent boys report closer relationships to their fathers than do girls (Youniss, 1985). In addition, the family processes associated with problem behaviors often differ by gender, and boys are at greater risk than are girls for externalizing behaviors and conduct problems (Loeber & Hay, 1997).

We account for race as some research finds that Black fathers are more involved with their children than are White fathers, while other research indicates that father involvement is lower among Black fathers (Marsiglio, 1991b; Pleck, 1997). Some studies also suggest more negative outcomes for children of minorities (Blum et al., 2000).

Prior Behaviors. We include measures of offspring's prior behaviors since past behaviors are often a predictor of ongoing and subsequent behaviors (Jessor, 1991; Jessor, Donovan, & Costa, 1991). Growing research also suggests that younger adolescents with higher academic achievement may develop an increased academic self-concept and sense of control as age increases which, in turn, may result in more positive academic achievement at a later stage of development (Ross & Broh, 2000).

DATA AND METHODS

Data

These analyses use data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 (NLSY97), a nationally representative survey created to document the transition from adolescence into adulthood. For the present study, we use data from six rounds of the survey, Rounds 1 through 5 and Round 7. These data were collected between 1997 and 2003, and include parent-specific demographic information collected at baseline as well as adolescent- and young adult-specific information collected annually. One of the strengths of the NLSY is that it is a multi-topic survey that taps many dimensions of household well-being and contains many family process measures. In addition, it is longitudinal, making it possible to connect variables in early adolescence with outcomes measured in

early adulthood. In the initial wave of the study, both parents and the young adults were interviewed, and we use demographic data obtained from both parent and adolescent/young adult reports. In Round 1 of the survey, data were collected for 8,984 youth, in Round 2 for 8,386 adolescents, in Round 5 for 7,883 adolescents, and in Round 7 for 7,754 young adults. The NLSY reports a retention rate of 87.9% for all participants, across Rounds 1 through 7 (Bureau of Labor Statistics US Department of Labor, 2001).

Sample for Analyses

Data were collected for 8,984 youth in Round 1 of the NLSY, and 1,487 cases were lost to attrition by Round 7 (ages 18 to 22). A total of 3,520 cases were excluded from our final analytic sample because youth transitioned into different family types between Rounds 3 and 5. Our final analytic sample consisted of 3,977 youth that lived continuously in the same family structure between Rounds 3 through 5. Within the final analytic sample, 91 youth lived continuously with a single custodial father; 35 with a custodial father and partner; 945 with a single custodial mother; 116 with a custodial mother and partner; 2,412 lived continuously with two biological parents; and 378 lived with an extended family between Rounds 3 and 5. Only residential parents (fathers and mothers) of respondents were considered in these analyses.

An analysis of the cases that were lost to attrition and not included in the final analytic sample indicates that these participants were more likely to live in households with lower incomes (\$47,082 vs. \$49,900 in the analytic sample), have parents with lower educational attainment (79.6% with some college or more vs. 83.0% with some college or more in the analytic sample), a lower mean on the family routines index (7.4 vs. 7.6 in the analytic sample), and, on average, fewer children under the age of eighteen in the household (1.5 children vs. 1.8 children in the analytic sample). In addition, participants missing from the analytic sample were more likely to be white (50.6% vs. 50.2% in the analytic sample), male (54.7% vs. 51.8% in the analytic sample) and slightly

older than the average age of respondents in the analytic sample (mean age of 14.6 in Round 3 vs. mean age of 14.0 in the analytic sample). It is important to note that because our sample contains families that remained stable for at least three time points of observation, these families are representative of stable family structures.

Analytic Strategy

We first present descriptive statistics for our variables of interest. Second, we conducted a series of Chi-square and t-test analyses to examine differences in socio-demographic characteristics, parenting styles and involvement across each family type. Third, we examine the effects of residing in a single custodial father household versus other family structures on outcomes for young adults in two domains using logistic regression models (Allison, 1999). This is the appropriate statistical test for dichotomous dependent variables. In these models, the logistic regressions explore whether specific aspects of living in a single father family, and the associated parenting styles and involvement of the father significantly predict the odds of completing high school and being disconnected. Results are interpreted in terms of odds ratios. For categorical variables, an odds ratio greater than one indicates an increased chance of an outcome occurring, while an odds ratio less than one signifies a decreased chance of an outcome occurring (Allison, 1999). We report odds ratios because, conceptually, odds ratios bear more social impact than the reporting of explained variance, which is the traditional metric of continuous regressions.

Models were built using hierarchical regression. First, each event of interest was modeled with the family structure measures as the primary predictors. Second, the effects of parenting styles were tested independent of family structure. Third, measures of parental involvement were added to the model. Finally, variables to test alternative hypotheses, including father and mother characteristics, child characteristics and family context, were added to the models to measure their effects on outcomes in emerging adulthood and their effects on the size and statistical significance of the family structure coefficients. A common and convincing approach to assessing causal

relationships is to include baseline scores on outcome variables to control for pre-existing associations between the outcome and predictor variable. We therefore included a measure of prior GPA (Round 3) in the academic achievement models.

Measures

Outcome Variables

Academic Achievement. Academic achievement was measured at Round 7 (ages 18 to 22) and assessed participants' completion of high school. Participants were coded as having completed high school (1) if they reported having finished the 12th grade and (0) if they had completed less than the 12th grade by Round 7.

Self-Sufficiency (Disconnected). Self-sufficiency was operationalized using a measure of being "disconnected" at Round 7 (ages 18 to 22). This variable was created by combining participants' answers to two questions: enrollment in any type of educational institution, and employment since the date of last interview. Respondents who indicated that they were neither enrolled in school nor employed were coded as disconnected (1), and those who indicated that they were either enrolled in school or employed were coded as connected (0).

Primary Predictors

Family Structure. Six categories of living arrangements were created for the analyses: 1) *Single custodial father* families were defined as those in which the adolescent lived only with a father at all three rounds (R3 – R5) and their father reported no resident partners during this time; 2) *Custodial fathers with partner* families were defined as those in which the adolescent lived with their father at all three rounds (R3 – R5) and their father had a live-in partner at one or more of the rounds; 3) *Single custodial mother* families were measured as the respondent having lived with their single mother at all three rounds (R3 – R5) and their mother having no partners; 4) *custodial mothers with partner* families were measured as the respondent having lived with their mother at all three rounds (R3 – R5) and their mother had a live-in partner at one or more of the rounds; 5) *extended*

families were defined as those where respondents indicated that they lived with any combination of their mother, father, and other relatives at all three rounds (R3 – R5); and 6) *Two biological parent* families were those where respondents reported living with both their biological mother and father at all rounds (R3 – R5).

Parenting Styles. Using the typology of parenting styles developed by Maccoby and Martin (1983), this measure was created by crossing two global dimensions of parenting: “demandingness” (e.g., strictness), and “responsiveness” (e.g., warmth, support). Authoritative parents are high on both demandingness and responsiveness; authoritarian parents are high on demandingness and low on responsiveness; indulgent parents are low on demandingness and high on responsiveness; and indifferent-uninvolved parents are low on both demandingness and responsiveness.

The two items that comprise this measure were asked of youth at Round 3 (ages 14 to 18) and assess whether the parent “in general is very supportive, somewhat supportive, or not very supportive”; and is “permissive or strict about making sure you did what you were supposed to do.” The supportiveness responses were measured on a three-point scale ranging from very supportive to not very supportive. The strictness responses were measured on a two-point scale ranging from permissive to strict. Responses of *not very supportive* and *somewhat supportive* on the supportiveness items were recorded 0 (*non-responsive*); responses of *very supportive* were recorded as 1 (*responsive*). Responses of *strict* on the permissive/strictness item were recorded as 1 (*demanding*), and responses of *permissive* were recorded 0 (*non-demanding*). These two-level variables were combined to produce a parenting style variable with four categories: *uninvolved* (permissive and not very or somewhat supportive), *authoritarian* (strict and not very or somewhat supportive), *permissive* (permissive and very supportive) and *authoritative* (strict and very supportive). Each category was dummy-coded (1) *father uses parenting style*, and (0), *father does not use parenting style*. Both construct and predictive validity have been found to be good for these parenting styles (Moore, McGroder, Hair, & Gunnoe, 1999).

Parental Involvement. Involvement measures were assessed in Round 3 for both residential fathers and mothers where available. If respondents lived with more than one parent, involvement measures were averaged between the two parents.

Parental *closeness* between residential parents and adolescents as reported by adolescents was measured at Round 3 using a three item index: I think highly of my father/mother, I want to be like my father/mother, and I enjoy spending time with my father/mother. The responses are measured on a five-point scale ranging from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). This measure has a range from 0-12 (mean = 8.7; alpha = 0.86). Higher scores indicate a closer parent-adolescent relationship.

Residential parent *support* as reported by adolescents was measured using a four-item index from Round 3. These items included: How often does he/she praise you for doing well?; How often does he/she help you do things that are important to you?; How often does he/she cancel plans for no reason?; and How often does he/she blame you for his problems? Responses are measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (*never*) to 4 (*always*). This measure has a range from 0-16 (mean = 12.4; alpha = 0.65). Higher scores indicate higher levels of parent support.

Parental *awareness* was assessed using adolescent self-report data in Round 3. The four items used to capture parental awareness of adolescents included: How much does your father/mother know about your close friends?; How much does your father/mother know about your close friends' parents?; How much does your father/mother know about who you are with when he is not home?; and How much does your father/mother know about your teachers and school? Responses were answered on a four-point scale ranging from 0 (*knows nothing*) to 4 (*knows everything*). This measure has a range from 0-16 (mean = 8.7; alpha = 0.84). Higher scores indicate higher levels of awareness. An analysis of predictive validity for this index found that both mothers and fathers who were rated high on awareness were also rated as more strict and had adolescents with fewer behavioral problems (Moore et al., 1999).

Control Variables

To better isolate the relationship between family structure and the outcomes of interest, we account for a number of potentially confounding factors. These include parenting styles, parental involvement, father characteristics, mother characteristics, child characteristics, family context, and baseline scores of the outcome variables observed at an earlier time point.

Family Context. We included measures of family routines, the number of children under 18 in the household, and a continuous measure of household income at Round 1. Participation in family routines was measured at Round 3 using a three-item scale, on which respondents rated the frequency with which they participated in various activities each week with their parents. The activities measured were: Number of days per week participant eats with family; number of days per week participant does fun activities with family; and number of days per week participant does religious activities with family. Responses ranged from zero to seven times per week. Responses to each question were summed to create an index of frequency of participation in family routines. Scores range from 0 to 24. Higher scores indicate a higher frequency of family routines (mean = 7.5; alpha = 0.71). Both content and predictive validity have been found to be good for this measure (Moore et al; 1999). Number of children in the household was measured using a continuous variable measured at Round 3 which captured the number of children in the adolescent respondents' household who were under the age of 18.

Parent Characteristics. We also include a measure of highest parental educational attainment from Round 1 as an indicator of family of origin socio-economic status. Parental education was coded as a dichotomous variable measuring whether at least one resident parent had obtained some college education or more, as compared to the reference category, high school or less.

Child Characteristics. Individual child characteristics included respondent self-reports of gender and race, measured in Round 1 (ages 12 to 16), and age measured in Round 3 (ages 14 to 18). A dummy variable identifying whether the adolescent was male or female was included. Race was

coded using four dummy variables identifying whether respondents were Black, White, Hispanic or Other. Finally, a continuous measure of the respondents' age at initial participation was included.

Baseline Scores. We also included baseline scores of adolescents' Grade Point Average (GPA) from Round 3 in the final multivariate models for academic achievement. Transcript data were collected for NLSY97 respondents who had provided signed authorization for transcript collection. Grades were collected from high school transcripts and these were standardized into a uniform grading system. GPA was then calculated by dividing the total amount of grade points earned by the total amount of credit hours.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 summarizes the distribution of the independent and dependent variables included in the analyses across each of the family types. Overall 2.3% of respondents lived with their single custodial father, 0.9% of respondents lived with their custodial father and a partner, 23.8% of respondents lived with their single custodial mother, 2.9% lived with their custodial mother and a partner, 9.5% of respondents lived with their extended family, and 60.6% of respondents lived with two biological parents.

Question 1: What are the socio-demographic characteristics of single father households with adolescents? Table 1 shows that the demographic portrait that emerges of single father families is that they are distinct from both married two-parent families and single mother families. Based on Chi-square and t-test analyses that examined differences in socio-demographic characteristics across family structure, single custodial fathers had higher levels of education compared to single mothers (92.3% of single fathers had at least some college experience vs. 80.0% of single mothers). Adolescents in single father households were more likely to be African American (24.6%) compared to adolescents living with both of their biological parents (13.4%), but less likely than adolescents

living with a single custodial mother (44.2%). Adolescents living with a single custodial father and their partner were much less likely to be Hispanic (12.1%) compared to all other family types.

In terms of the family context of single father families, adolescents from single custodial father families where a partner is present had the lowest level of family routines. Single father families had higher income levels compared to single mother families, but lower levels of income compared to two biological parent families. Single fathers (without a partner) also had fewer children compared to all other family types.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Question 2: What are the parenting styles of single fathers and how are they involved with their adolescent offspring?

Parenting Styles. Table 2 presents results from Chi-square and t-test analyses that examined differences in parenting styles and parental involvement across each family structure category. The results indicated that there were significant differences in *parenting styles* across family types. Significantly more adolescents living with a single custodial father reported having an uninvolved parent (27.5%) compared to adolescents living with a single custodial mother (18.52%), two biological parents (13.1%), or in an extended family (12.7%). Additionally, respondents in single custodial father families were significantly less likely to indicate that their fathers were authoritative or authoritarian compared to respondents living with two biological parents. The greatest number of offspring reported permissive parenting styles within single father families (39.6%).

Parental Involvement. Table 2 also shows the ways in which single fathers and parents in other family types are differentially involved in the lives of their children. Although none of the differences in parental involvement across family type were statistically significant, the patterns that emerge in Table 2 suggest that adolescents living with a single custodial father report similar levels of father closeness, support, and awareness compared to adolescents that live with both of their biological parents.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Multivariate Results

Question 3: *Does living in a single father household during adolescence influence outcomes during emerging adulthood?*

Our second objective was to conduct multivariate analyses to examine whether living in a single father household during adolescence is associated with academic achievement and self-sufficiency during emerging adulthood. Tables 3-5 present the results of logistic regression analyses for these outcomes. Results are interpreted as odds ratios.

Academic Achievement (High School Completion). *Models 1– 4* of Table 3 show the direct effect of family structure on emerging adult offspring’s high school completion when accounting for, in each additional model, parenting styles, parental involvement, additional parent characteristics, the family context and adolescent characteristics. The final model, *Model 4*, continues to show significant family structure differences after accounting for these factors. Adolescents in single custodial father homes (OR = 0.49; $p < 0.05$) and adolescents living with a custodial father with a partner (OR = 0.28; $p < 0.01$) were significantly less likely to complete high school compared to adolescents living with two biological parents (the reference category). The number of co-resident children under the age of eighteen, being male, and being Black significantly reduced the odds of completing high school. Additional covariates associated with a greater likelihood of finishing high school included higher parental educational attainment, age, and a higher grade point average at Round 3.

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Self Sufficiency (Disconnected). *Model 1* of Table 5 shows that adolescents in all other family structures had significantly higher odds of disconnectedness compared to two biological parent households. These associations held in *Models 2, 3, and 4* with the addition of parenting styles, parental involvement, additional parent characteristics, the family context and adolescent

characteristics to the models. In the final model with all controls, *Model 4*, living in a single custodial father family (OR = 1.84; $p < 0.05$) and a custodial father with a partner family (OR = 2.53; $p < 0.05$) continued to be associated with higher odds of being disconnected compared to two biological parent households (reference category). Additional covariates associated with increased odds of being disconnected during emerging adulthood included family routines, living in a home with a larger number of children under the age of 18, and being Black. Covariates associated with decreased odds of being disconnected included having a parent with at least some college education.

[TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

DISCUSSION

Using a life course theory of family development and social capital theory, this study had three objectives: (1) to examine the socio-demographic characteristics of single father families with adolescents compared to other family structures; (2) to determine differentials in single custodial fathers' parenting and involvement during adolescence (compared to that of other family arrangements); and (3) to determine the effects of living in a single father household on outcomes during emerging adulthood (compared to other family configurations). Some of our proposed hypotheses were supported.

Hypothesis 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Single Father Families. We found that single father families differ from single mother and two-parent families on a number of demographic and family background characteristics. Single father families were less disadvantaged in terms of socio-economic resources compared to single mothers (Ainsworth-Darnell, & Dufur, 1998; Demuth & Brown, 2004), and were no different from two-parent families in terms of fathers' level of education. However, single father families did have fewer financial resources compared to two-parent families which may contribute to lower achievement during emerging adulthood. The composition of single father households differed from all other household comparisons with single fathers having the fewest number of children under the age of 18 in the household. These findings

suggest that adolescents in single father families may benefit from greater levels of per capita resources as there are fewer children to receive fathers' financial and social resources (Blake, 1981, 1989). Single custodial father families did not differ from other families in terms of family routines, but single father families where a partner also resided in the household had the lowest levels of family routines, suggesting that they are the least likely to eat regular meals with their father, and the least likely to participate in family activities on a weekly basis. This suggests that the presence of a partner may prevent single fathers' from devoting more time to their children and to maintaining regular family routines. These results are consistent with previous research which suggests that parental involvement and parenting practices are affected by the presence of a partner in cohabiting unions (Artis, 2007; Brown, 2004).

Hypothesis 2: Parenting Styles of Single Fathers. We found significant differences in *parenting styles* between single fathers and other family arrangements. Single fathers exhibited less authoritarian and authoritative parenting compared to two-parent families, and were more uninvolved than parents in single mother, two-parent and extended families. The highest number of adolescents reported permissive parenting styles within single father families. These results partially support our second hypothesis that single fathers exhibit less authoritative methods of parenting and more permissive and uninvolved methods, and support prior research that suggests that single parents may be more likely to use ineffective parenting practices, and provide less supervision, parental involvement, and control than two-parent parents (McClanahan & Booth, 1989). We also hypothesized that single custodial fathers would be less uninvolved compared to single custodial mothers, but found higher numbers of uninvolved single custodial fathers compared to single custodial mothers. Some studies suggest that adolescents are more likely to perceive their fathers as uninvolved or permissive even when an independent observer considers the parenting style of the father to be authoritative or authoritarian (Simons & Conger, 2007). Children living in single

custodial father households may be especially likely to view their father as permissive or uninvolved (even if they are not) due to a lack of traditional notions about parenting (Simons & Conger, 2007).

Hypothesis 3: Engagement/Involvement of Single Fathers. We found no significant differences between single fathers and other family arrangements with regard to the nature of their involvement. Stable single father families represent a unique type of family structure in which fathers appear to be similar to both mothers in single mother families and fathers in two-parent families on certain dimensions of father involvement. A lack of significant differences in levels of parent involvement across family structures may reflect the offspring's age and developmental stage at the time that parental involvement was measured. Parental involvement with adolescents may depend more on the characteristics and behaviors of the adolescent rather than the parent (Bell & Chapman, 1986), and may not vary much across family types. Adolescence is a developmental period in which youth are developing biologically, cognitively, emotionally, and interpersonally, as they gain autonomy and begin distancing themselves from their parents (Steinberg & Silk, 2002). The developmental changes that take place during this stage of the life course for offspring may play a larger role in shaping patterns of parent-involvement than family structure or characteristics of parents. As a result, levels of parent involvement with adolescents may be similar across all family structures, as our results suggest. These results underscore the need for additional research on single father families to more fully conceptualize the emotional and behavioral components of single father involvement and how it varies by age of the child.

Hypothesis 4: Single Father Involvement and Academic Achievement. We found that in keeping with the life course theory of human development that positive aspects of the single father child relationship from adolescence into emerging adulthood had an influence in young adults' academic achievement. We found evidence of the negative influence of being uninvolved and the positive effects of parental support for academic achievement. These findings suggest that single fathers' positive involvement is a catalyst for positive change in the academic domains. Higher levels

of emotional closeness for single fathers and their offspring during adolescence sets the stage for academic development in emerging adulthood. Despite these positive influences, offspring from single father households continued to have lower odds of high school completion compared to offspring that lived with two biological parents during adolescence. Our analyses of the family context of single father households and single fathers' parenting styles suggest that single father families have lower social capital resources due to their more permissive and uninvolved parenting styles, and lower levels of family routines (especially among single father families with a partner). Single fathers may be less able to transmit important social resources, as well as financial resources, to their children, resulting in lower odds of academic achievement during emerging adulthood.

Hypothesis 5: Single Father Involvement and Self-Sufficiency. We found that the likelihood of being disconnected was higher for adolescents in single father households. In single father households with a partner, these negative effects were even higher. Custodial fathers that live with a partner may transition into and out of relationships, resulting in disrupted and stressful living situations for their children. The quality of fathers' involvement may also suffer when they re-partner. In a previous study, Hawkins, Amato and King (2006) found that father involvement was higher in single custodial father families compared to families where the custodial biological father had re-partnered, especially for involvement activities that are traditionally perceived as female-oriented such as communicating about problems. It is possible that custodial fathers with partners do not engage in certain involvement activities like communicating about relationships or problems to the same extent that single custodial fathers do, resulting in lower levels of self-sufficiency during emerging adulthood. In keeping with the social capital perspective, single father families have lower levels of social capital compared to other family types, and single fathers may have even fewer social resources to transmit to their children if a partner is also present in the household. These results remained consistent after controlling for parental involvement, father characteristics, mother characteristics, child characteristics, and the family context.

We also found that fathers' supportiveness decreased the likelihood of offspring becoming disconnected during emerging adulthood. This indicates that the instrumental and positive support that fathers may provide helps adolescents become autonomous and independent, resulting in non-dependence on parents in the young adult years. These findings are in keeping with the life course theory of human development, which suggests linkages between early relationship and later changes and adaptations (Elder, 1984).

In sum, across the two outcome domains we considered, we find that single father involvement matters, although offspring that reside with single custodial fathers during adolescence consistently have poorer outcomes compared to offspring that reside with two biological parents. Our results also confirm that father involvement is multidimensional, and the importance of individual dimensions is varied in their implications for young adult well-being. Our findings are also in keeping with the tenets of the life course theory of human development which emphasizes the plasticity of relationships between family members over time (Elder et al., 1984). These related, but distinct aspects of single father involvement matter in different ways for young adult outcomes over time as well as across domains (Amato, 1994; Videon, 2005). This is also confirmed in this nationally representative sample of young adults and their single fathers illustrating benefits in the domains of self-sufficiency and academic achievement. These analyses paint a portrait that supports the notion that single fathers' involvement is multi-faceted; comprising a range of activities and their interactions over time provides unique contributions to adult offspring well-being.

Limitations of Current Study. There are some limitations of this study that should be noted. First, we used available measures of father involvement and parenting styles. Similar measures of involvement or parenting styles were not used across all waves of the NLSY (i.e., Rounds 4, 5 and 6), precluding an examination of changes in the *same* measures of father involvement or parenting styles over time. The substantive analyses presented here however do suggest that the measures in the NLSY97 capture critical influences in the lives of young adults and are robust predictors of

important outcomes. Second, our data did not contain variables that would allow us to measure the possible negative influences of parents' own behaviors on young adult outcomes. Third, our results may also be influenced by young adults' underreporting of negative behaviors. Finally, another limitation involves the fact that adolescents provide information about the father-child relationship as well as their own behaviors. For this reason, same-source bias may affect some of the estimates of single father effects.

Contributions of the Present Study. Despite these limitations, the present study serves as a first glimpse into the nature and context of single father families with adolescents, and makes a straightforward contribution to the literature on both single fathers and parenting processes in emerging adulthood. Using data from single custodial fathers of youth in a nationally representative survey, we are able to demonstrate the unique demographic and family context of single father families that is different from both single mother families and two-parent families. Our study also provides preliminary evidence of a link between single father involvement and aspects of parenting styles for outcomes in emerging adulthood. Our attempts to capture dimensions of the quality and quantity of involvement remind us that a constellation of fathering behaviors is ideal for good parenting.

Implications for Policy and Practice. Regarding fathering, our study provides continuing evidence that single fathers are important to the well-being of young adults, and suggests that any holistic policy or program to promote well-being in the early adult years should include fathers when feasible. Work aimed at improving the measurement and collection of the single father-adolescent/young adult relationship data in nationally representative surveys and including single fathers in analytical work is well warranted. More broadly, these analyses indicate that parental influences continue into the early years of adulthood.

REFERENCES

- Allison, P. D. (1999). *Logistic Regression Using the SAS System: Theory and Application*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.
- Almeida, D. M., & Galambos, N. L. (1991). Examining father involvement and the quality of father-adolescent relations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 1*(2), 155-172.
- Amato, P. A., & Gilbreth, J. G. (1999). Nonresident fathers and children's well-being: Media analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61*, 15-73.
- Amato, P. R. (1994). Father-child relations, mother-child relations, and offspring psychological well-being in early adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56*, 1031-1042.
- Amato, P. R. (2000). The consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62*(4), 1269-1287.
- Aquilino, W. S. (1997). From adolescent to young adult: a prospective study of parent-child relations during the transition to adulthood. *59*, 670-686.
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55*(5), 469-480.
- Julie E Artis. (2007). Maternal Cohabitation and Child Well-Being Among Kindergarten Children. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 69*, 222-236.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75*(1), 43-88.
- Bell, R. Q. & Chapman, M. (1986). Child effects in studies using experimental or brief longitudinal approaches to socialization. *Developmental Psychology 22*, 595-603.
- Bengtson, V. L., & Allen, K. R. (1993). The life course perspective applied to families over time. In P. G. Boss, Doherty, W.J., LaRossa, R., Schumm, W.R., Steinmetz, S.D. (Ed.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 469-504). New York: Plenum Press.
- Bianchi, S. M., & Casper, L. M. (2000). American Families. *Population Bulletin, 55*(4).
- Biller, H. B., & Lopez Kimpton, J. (1997). The father and the school-aged child. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *In The role of the father in child development* (pp. 143-161). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Blake, J. (1981). Family size and quality of children. *Demography, 18*, 621-662.
- Blum, R. W., Beuhring, T., Shew, M. L., Bearinger, L. H., Sieving, R. E., & Resnick, M. D. (2000). The effects of race/ethnicity, income, and family structure on adolescent risk behaviors. *American Journal of Public Health, 90*(12), 1879-1884.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The Forms of Capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood.
- Brack, G., Gay, M., & Matheny, K. (1993). Relationships between attachment and coping resources among late adolescents. *Journal of College Student Development, 34*(3), 212-215.
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(371-399).
- Breivik, O., & Olweus, D. (2006). Adolescent's Adjustment in Four Post-Divorce Family Structures Single Mother, Stepfather, Joint Physical Custody and Single Father Families *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 44*(3/4), 99 - 124.
- Bronte-Tinkew, J., Moore, K., & Carrano, J. (2006). The father-child relationship, parenting styles, and adolescent risk behaviors in intact families. *Journal of Family Issues, 27*(6), 850-881.

- Bronte-Tinkew, J., Moore, K. A., Capps, R., & Zaff, J. (2006). Father involvement and youth transition into risky behaviors in immigrant and native-born families. *Social Science Research, 35*, 181-209.
- Bronte-Tinkew, J., Moore, K. A., & Carrano, J. (2006). The Father-Child Relationship, Parenting Styles, and Adolescent Risk Behaviors in Intact Families. *27(6)*, 850-881.
- Brown, S. L. (2004). Family structure and child well-being: The significance of parental cohabitation. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 351 - 367.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics US Department of Labor. (2001). *NLSY79 User's Guide*. Columbus, OH: Center for Human Resource Research, The Ohio State University.
- Carlson, M. J. (2006). Family Structure, Father Involvement, and Adolescent Behavioral Outcomes. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68(1)*, 137-154.
- Carlson, M. J., & Corcoran, M. E. (2001). Family structure and children's behavioral and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*, 779-792.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 96*, S95-S120.
- Coles, R. (2001). African American single full-time fathers: How are they doing? *Journal of African American Men, 6(2)*, 63-82.
- Coley, R. L., & Hernandez, D. C. (2006). Predictors of Paternal Involvement for Resident and Nonresident Low-Income Fathers. *Developmental Psychology, 42(6)*, 1041-1056.
- Cooksey, E. C., & Craig, P. H. (1998). Parenting from a distance: the effects of paternal characteristics on contact between nonresidential fathers and their children. *Demography, 35(2)*, 187-200.
- Cooksey, E. C., & Fondell, M. M. (1996). Spending time with his kids: Effects of family structure on fathers' and children's lives. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 58(3)*, 693-707.
- Crosnoe, R. (2001). Parental involvement in education: the influence of school and neighborhood. *Sociological Focus, 34(4)*, 417-434.
- Current Population Survey. (2005). *FM-3. Average number of own children under 18 per family, by type of family: 1955 to present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Darling, N. (1999). Parenting style and its correlates. *ERIC Digest, 99(3)*, 1-2.
- Demuth, S., & Brown, S. L. (2004). Family Structure, Family Processes, and Adolescent Delinquency: The Significance of Parental Absence versus Parental Gender. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 41*, 58-81.
- Downey, D. B., Ainsworth-Darnell, J.W. & Dufur, M.J. (1998). Sex of Parent and Children's Well-Being in Single-Parent Households. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*, 878-893.
- Downey, D. B. P., B. . (1993). Do Children in Single-Parent Households Fare Better Living with Same-Sex Parents? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55(1)*, 55-71.
- Elder, G., Liker, J., & Cross, C. (1984). Parent-child behavior in the Great Depression: Life course and intergenerational influences. In P. Baltes & O. Brim (Eds.). In *Life span development and behavior* (Vol. 6, pp. 109-158). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Erkut, S., Szalacha, L. A., & Coll, C. G. (2005). A framework for studying minority youths' transitions to fatherhood: the case of Puerto Rican adolescents. *Adolescence, 40(160)*, 709-727.
- Fass, M., & Tubman, J. (2002). The influence of parental and peer attachment on college students' academic achievement. *Psychology in the Schools, 39(5)*, 561-573.

- Furstenberg, F. F., Rumbaut, R. C., & Settersten, R. A. (2005). On the Frontier of Adulthood: Emerging Themes and New Directions. In *On the frontier of adulthood: Theory, research, and public policy*. (pp. 3-25): University of Chicago Press.
- Grief, G. (1985). *Single Fathers*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Griswold, R. L. (1993). *Fatherhood in America: A history*. New York: Basic Books.
- Harris, K. M., Furstenberg, F. F., & Marmer, J. K. (1998). Paternal involvement with adolescents in intact families: The influence of fathers over the life course. *Demography*, 35(2), 201-216.
- Harris, K. M., & Morgan, S. P. (1991). Fathers, sons, and daughters: Differential paternal involvement in parenting. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53(3), 531-544.
- Hawkins, D. N., Amato, P. R., & King, V. (2006). Parent-adolescent involvement: The relative influence of parent gender and residence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 68(1), 125-136.
- Herman, M., Dornbusch, S., Herron, M., & Herting, J. (1997). The influence of family regulation, connection, and psychological autonomy on six measures of adolescent functioning. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 12(1), 34-67.
- Hilton, J., & Devall, E. (1998). Comparison of parenting and children's behavior in single-mother, single-father, and intact families. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 29(3/4), 23-54.
- Hofferth, S. (2003). Race/ethnic differences in father involvement in two-parent families: Culture, context, or economy. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(2), 185-216.
- Holmbeck, G. N., Paikoff, R. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1995). Parenting adolescents. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of Parenting* (Vol. 1, pp. 91-118). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Jessor, R. (1991). Risk Behavior in adolescence: A psychosocial framework for understanding and action. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 12, 597-605.
- Jessor, R., Donovan, J. W., & Costa, F. M. (1991). *Beyond adolescence: Problem behavior and young adult development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- King, V., Harris, K. M., & Heard, H. E. (2004). Racial and ethnic diversity in nonresident father involvement. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 66(1), 1-21.
- Lamb, M. (1997). Fathers and Child Development: An Introductory Overview and Guide. In M. Lamb (Ed.), *The Role of the Father in Child Development* (3 ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Lamb, M. E. (1987). Introduction: The emergent American father. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father's role: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 3-25). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J. H., Charnov, E. L., & Levine, J. A. (1985). The role of the father in child development: The effects of increased paternal involvement. In B. B. Lahey & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Advances in clinical child psychology* (Vol. 8, pp. 229 - 266). New York: Plenum.
- Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J. H., Charnov, E. L., & Levine, J. A. (1987). A biosocial perspective on paternal behavior and involvement. In J. B. Lancaster, J. Altman, S. Rossi & L. R. Sherrod (Eds.), *Parenting across the lifespan: Biosocial dimensions* (pp. 111 - 142). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of Competence and Adjustment among Adolescents from Authoritative, Authoritarian, Indulgent, and Neglectful Families. *Child Development*, 62(5), 1049.

- Loeber, R., & Hay, D. (1997). Key issues in the development of aggression and violence from childhood to early adulthood. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48(1), 371.
- Loukas, A., & Prelow, H. M. (2004). Externalizing and Internalizing Problems in Low-Income Latino Early Adolescents: Risk, Resource, and Protective Factors. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 24(3), 250-273.
- Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 1-101). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- MacMillan, R., & Copher, R. (2005). Families in the Lifecourse: Interdependency of Roles, Role Configurations, and Pathways. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 67, 858-879.
- Marsiglio, W. (1991a). Male procreative consciousness and responsibility: A conceptual analysis and research agenda. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 268-290.
- Marsiglio, W. (1991b). Paternal engagement activities with minor children. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 62, 1173-1191.
- Marsiglio, W., & Cohan, M. (1997). Young fathers and child development. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed.). (pp. 227-244): John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- McClanahan, G., & Booth, K. (1989). Single Mothers and Their Children: Problems, Reproduction, and Politics. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 557-580.
- McLanahan, S., & Sandefur, G. D. (1994). *Growing up with a single parent: What hurts, what helps*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Moore, K., McGroder, S. M., Hair, E. C., & Gunnoe, M. (1999). *NLSY97 codebook supplement main file, round 1. Appendix 9: Family process and adolescent outcomes measures*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Morman, M. T., & Floyd, K. (2006). Son-hood: Defining what it means to be a good son. In K. Floyd & M. T. Morman (Eds.), *Widening the family circle: New research on family communication* (pp. 37-55). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mortimer, J. T., Finch, M. D., Ryu, S., Shanahan, M. J., & Call, K. T. (1996). The effects of work intensity on adolescent mental health, achievement and behavioral adjustment: New evidence from a prospective study. *Child Development*, 67(3), 1243-1261.
- Nelson, L., & Barry, C. (2005). Distinguishing features of emerging adulthood: The role of self-classification as an adult. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 20(3), 242-262.
- Nord, C. W., Brimhall, D., & West, J. (1997). *Father's involvement in schools* (No. NCES 98-091). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Palkovitz, R. (2002). *Involved fathering and men's adult development: Provisional balances*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Parcel, T. J., & Dufur, M. J. (2001). Capital at home and at school: effects on child social adjustment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 63(1), 32-47.
- Parcel, T. L., & Menaghan, E. G. (1993). Family social capital and children's behavior problems. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 56, 120-135.
- Pleck, J. (1997). Paternal involvement: Levels, sources and consequences. In M. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of father in child development* (3rd ed., pp. 66-103). New York: Wiley.
- Roberts, R. E., & Bengtson, V. L. (1993). Relationships with parents, self-esteem, and psychological well-being in young adulthood. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 56(4), 263-278.

- Ross, C. E., & Broh, B. A. (2000). The roles of self-esteem and the sense of personal control in the academic achievement process. *Sociology of Education*, 73(4), 270-284.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
- Santrock, J. W., & Warshak, R. (1979). Father Custody and social development in boys and girls. *Journal of Social Issues*, 35(112-125).
- Santrock, J. W., Warshak, R., Lindbergh, C., & Meadows, L. (1982). Children's and Parents' Observed Social Behavior in Stepfather Families. *Child Development*, 53(2), 472-480.
- Schoen, R., Young, K., Nathanson, C. A., Fields, J., & Astone, N. M. (1997). Why do Americans want children? *Population and Development Review*, 23(2), 333-358.
- Schwartz, S. J., & Finley, G. E. (2006). Father Involvement, Nurturant Fathering, and Young Adult Psychosocial Functioning: Differences Among Adoptive, Adoptive Stepfather, and Nonadoptive Stepfamilies. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27(5), 712-731.
- Seltzer, J. A. (1991). Relationships between fathers and children who live apart: The father's role after separation. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 53, 79-101.
- Simons, L. G., & Conger, R. D. (2007). Linking Mother-Father Differences in Parenting to a Typology of Family Parenting Styles and Adolescent Outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(2), 212-241.
- Starrels, M. E., & Holms, K. E. (2000). Adolescents' Plans for Family Formation: Is Parental Socialization Important? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(2), 416-429
- Steinberg, L. (2001). We know some things: Parent-adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Research on adolescence*, 11(1), 1-19.
- Steinberg, L., & Silk, J. (2002). Parenting adolescents. In M.H. Borstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol 1. Children's parenting* (2nd ed., pp. 103-133). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Teachman, J. D., Paasch, K. M., Day, R. D., & Carver, K. P. (1997). Poverty during adolescence and subsequent educational attainment. In G. J. Duncan & J. Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), *Consequences of growing up poor*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Updegraff, K. A., McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., & Kupanoff, K. (2001). Parents' involvement in adolescents' peer relationships: A comparison of mothers' and fathers' roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 63(3), 655-668.
- Videon, T. M. (2005). Parent-child relations and children's psychological well-being - Do dads matter? *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(1), 55-78.
- Williams, J. M., Currie, C. E., Wright, P., Elton, R. A., & Beattie, T. F. (1997). Socioeconomic status and adolescent injuries. *Social Science & Medicine*, 44(12), 1881-1891.
- Xie, B., Gilliland, F. D., Li, Y.-F., & Rockett, H. R. H. (2003). Effects of ethnicity, family income, and education on dietary intake among adolescents. *Preventive Medicine: An International Journal Devoted to Practice and Theory*, 36(1), 30-40.
- Youniss, J., & Smollar, J. (1985). *Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers, and friends*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Table 1: Sample Characteristics by Family Structure, NLSY 1997 (Rounds 1 - Round 7)

	Single Custodial Father	Single Custodial Father with Partner	Single Custodial Mother	Single Custodial Mother with Partner	Two Biological Parents	Extended Family	All Family Types	
Dependent Variables (R7)								
High School Completion	84.6%	74.3%	78.2%	80.9%	92.8%	**	78.3%	87.3%
Disconnectedness	18.9%	25.7%	20.2%	19.0%	9.5%	**	21.4%	13.8%
Family Context								
Index of Family Routines (R3) (Range: 0 - 21)	7.6	6.0 *	7.4	6.8	7.7		7.6	7.6
Gross Household Income -- in thousands(R1) (Range: 0-246.5)	38.8	43.7	31.3 *	31.8	58.6	***	39.7	49.9
Number of co-resident children under age 18 (R3) (Range: 0-12)	1.3	2.0 **	1.8 ***	1.9 ***	1.8	***	1.8	1.8 ***
Parental Characteristics (R1)								
Highest Parental Educational Attainment								
Some college or more	92.3%	88.6%	80.0% **	89.7%	87.4%		57.9%	83.0% ***
(High school or less)	7.7%	11.4%	20.0%	10.3%	12.6%		42.1%	17.0%
Child Characteristics (R1)								
Gender								
Male	56.0%	65.7%	48.3%	46.6%	52.4%		55.6%	51.8%
(Female)	44.0%	34.3%	51.8%	53.5%	47.6%		44.4%	48.3%
Race/Ethnicity								
Black	20.8%	20.0%	44.2% ***	21.6%	13.4%	*	50.0%	24.6% ***
Hispanic	12.1%	20.0%	20.6% *	25.0% *	21.4%	*	22.2%	21.2% *
Other	7.7%	0.0%	1.8% ***	2.6%	4.2%		5.3%	3.7%
(White)	58.2%	60.0%	33.1% ***	50.9%	60.7%		22.5%	50.2% ***
Age (Range: 12-16)	14.1	14.0	14.0	13.7 *	13.9		14.1	14.0
Baseline Characteristics								
GPA (R3) (Range: 0 - 4)	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.0	***	2.8	3.0
N (%)	91 (2.3%)	35 (0.9%)	945 (23.8%)	116 (2.9%)	(60.6%)		378 (9.5%)	3,977 (100%)

Note: Significance tests represent differences between each family structure and single custodial father households

*p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001

Table 2: Differences in Parenting Styles and Involvement by Family Structure, NLSY 1997

	FAMILY STRUCTURE						Total
	Single Custodial Father	Single Custodial Father with Partner	Single Custodial Mother	Single Custodial Mother with Partner	Two Biological Parents	Extended Family	
PARENTING STYLES							
Uninvolved	27.5%	28.6%	18.5% *	22.4%	13.1%***	12.7%***	15.1%
Authoritarian	8.8%	20.0%	14.7%	18.1%	17.6% *	10.3%	15.8%
Permissive	39.6%	34.3%	35.5%	33.6%	32.7%	56.9% **	35.8%
Authoritative	24.2%	17.1%	31.3%	25.9%	37.0% *	20.1%	33.3%
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT							
<i>Closeness</i>							
Closeness Index (Range: 0 - 12)	8.81	8.21	8.85	8.63	9.08	8.56	8.95
<i>Support</i>							
Support Index (Range: 0 - 16)	12.74	12.04	12.59	12.47	12.85	12.37	12.72
<i>Awareness</i>							
Awareness Index (Range: 0 - 16)	8.91	8.35	9.43	9.34	8.92	8.79	9.03
N	91	35	945	116	2,412	378	3,977

Note: Significance tests represent differences between each family structure and single custodial father households

*p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001

Table 3: Odds Ratios for Logistic Regression Analysis of the Effects of Living in a Single Custodial Father Family on High School Completion in Emerging Adulthood, NLSY 1997

	High School Completion											
	Model 1			Model 2		Model 3		Model 4				
	Odds Ratio	SE		Odds Ratio	SE	Odds Ratio	SE	Odds Ratio	SE			
FAMILY STRUCTURE (R3-5)												
Single Custodial Father - no cohabiting partners	0.43	**	0.30	0.44	**	0.30	0.43	**	0.31	0.48	*	0.32
Single Custodial Father - cohabiting partners	0.22	***	0.39	0.24	***	0.40	0.25	***	0.40	0.28	**	0.43
Single Custodial Mother - no cohabiting partners	0.28	***	0.11	0.28	***	0.11	0.28	***	0.11	0.47	***	0.13
Single Custodial Mother - cohabiting partners	0.33	***	0.25	0.34	***	0.25	0.34	***	0.25	0.48	**	0.27
Extended Family (Two Biological Parents--Married or Unmarried)	0.28	***	0.15	0.26	***	0.15	0.26	***	0.16	0.47	***	0.18
PARENTING STYLE (R3)												
Uninvolved				0.57	***	0.14	0.72	*	0.16	0.67	*	0.17
Permissive				1.19		0.13	1.14		0.13	1.06		0.14
Authoritarian (Authoritative)				0.69	**	0.15	0.87		0.16	0.85		0.17
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT (R3)												
Closeness												
Closeness Index							0.98		0.03	0.98		0.03
Support												
Support Index							1.08	*	0.03	1.07	*	0.03
Awareness												
Paternal Awareness Index							1.02		0.02	1.04		0.02
CONTROL VARIABLES												
Family Context (R3)												
Index of Family Routines										0.98		0.04
Gross Household Income (R1) - in thousands										1.00	***	0.00
# of co-resident children under age 18										0.85	***	0.03
Parental Characteristics												
Highest Household Educational Attainment (R1)												
Some college or more (High school or less)										1.82	***	0.13
Child Characteristics												
Gender (R1)												
Male (Female)										0.58	***	0.11
Race/Ethnicity (R1)												
Black										0.63	***	0.14
Hispanic										0.78		0.15
Other (White)										1.20		0.34
Age (R1)										1.20	**	0.06
Baseline Characteristics												
GPA (R3)										1.25	*	0.11
-2 Log Likelihood (df)	2844.5 (5)			2811.0 (8)		2781.1 (14)		2510.6 (26)				
N	3,950			3,950		3,950		3,950				

*p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001

Table 4: Odds Ratios for Logistic Regression Analysis of the Effects of living in a Single Custodial Father Family on Being Disconnected in Emerging Adulthood, NLSY 1997

	Disconnected											
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4					
	Odds Ratio	SE	Odds Ratio	SE	Odds Ratio	SE	Odds Ratio	SE				
FAMILY STRUCTURE (R3-5)												
Single Custodial Father - no cohabiting partners	2.21	**	0.28	2.15	**	0.28	2.16	**	0.28	1.84	*	0.29
Single Custodial Father - cohabiting partners	3.29	**	0.39	3.08	**	0.39	2.87	**	0.37	2.53	*	0.41
Single Custodial Mother - no cohabiting partners	2.40	***	0.11	2.37	***	0.11	2.32	***	0.11	1.38	**	0.11
Single Custodial Mother - cohabiting partners	2.22	**	0.25	2.14	**	0.25	2.09	**	0.24	1.53		0.25
Extended Family (Two Biological Parents--Married or Unmarried)	2.59	***	0.14	2.68	***	0.15	2.46	***	0.15	1.43	*	0.16
PARENTING STYLE (R3)												
Uninvolved				1.50	**	0.10	1.19	*	0.10	1.28		0.11
Permissive				0.94		0.09	0.92		0.09	0.97		0.09
Authoritarian (Authoritative)				1.28		0.08	1.02		0.11	1.03		0.11
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT (R3)												
Closeness												
Closeness Index							0.97		0.02	0.97		0.02
Support												
Support Index							0.91	**	0.02	0.92	**	0.02
Awareness												
Paternal Awareness Index							1.01		0.01	0.99		0.01
CONTROL VARIABLES												
Family Context (R3)												
Index of Family Routines										1.05	***	0.01
Gross Household Income (R1) - in thousands										1.00	***	0.00
# of co-resident children under age 18										1.08	*	0.02
Parental Characteristics												
Highest Household Educational Attainment (R1)												
Some college or more (High school or less)										0.80		0.13
Child Characteristics												
Gender (R1)												
Male (Female)										1.09		0.06
Race/Ethnicity (R1)												
Black										1.78	***	0.08
Hispanic										1.14		0.09
Other (White)										0.64		0.18
Age (R1)										0.95		0.04
-2 Log Likelihood (df)	3056.2 (5)		3041.6 (8)		3023.2 (14)		2859.5 (25)					
N	3,927		3,927		3,927		3,927					

*p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001