

May 2018

Fathers' Caregiving in Fragile Families: Variation by Family Contexts, Gender Ideology, Race and Ethnicity

Rachel Teressa Macfarlane
rachelraymacfarlane@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>



Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Macfarlane, Rachel Teressa, "Fathers' Caregiving in Fragile Families: Variation by Family Contexts, Gender Ideology, Race and Ethnicity" (2018). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 3283.

<https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/3283>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

FATHERS' CAREGIVING IN FRAGILE FAMILIES:
VARIATION BY FAMILY CONTEXTS, GENDER
IDEOLOGY, RACE AND ETHNICITY

By

Rachel Teressa Macfarlane

Bachelor of Arts – Sociology
Weber State University
2006

Master of Arts - Sociology
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
2013

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Doctor of Philosophy – Sociology

Department of Sociology
College of Liberal Arts
The Graduate College

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
May 2018

Copyright 2018 by Rachel Teressa Macfarlane
All Rights Reserved



Dissertation Approval

The Graduate College
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas

May 7, 2018

This dissertation prepared by

Rachel Teressa Macfarlane

entitled

Fathers' Caregiving in Fragile Families: Variation by Family Contexts, Gender Ideology,
Race and Ethnicity

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy – Sociology
Department of Sociology

Christie Batson, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Chair

Kathryn Hausbeck Korgan, Ph.D.
Graduate College Interim Dean

Georgiann Davis, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Co-Chair

Jennifer Keene, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Member

Terry Miethe, Ph.D.
Graduate College Faculty Representative

Abstract

Using data from the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study, I explore factors that predict fathers' caregiving for children up to five years old. I study the role of social contexts in fathers' caregiving trajectories for their young children, including family dynamics and parent's gender ideology, across ethnoracial groups. I use OLS regressions to investigate how fathers' early caregiving experiences, their linked-lives with others, and their attitudes about the fatherhood role predict later caregiving for their children, and how those patterns vary between families with different ethnoracial backgrounds. I use summed averages of itemized caregiving by fathers, rather than proxy measures for access or presence, and several measures of gendered ideology around the fatherhood role. The sample includes a diverse pool of fathers, particularly from vulnerable and underrepresented populations. These experiences are not monolithic, and we should seek to understand the intersectional experiences of fatherhood. As gendered expectations change over time, understanding the social contexts of caregiving in families allows us to better inform effective and supportive family policies, and make a more humane world for caregivers and those they care for. Results show that fathers' early caregiving predicts later caregiving, especially for white fathers. Fathers' consistent residency with the child predicted more caregiving when the child was five-years-old, and fewer people in the household predicted more caregiving by fathers when the child was three. White fathers were the only group for whom gender ideology variables had a significant relationship with caregiving: white fathers who agreed that men should work, and women should care did less caregiving. White fathers did more caregiving overall, but types of caregiving varied across ethnoracial groups. For white fathers, being older was associated with less

caregiving at five-years old. Black fathers with more education did more caregiving for five-year-old's. Lack of stable residency was associated with less caregiving for black fathers, compared to black fathers with less education. More people in Hispanic fathers' household predicted less caregiving for three-year-old's. In the full regression, no particular variable predicted caregiving by fathers in other ethnoracial groups. This study contributes to the body of knowledge about the contexts of fathers' caregiving.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Jennifer Keene for the time and mentorship that helped to launch this research, and for emphasizing the importance of time, agency and context, in my research and in my own life. Thank you to Drs. Christie Batson and Georgiann Davis for their generous time, attention and feedback as they helped shepherd this project through to the end. Drs. Barb Brents and Robert Futrell for their invaluable advice and willingness to listen. Dr. Monnat for being a Stats Goddess I hope to emulate, and for teaching students to rise to difficult challenges, and appreciate them. Thank you to Terry Miethe for the help and advice with my analysis along the way. Thank you to the Sociologists for Women in Society and Society for the Study of Social Problems, where I have found an academic home.

Thank you to both of my undergraduate professors, Dr. Ollilainen and Dr. Autumn Behringer for continuously connecting me with literature, communities, research and leadership opportunities that set me on the path to graduate school. I am especially indebted to Dr. Marjukka Ollilainen for her straight-forward and supportive advice over the years, for reassurance, and helping me to see red-ink as a gift of time and attention. Thank you to my high school English teacher and advisor, Marie Schweitzer for inspiring me to enjoy going above and beyond, to treasure learning and writing, and to trust myself to take charge and make bold choices.

Thank you to my celebrity research crushes. Carl Sagan reminds me that in the social world as in the physical, “the beauty of a living thing is not the atoms that go into it, but the way those atoms come together,” and science is an awesome responsibility. Thank you to Gloria Anzaldúa, Kimberlé Crenshaw, Patricia Hill-Collins, bell hooks,

Dorothy Smith, Joan Acker, Hans Rosling, and so many others, for inspiring me to do better research, to appreciate social locations, to be more inclusive and innovative in my methods, and more critical in my analysis.

I would like to thank my family for their optimism and enthusiasm for my goals. I would like to acknowledge that over the years I have strained, lost, gained, and strengthened relationships in pursuit of this research. I am grateful for all the support over the years from Teresa & Robert Loris, Alice Hunt, and Wanda & Robert Shepherd. Sara Macfarlane Burns, Audrey Macfarlane Shapiro, Darcy Macfarlane Robinson, Samuel Macfarlane, and Lisa Macfarlane for providing editing, caregiving, advise, distraction, patience and understanding when I needed it most.

Dedication

This research is dedicated to the caregivers in my own family. Not one of us has had a similar path through it, but we have found and forged ways to give each other what we need. I look forward to years of building our lives together and enjoying the act of caring for one another, and caring for others, together.

Table of Contents:

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements.....	v
Dedication	vii
Table of Contents.....	viii
List of Tables.....	x
Chapter 1: Caregiving in Fragile Families	
o Introduction.....	1
o Sociological Contribution.....	3
o Theoretical Perspective.....	5
o Caregiving Literature	7
Chapter 2: Methods	
o Research Questions.....	12
o Methods.....	14
o Fragile Families Data.....	14
o Variables.....	18
o Analytic Plan.....	27
Chapter 3: Caregiving in Family Contexts	
o Introduction.....	30
o Family Contexts Literature Review.....	30
o Research Questions.....	35
o Hypotheses.....	36
o Data and Methods.....	37
o Results.....	43
o Discussion.....	48
Chapter 4: Caregiving by Gender Ideology	
o Introduction.....	55
o Gender Ideology Literature Review.....	56
o Research Questions.....	60
o Hypotheses.....	60
o Data and Methods	61
o Results.....	64
o Discussion.....	67
Chapter 5: Caregiving by Race and Ethnicity	
o Introduction.....	70
o Race and Ethnicity Literature Review.....	70
o Research Questions.....	76
o Hypotheses.....	76
o Data and Methods.....	76
o Results.....	83

o Discussion.....	94
Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusions	
o Overview	97
o Contributions.....	97
o Limitations and Future Work.....	114
Appendix	
o Tables.....	117
o Additional Tables.....	134
o End Notes.....	136
Bibliography.....	137
Curriculum Vitae.....	151

List of Tables:

Table 2.1: Descriptive Statistics for Variables.....117

Table 2.2: Analytic Plan Overview.....118

Table 3.1: Father's Mean Caregiving by Variables in Chapter 3:
Caregiving by Family Context..... 119

Table 3.2: Analytic Plan and Regression Modeling for Chapter 3:
Caregiving by Family Context.....120

Table 3.3: Father's Later Caregiving Predicted by Earlier Caregiving
and Family Context..... 121

Table 4.1: Father's Mean Caregiving by Variables in Chapter 4:
Caregiving by Gender Ideology.....122

Table 4.2: Analytic Plan and Regression Modeling for Chapter 4:
Caregiving by Gender Ideology.....123

Table 4.3: Father's Early Caregiving Predicting Later Caregiving by
Gender Ideology.....124

Table 5.1: Father's Specific Caregiving Activities by Race and Ethnicity....125

Table 5.2: Father's Mean Caregiving by Variables in Chapter 5:
Caregiving by Race and Ethnicity.....126

Table 5.3: Analytic Plan and Regression Modeling for Chapter 5:
Caregiving by Race and Ethnicity.....127

Table 5.4: Father's Caregiving at Year Three and Five Predicted by
Earlier Caregiving, All Families.....128

Table 5.5: Father's Caregiving at Year Three and Five Predicted by
Earlier Caregiving, White Families.....129

Table 5.6: Father's Caregiving at Year Three and Five Predicted by
Earlier Caregiving, Black Families.....130

Table 5.7: Father's Caregiving at Year Three and Five Predicted by
Earlier Caregiving, Hispanic Families.....131

Table 5.8: Father's Caregiving at Year Three and Five Predicted by
Earlier Caregiving, Other Families.....132

Table 5.9: Father's Caregiving at Year Three and Five Predicted by
Earlier Caregiving, Ethnoracial Comparison.....133

Table A1: Research Questions.....134

Table A2: Hypotheses for Each Chapter.....134

Table A.3: Available Variable Responses for Items of Interest.....135

Chapter 1: Caregiving in Fragile Families

Introduction

Since the 1960's women have drastically increased their contributions to the paid labor market, while men have made modest increases in their contributions to domestic labor, despite increased expectation for men to engage in caregiving (Brewster and Padavic 2000; Brooks and Bolzendahl 2004; Ciabattari 2001; Coltrane 1996; Davis and Greenstein 2009; England 2010; Campbell and Carroll 2007). While many scholars point out that egalitarian trends in paid and domestic work and the progress of the gender revolution has stalled since the 1990's, the family remains the primary institution in which gender inequality is both reproduced and recreated (Campbell and Carroll 2007; England 2010; Gerson 2010; Hochschild 1997; Hochschild and Machung 2012; Goldscheider et al. 2015; Gerstel and Gallagher 2001). Men's lesser participation in domestic work serves as a bottleneck in the unfinished gender revolution (Ferree 2010; Gerson 2002; Lee & Tang 2013). This bottleneck continues to have implications for families. Without men taking up the domestic mantle at comparable levels to women's employment, women continue to perform second shift duties while men continue to miss out on experiences and relationships that develop via caregiving (Hochschild and Machung 2012).

To date, research has shown that both men and women have become more egalitarian about gendered labor (on topics such as who should earn and who should care, whether mothers can care while working, etc) (Cotter, Hermsen and Vanneman 2011; 2014; England 2010). However, there is reason to believe that this pattern may reverse, and less egalitarian attitudes may be on the rise (Pepin and Cotters 2017; Fate-Dixon

2017). A combination of factors has contributed to men's slow entrance into the domestic sphere, including structural constraints, such as the absence of policies supporting workers who do caregiving, individual strategies to preserve masculine gender performance, as well as reticence to let go of existing privilege (Brines 1994; Gerson 2010; Risman 2004). Research has connected gender ideology and performing caregiving (Zuo 2004). Men's caregiving is shaped by their family contexts and economic realities (Chang and White-Means 1991; Tach, Mincy and Edin 2010; Vespa 2009).

Family contexts, such as fathers' residency with the child and marriage to the mother, impact fathers' caregiving and attitudes differently across ethnoracial categories (Shannon, Cabrera, Tamis-LeMondac, and Lamb 2009; Vespa 2009; Jones and Mosher 2013; Cabrera, Hofferth and Chae 2011). Parents' and especially fathers' gender ideology about fatherhood are important factors as to how fathers participate in caregiving (Bulanda 2004; Meteyer and Perry-Jenkins 2010; Adamsons and Pasley 2013; Gaunt 2006; Zou 2004). Even still, questions remain about how men's caregiving trajectories are shaped, how family formation and household composition predict men's caregiving, how care changes over time, and how vulnerable family types share in caregiving.

While much of the existing research on family caregiving of children focuses on nuclear families, coresidential parents and dual earners, there is limited scholarship exploring parental caregiving duties in families that remain vulnerable, such as single-parent households, father-only households, and households with multiple partner-transitions over the course of a child's life (Gerstel 2011; Powell et al. 2012). This study explores important questions about men's caregiving for their children over time and examines how father's caregiving is shaped across family contexts, across racial and

ethnic lines, across diverse educational and labor force experiences, and across gender ideologies. I use the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being (Fragile Families) data to bridge the gaps in the literature by examining how these relationships manifest among vulnerable families who live in more complicated circumstances. With a focus on changing caregiving patterns over time, I use an intersectional framework and life-course theories to examine how caregiving patterns change for fathers as their children age from birth to five years old.

Sociological Contribution

In this dissertation, I study the role of social contexts in fathers' caregiving trajectories for their young children, including family dynamics and parent's gender ideology, across ethnoracial groups. I investigate how fathers' early caregiving experiences, their linked-lives with others, and their attitudes about the fatherhood role predict later caregiving for their children, and how those patterns vary between families with different ethnoracial backgrounds. I am able to use measures of fathers' caregiving, rather than proxy measures for access or presence, and several measures of gendered ideology around the fatherhood role. The sample includes a diverse pool of fathers, particularly from vulnerable and underrepresented populations. These experiences are not monolithic, and we should seek to understand the intersectional experiences of fatherhood. As gendered expectations change through time, understanding the social contexts of caregiving in families allows us to better inform effective and supportive family policies, and make a more humane world for caregivers and those they care for. This study contributes to the body of knowledge about the contexts of fathers' caregiving.

The Fragile Families data allow for the exploration of in-depth questions about how fathers' caregiving trajectories are shaped, particularly for poor, minority and nonresident fathers. Because the Fragile Families dataset includes both mothers and fathers in longitudinal data collection, the data afford me a unique opportunity to explore fathers' caregiving of their children over time, regardless of their relationship status or living arrangements with the child's mother. Although previous scholars have looked at various iterations of fatherhood accessibility, contact, involvement, presence and caregiving, none have examined the trajectory of fathers' caregiving for their child over time using the specific caregiving activity items available in the dataset, which is an advantage over only being able to count a fathers' presence as involvement, since this measure details actual caregiving.

One previous study approaches the Fragile Families data with a life-course perspective, investigating the impact of prenatal caregiving for the mother on later caregiving for the child (Cabrera et al 2008). They use measures of fathers' support for mothers during pregnancy as prenatal caregiving, as it relates to fathers' caregiving for their child at one and three years old. Their research investigates the life-course trajectories of fathers' caregiving over time, finding that involvement at the transition into fatherhood predicts fathers' later caregiving. I build on that line of research by investigating fathers' caregiving trajectories starting at year one and impacting their later caregiving at years three and five.

The Fragile Families study is designed specifically to follow these types of families over time. Using this dataset allows me to look at the experiences of families as they are in much richer contexts than in previous research. I am able to investigate the

diverse experiences of fathers across different ethnoracial groups, economic situations, household arrangements, and to consider how gender ideologies play out across those experiences. Using the Fragile Families dataset, I am able to study families as they really are, with a representative sample that includes the most vulnerable as well as wealthier and married parents. I compare families living together with families spread across households, paying attention to the linked-lives of parents living with other adults and caring for other children, accounting for changing family and work dynamics over the years. This dataset allows me to approach fathers' early caregiving experiences as trajectories that are being shaped by time-specific experiences. This life-course framework combined with the Fragile Families dataset allows me to pay closer attention to intersectional factors within family experiences, for example, exploring how family contexts matter differently for different ethnoracial groups, and how gender ideologies specific to fatherhood shape caregiving within these contexts. I investigate how father's lives are embedded in their social contexts and by looking for differences in fathers' caregiving trajectories across diverse ethnoracial identities, family contexts, and gender ideology.

[Figure 1 about here]

Theoretical Perspectives on the Life Course and Fragile Families

This dissertation is theoretically framed by a life-course perspective. Life-course perspectives focus on the interconnectedness of the lives of individuals and follow the developmental trajectories of individuals embedded within the contexts of numerous relationships over their lives (Elder 1994). Different areas of our lives are connected and need to be looked at holistically and with special attention to specific moments of change.

In the context of this study, I examine early caregiving as a predictor of fathers' participation in caregiving as the child ages.

Life-course theories focus on events and transitions, which we experience in connection to other people in our linked-lives, constrain future options and shape our age-graded trajectories of work and family (Elder 1994). Using a life-course perspective, I investigate how fathers' caregiving trajectories are shaped by their family and household contexts, their gender ideologies around fatherhood, and the ethnoraical makeup of the family.

Cabrera, Fagan and Farrie (2008) draw on life-course perspectives using the Fragile Families data to observe fathers' caregiving trajectories starting before the focal child is born. They found that prenatal contributions to the mother predicted father's participation in various caregiving activities at years one and three, even when controlling for caregiving at year one. Their research suggests that early timing and involvement in caregiving is important for fathers' caregiving trajectories as they transition into fatherhood. I extend this research to see if fathers' caregiving in the first year also predicts fathers' caregiving trajectories in later years.

The interconnectedness of fathers' lives is also demonstrated in Townsend's theory of the Package Deal (2002). In a qualitative study of men who graduated from the same high school in California in the 1970s, Townsend (2002) found that men think of fatherhood as a "package deal." In this model, men's conception of fatherhood requires that a man financially provides for a wife who is the mother of cohabitating, biological children and provides care on his behalf (Townsend 2002). A failure in any one part is seen as a disintegration of the whole, so that each piece is reliant on the others. From this

view, successful fatherhood requires that men fulfill all four components of the package deal. Under the package deal schema, an interruption in the relationship with the mother interrupts the relationship a father has vicariously through her with his children.

Supporting this, a more recent evaluation of the package deal model of fatherhood and masculinity has found that unmarried fathers become less involved in children's lives after their relationship with the child's mother ends, showing that men's identities as fathers are intertwined with their identities as partners (Tach, Mincy and Edin 2010).

Caregiving Literature

In this section I provide some terms and definitions that I use throughout my dissertation in reference to caregiving and provide an overview of what we know about fathers' caregiving and factors that are associated with it.

Research on family caregiving spans several disciplines and uses various terms for similar concepts. For clarity, it is important that I differentiate between the key terms used in this project. Key concepts relevant to this study include *caregiving* and *carework*. I draw on research on family caregiving and use these terms based on their definitions in the research literature. Meyer (2000) identifies research in gerontology as the original source of the term caregiver, differentiating between those receiving and providing care. She discusses the important difference between conceptualizing care within families as *caregiving*, which implies that care is freely given, but also ignores the gendered and ideological pressure that women face to care and the unpaid costs that are involved in caregiving (Meyer 2000). New theories that account for the disparate emotional, economic, physical and familial burdens of care reframe the work done by caregivers as carework, whether paid or unpaid (Meyer 2000; England 2005).

In this dissertation, I use the term *carework*, to include any physical or mental labor to care for others in the broadest sense throughout society, including elder care, child care, paid and unpaid labor (England 2005). I use the term *caregiving* to refer to individuals doing care, taking care, care taking, caring, or in any sense providing unpaid care for children in their families, and those who are doing caregiving are caregivers (Meyer 2000). I also use the term caregiving to refer to the scale of fathers' involvement in age-appropriate care, measured when focal children of the families in the study are about one, three and five years old.

While carework may not be as readily thought of as a men's issue, framing carework as a women's issue contributes to the idea that care is an innate part of womanhood, that families only take one particular form, and ignores that men are both consumers and providers of care. For example, according to the Family Caregiver Alliance, men make up 40% of informal caregivers (National Alliance of Caregivers and AARP 2015:16). Understanding the gendered discrepancies in the provision of caregiving and unpaid work is important in forging happier, better families and relationships. Men's participation in family is couched within gendered constructions of fatherhood.

Men's participation in caregiving has received increased attention (Goldscheider et al. 2015; Gerstel and Gallagher 2001). Changes in national demographics, gender ideology, family policies, and work force participation all point to the continued need to study men who participate (or not) in carework (Goldscheider et al. 2015). The social narrative of families in the last century has been one of families adapting to economic developments and cultural changes that expand individual rights. These macro changes

reveal both adaptations and holdouts in the division of labor between parents, contributions of extended family, the role of children, the state, and the community. Previous research fails to analyze the role of men in gendered divisions of labor, privileging masculinity and nuclear family formations as unmarked categories.

Although much of the research on fatherhood focuses on increasing men's caregiving, a substantial body of research demonstrates the extent to which many men do participate in caregiving and the ways in which their caregiving experiences are both similar to, as well as different than, women's. Research has underemphasized gender sameness in caregiving practices (Connell 2009; Keene and Quadagno 2004). For example, one study (Thompson 2002) points out that fathers' average 15.5 hours per week of care compared to mothers who average 18.8 hours of care shows sameness as well as difference. Some older research suggests that increases in men's caregiving are centered mostly around play activity (Pleck 1997), while more recent counts have shown more rounded increases that do include routine caregiving (Sayer, Bianchi and Robinson 2004). The point is that men are already caregivers. Men have an investment in being involved in carework.

In addition to involvement in some family of origin, most people partner and have children (Cherlin 2010). Men care about the women in their lives who are made dependent and financially crippled by policies that do not reward mixing unpaid family labor and paid work (Tamborini, Iams and Whitman 2009; Folbre 2001; Crompton 2001; Crittenden 2001). Structural policies tie social welfare programs to employment, unequal pay, and normative care arrangements, which thwart women's work positions, leaving women dependent on men and thereby vulnerable to being left out of social security and

pensions in old age (Tamborni et al. 2009). Disparities are exacerbated in many ways for less privileged groups, particularly the less educated, people of color, and women with children (Meyer 2000).

Despite the battle-of-the-sexes mentality that is perpetuated in sensational media, most relationships between men and women are not a zero-sum game, and men want to be providers and caregivers (Gerson 1993; 2010; Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Townsend 2002). Everyone is involved in family at some point. We all participate in one way, or at one time or another in the course of our lives, often in collaboration with extended, blended and uncharted family forms, but despite this, family and particularly caregiving are usually framed as a women's issue in a heteronormative household. Kathleen Gerson has been studying the problem of framing family and carework as a woman's issue for two decades. In *No Man's Land* (Gerson 1993), she uses qualitative methods to discuss shifts in men's relationships to work and family care. In her study, 38% of men wanted to be "involved fathers" and valued family participation over paid work. In addition, men's experiences of caregiving shaped the way men felt and thought about egalitarian divisions of domestic labor (Gerson 1993).

Families are also potential sites for changing gender norms. Particularly, research shows that men want closer relationships to children that come through caregiving (Gerson 2010; Jacobs and Gerson 2004). Many men want to work less than they do (Hochschild 1997; Hochschild and Machung 2012; Moen and Sweet 2004).

Ethnographers have discussed the production and reproduction of gender inequitable divisions as a result of men's gender performances which reject caregiving in a nostalgic, but ineffective attempt to reenact a time when men could financially support families by

their employment alone (Rios 2011; Anderson 2000; Bourgois 2002). Even when men are interested in gender equality, they may undermine it to preserve their own masculine gender performance, especially when gender equality might be difficult. For example, unemployed men might do less housework when they are unemployed since their gender performance is already threatened (Brines 1994) or when men are presented with a scenario in which they want to, but are unable to negotiate an egalitarian household arrangement, claim they would opt for a relationship in which they work, and women stay home (Gerson 2010; 2015).

In studying gendered tasks in parenthood, scholars have emphasized concerns about self-report bias. Previous research has shown that men and women have biased self-assessments of their own abilities to do gendered tasks that do not match their own identity (Correll 2001). This is the notion that men may evaluate themselves as worse, and women may evaluate themselves as better at gendered tasks like carework. However, Hernandez and Coley (2007) found that both fathers' and mothers' reports of fathers' involvement with children are reliable, but fathers' reports of their own involvement with children were more consistent than mothers' reports of fathers' involvement and that either can be used for father involvement measures.

Each analytical chapter of this dissertation addresses a specific factor in predicting fathers' caregiving and focuses on different key variables that accompany fathers' caregiving in year one as main predictors of later caregiving. In Chapter 2, I describe the main research questions that will guide my investigations, discuss my methods and the variables used in each of the analyses, then review specific literatures and my analytic plan for each topic in the chapters ahead.

Chapter 2: Methods

Research Questions

My primary focus is to investigate the factors that shape fathers' caregiving of their children in the first five years of their children's lives, starting with the relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving, family contexts, gender ideology, and differences across ethnoracial groups. Overall, I want to know, what are the social contexts that shape fathers' caregiving? My research is guided by the four primary research questions listed below.

- 1) Is there a relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving as the child ages from one to five years old?
- 2) How does the relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving differ across family contexts? More specifically, how might fathers' caregiving be shaped by their living situations, the people with whom they live, and other people who might be living in the home with their children?
- 3) How does the relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving differ among families who do not share similar gender ideologies? How might a father's gender ideology shape their caregiving and to what extent are gender ideologies and caregiving interrelated?
- 4) How does the relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving differ across racial and ethnic families? In essence, do racial and ethnic cultural differences in family forms manifest through fathers' caregiving patterns?

Chapter 3 is the first analytic chapter, which examines the social contexts in which fathers live. Fathers' experiences are impacted by the people around them. I analyze

fathers' residency with their coparent and with their child, the effect of mothers living with new partners, the presence of other adults who live with fathers, especially grandmothers, fathers' other children, particularly children since the birth of the focal child and gender of the focal child. Using these variables, I investigate how family contexts shape father's caregiving, asking how the availability of family and household members shape fathers' caregiving trajectories.

Chapter 4 is the second analytic chapter, which investigates how parents', and particularly how fathers' gender ideologies around fatherhood impact fathers' caregiving. I utilize new variables unique to this dataset that measure how they value caregiving by fathers, how they identify as fathers, and how they view gendered obligations to work and home. By looking at these questions, I hope to mirror and add to extant research with the added benefit of the diversity captured by the Fragile Families sample. I ask how gender ideologies about fatherhood and caregiving impact fathers' caregiving, for men of different backgrounds.

Chapter 5 is the final analytical chapter, which explores how the relationship between early caregiving and later caregiving differ across racial and ethnic families. With this set of variables, I can also focus on how racial and ethnic (or ethnoracial) differences in fathers' caregiving vary by economic factors like poverty, employment and education. Specifically, I ask how fathers' caregiving trajectories vary differently for coparents who are white, black, Hispanic or other groups including couples in mixed relationships.

In a concluding chapter I summarize and discuss my findings.

Methods

Here, I discuss the unique features of and some relevant findings from the Fragile Families data set. I provide some basic descriptive statistics as a snapshot of families in my analytic sample. Lastly, I specify how I have operationalized and coded the variables that I use in the analyses in the chapters ahead.

Fragile Families Data

The Fragile Families study is a first-of-its-kind project conducted at Princeton University. The ongoing project is a joint venture of Princeton University's Center for Research on Child Wellbeing, Center for Health and Wellbeing, the Columbia Population Research Center, and the National Center for Children and Families at Columbia University (Fragile Families 2016). The study was designed to focus on questions about the "conditions and capabilities" of unmarried parents, especially fathers, the nature of relationships between unmarried parents, how children fare, and how policies and environment affect families (Fragile Families 2016).

Data are nationally representative, collected from a multi-tiered random sample (cities, hospitals and individuals were all selected randomly) of parents of children born between 1998 and 2000 across twenty U.S. cities with populations over 20,000, from 75 hospitals (Fragile Families 2016). The study follows the families of nearly 5,000 children, so far, up to age fifteen years. Mothers and fathers were interviewed in person at the hospital birth, then researchers followed up with both over the phone and in person at one year, three years, five years, nine years, and fifteen years. One quarter of the sample serves as a comparison group, while three-fourths are part of an oversampling of families

considered to be truly fragile, that is, families with an unwed birth. The study made a special focus on collecting data from unmarried fathers.

As expected, following families through time is difficult, therefore weights are provided to help account for non-response at baseline and attrition bias on observed characteristics over the waves. About 78% of fathers were interviewed within the first week of their child being born, 89% of married fathers, and 75% of unmarried fathers, then contacted again by phone at years 1 (89%), 3 (86%) and 5 (85%). I use the basic weight for couples at baseline, since that is where I have the most respondents, and use the basic weight as well as 33 replicate weights in a jackknife procedure, as recommended by the Fragile Families weight guidelines (Fragile Families 2008).

For this study the unit of analysis is the family, using questions asked of the parents of the focal child. The Fragile Families study follows the child born at baseline as its unit of analysis, which means that by using this data, the focus remains on the child even as family formations and relationships shift and evolve over time. The strength of this design is that we can see the dynamics and changes in family units across time, and within context of networks of people rather than housing or legal arrangements. Using Fragile Families data allows me to take a more nuanced look into family life and family caregiving. My goal is to examine whole family units, including other adults in the household in a variety of residential arrangements. Fragile Families questions about parental relationships allow for an analysis that compares parents who are in the home or not, rather than married or not, which provides a better measure for the proximity of parents to each other and availability for caregiving for children. Additionally, Fragile Families asks about other household members and their relationship to the parent, so the

analysis includes indicators for paternal grandmothers and other adults who could be potential caregivers in the household.

While this dataset allows for a complex look at families who have recently had children, the data collection design restricts my sample to recent parents, which likely excludes the coparenting experiences of same sex couples. While this is limiting, I try to take advantage of the strengths of the dataset, which allow for a quantitative analysis of families across households and generations. Another challenge for my dissertation analyses is including all the relevant variables while maintaining a sufficient enough number of families to keep up statistical power. As seen in the literature cited here, there are many factors that go into caregiving, ideology and parenting relationships, and despite all efforts, there are only so many families followed throughout the entire study.

[Table 2.1 about here]

Analytic Sample Characteristics

This analytic sample taken from families who have valid information for all variables of interest, which amounts to 1,020 families in Chapters 3 and 5, and 993 in Chapter 4. Table 2.1 includes descriptive statistics for all variables in the analysis, using the analytic sample of 1020 and weighted with the national baseline family weights (f1natwt). My description of the sample begins with ethnoracial, work and education backgrounds, then summarizes family contexts including residency and gender ideologies about family.

Parents who were both white make up 42% of families, while 14% were both black, 28% were both Hispanic, and 16% were another category or from multiple categories. Between year one and year three, 23% of fathers had experienced unstable

employment, and 35% had by year five. About 24% of fathers' households earned below the poverty line for the number of people in the household sometime between year one and year three, rising to 27% by year five. For mothers, 26% of their households were in poverty by year three and 30% by year five. Fathers ranged in age from 16 to 53 with an average age of 31. Mothers ranged in age from 15 to 43 with an average age of 28.

Among fathers, 17% had less than a high school education, 26% had a high school education, 33% had some college or technical school and 23% had a college degree or graduate education. Among mothers, 19% had less than a high school education, 28% had a high school education, 25% had some college or technical school, and 27% had a college degree or graduate education. By the time the child was about three, 7% of fathers had been to jail, which stayed the same at year five.

At year three, 89% of men lived with their child's mother between the time their child was one and five years old, 11% had mixed residency or had never resided with the mother. At year five, 81% of men lived regularly with their child's mother, another 14% had mixed residency or lived stably apart. In 1% of families, the mother lived with another partner at some point between when the child was one and three years old, which increased to 5% by the time the child was five years old. Father's reports at one and three years show that 90% of fathers regularly lived with their child, while 10% had mixed or no residency (reporting half, sometimes or weekend residency or never living with their child). By year five, 85% of fathers lived with their child and 15% had mixed or no residency with their child. At year three, 13% of fathers have a grandmother living with them, and by year five, grandmothers live in 16% of fathers' households. The number of people in fathers' households averaged around 2.2 through years one, three and five.

Fathers had an average of 2.51 children by year five, and 32% of fathers had or expected another child by year three. Baby boys were the focal child of 57% of families.

Parents who did not both agree that direct care is a “very important” part of fatherhood made up 28% of the sample. Fathers who did not have a strong fatherhood identity, (strongly agree with three measures of the importance of fatherhood in their lives) made up 33% of the sample. When asked two questions about the role of men at work and home 40% of men agreed that it’s better for men to work and women to care, and 84% disagreed that men’s family time is more important than spending as much time as possible at work.

Variables

-Caregiving

Fragile Families data includes measures fathers’ participation in specific, age appropriate caregiving activities reported by mothers and fathers, 8 items at year one, 13 items at year three, and 8 items at year five. Weighing the options of which reporter to use, I reviewed how previous research has used each, and discussed their benefits and challenges. Mikelson (2008) analyzed the discrepancies between mother and father’s reports of caregiving on these items in the Fragile Families data and found that fathers report more caregiving, especially when parents were living together, and recommends taking advantage of fathers’ first-hand accounts of their caregiving rather than relying on mothers’ reports.¹

Fagan and Palkovitz (2011) also used the father’s report from Fragile Families of father’s caregiving measures at years one, three, and five, making composite measures for the items rather than subscales (excluded peek-a-boo and gotcha in year one). Cabrera

et al (2008) used father reports of the caregiving items in the Fragile Families data at years one and three, noting that using mother's reports would have limited the sample due to skip patterns.

Goldberg (2015) used mother's responses about fathers helps to reduce attrition problems and includes their experiences and perceptions of caregiving for the child. Mother's responses also ask about feeding and changing diapers that are missing in the father's questions, which are especially important given the mixed results of research investigating whether fathers are increasing contributions to routine care as well as play with children (Pleck 1997; Sayer, Bianchi and Robinson 2004). The questions asked of fathers do include information about feeding and putting children to bed, but it is unfortunate that they were not asked about feeding and putting to bed in the year one interviews. Despite this, I use the father's data for the reasons mentioned before.

For my primary independent variable, I created an index based on the eight questions that ask about the frequency that fathers do specific caregiving tasks over a week. When the child was one year old, fathers were asked how many days a week they engage in age-appropriate caregiving, including: play games like peek-a-boo or gotcha with the child, sing songs or nursery rhymes to the child, read stories to the child, tell stories to child, play inside with the child with toys such as blocks or Legos, take the child to visit relatives, hug or show physical affection to the child, and put the child to bed. The Cronbach's alpha for these items together is .825. I sum and average the reports from these questions to come up with an average weekly frequency for fathers' caregiving.

For my dependent variables, I create a similar index for fathers' caregiving at years three and five. At year three, fathers were asked how many days per week they did thirteen age-appropriate care items, including sings songs or nursery rhymes, reads stories, tells stories, play inside with child with toys such as blocks or Legos, take child to visit relatives, tell the child something they did was appreciated, hug or show child physical affection, tell child they love them, play imaginary games, play outside at a park or playground, take child to an outing like a restaurant, assist with feeding, and put child to bed. The Cronbach's alpha for these items together is .850. I sum and average the reports from these questions to come up with an average weekly frequency for fathers' caregiving.

At year five, fathers were asked how often in the last week they engaged in eight age-appropriate care items, including sing songs or nursery rhymes to the child, read stories to the child, tell stories to child, play inside with the child with toys such as blocks or Legos, tell the child something they did was appreciated, plays outside in the yard, park or playground, take child on an outing such as shopping, or to a restaurant, church, museum, or special activity or event, and watch television or a video together. The Cronbach's alpha for these items together is .831. I sum and average the reports to create an index from these questions that can be understood in terms of an average weekly frequency for fathers' caregiving.

-Race

Throughout this research I use the term ethnoracial to describe families ethnic and racial identification. By ethnoracial, I mean, the current research configuration of definitions and categories that delineate people into exhaustive, mutually exclusive

groups of ethnic and racial self-identification. Most research and common forms ask a series of questions about race and Hispanic origin, recording and recoding individuals into ethnoracial categories. This schema records individuals as Hispanic of any racial group, non-Hispanic whites, non-Hispanic blacks, non-Hispanic Asians and non-Hispanic Natives, and others. The category of other often includes people who belong to unknown groups, multiple categories, and people from groups with small populations. Because of this sample's small numbers of Asians, Natives, and people who identify as having more than one racial category, they will be combined into an "other" category for this analysis.

Father and mothers' ethnoracial identities indicated using a set of dummy variables for the couple, including: both parents are white non-Hispanic (reference), both are black non-Hispanic, both are Hispanic of any race, and other, meaning either parent is in another ethnoracial category or parents are in different categories from one another.

- Parents' age

Mother and fathers' age are measured as continuous variables.

-Employment

To examine the work situations within families, I have recoded measures for number of hours fathers worked in the last week and the number of weeks in the year which fathers worked during years one, three and five. For analyses that involve fathers' caregiving in year three, I use a dichotomous variable that indicate whether fathers have worked less than thirty hours a week, or fewer than forty weeks in a year in either year one or three, leaving those with stable, fulltime employment as a reference. I use a similar variable that includes fathers' work experiences at years one, three and five in analyses that use fathers' caregiving at year five as the dependent variable.

Waller (2009) uses data from qualitative interviews with parents in the Fragile Families data set and finds that “while some motivated and skilled men actively chose to become caregivers with the support of mothers, others developed new motivations, skills, and parenting supports in response to situations in which they were out of work or the mother was experiencing challenges” (156). Hofferth and Goldscheider (2010) found that fathers were more involved in caregiving in dual earning situations, and less involved as primary breadwinners.

- Education

Mothers’ and fathers’ household income are continuous variables at years one, three and five. Fathers’ and mothers’ education is a series of dummy variables: less than high school, finished high school but went no further (reference), some college or technical school, and finished a college or graduate degree.

Previous research with the Fragile Families data evaluates the role of money and education in union formation, finding that men’s economic status does in fact encourage unions, as does mothers’ economic status. Education is associated with either breaking up or getting together, rather than remaining in the “visiting” limbo, in which couples maintain a romantic relationship living apart while coparenting (Carlson, McLanahan and England 2004). Considering previous research on the importance of residency on childbearing, this indirect relationship between employment and caregiving could be important (Cabrera et al 2008).

-Incarceration

Fathers may be unavailable for caregiving if they are incarcerated, so I also include a dummy variable indicating if the father was ever incarcerated by year three

(coded 1) for analysis with fathers' caregiving at year three as dependent variable, leaving fathers who have not as reference. For analyses focusing on fathers' caregiving at year five, I include a dummy variable that indicates if the father was ever incarcerated by year five (coded 1), leaving un-incarcerated fathers as reference.

Stykes (2015) also included illegal activity as a barrier to fathers' involvement, differentiating between regular, illegal, other, and no employment, theorizing that fathers are less involved when they are participating in illegal work, due to mothers' gatekeeping or out of a sense of responsibility to distance themselves (Myers 2013). The ramifications of illegal activity may also keep fathers out of caregiving. Geller (2013) used Fragile Families data to determine how incarceration impacted father involvement and found that most incarcerated fathers lived apart but kept contact with children before being locked up, and that probability of coresidence and visitation dropped dramatically after release.

-Father's residency with mother of their child

In changing families, it is difficult to decide how to measure families through time. Researchers have analyzed this a number of ways, even getting innovative. For example, although relationship status generally treated as a nominal variable, Carlson and McLanahan (2001) in their working paper conceptualized relationships in Fragile Families couples as an ordered status, ranging from no relationship (little or no contact), friends, visiting, cohabiting to married.

To investigate parents' relationships, I adapt Cabrera et al's (2008) and Goldberg's (2015) models and use measures of relationship transitions. I created dummy variables for transitions in relationship status by using the constructed variables in the data set that indicate if parents are married, cohabiting, separated, divorced, romantic,

friends, or acquaintance), at each time point, indicating whether or not parents were residential at both times, stably resident (reference), or not. Unstable residents have mixed residency, changing from nonresidential to residential, from residential to nonresidential, or were stably nonresidential at both time points. Separate variables were created to include only years one and three in the analyses that use fathers' caregiving at time three as the dependent variable, and years one three and five for analyses using fathers' caregiving at time five for the dependent variable.

-Mother's residency with other partners

Following the example of Tach et al (2010), I also include a measure for whether mothers have a new partner. I combine mothers' reports of cohabiting with or being married to a new partner at year one, three and five and then recoded it into a dummy variable with 1 indicating that mothers had a new live-in partner, and left mothers with no residential partner as reference. Again, separate variables were created to include only years one and three in the analyses that use fathers' caregiving at time three as the dependent variable, and years one three and five for analyses using fathers' caregiving at time five for the dependent variable.

-Father's coresidence with the child

Fathers in the Fragile Family study have dynamic lives, and their residency status with their children changes across time. To capture those residency transitions I have mirrored the parental residency by recoding fathers into dummy variables. Fathers who are stably resident (reference) have reported living with their child "all the time" at all three time-points. A dummy variable for those who are not stable residents includes fathers who report having their child half the time, sometimes, on the weekend or a mix

of statuses, or not at all during the interviews up to that timepoint. Separate variables were created to include only years one and three in the analyses that use fathers' caregiving at time three as the dependent variable, and years one three and five for analyses using fathers' caregiving at time five for the dependent variable.

- Adults in father's household

In consideration of fathers' linked lives with other people, I include a variable to account for other adults that might be available in fathers' households to assist. I combine reports from years one, three, and five into a dummy variable that indicates whether a grandmother was in the father's household at any point that caregiving is measured, with one indicating a grandmother was present (coded 1), leaving no grandmother as a reference. Additionally, I use continuous variables that count the number of people in the father's household at years one, three, and five.

- Fathers' additional children

For analyses that use fathers' caregiving as a dependent variable, fathers' other children are measured by a continuous variable representing the number of children that a father had or expected by year three. For analyses that use fathers' caregiving as a dependent variable, fathers' other children are measured by a continuous variable representing the number of children a father reported by year five.

- Gender of the child

The gender of the focal child is indicated by a dummy variable coded 1 for families with baby boys and 0 for families with baby girls.

-Parents agreement about direct care in fatherhood role

I use questions asked of mothers about the importance of fathers' caregiving at the time of birth. I constructed dummy variables to indicate a combination of mothers and father's attitudes about fathers' caregiving as a part of the fatherhood role, answered at birth. Overwhelmingly, most parents agreed that it was important, indicating something specific and unique about parents who did not indicate direct care as "very important." In a similar situation described in the next variable, researchers dichotomized the variable to indicate the parents who responded against the trend (Goldberg 2015). Parents who answered, "somewhat important" or "not very important" were combined (coded 1), leaving parents who both agreed father's direct care was a "very important" part of fatherhood as a reference category.

-Fatherhood Identity Centrality

Previous research has shown that how closely fathers view the fatherhood role as a part of their identity is predictive of caregiving (Collett, Vercel and Boykin 2015; Kalil, 2004; Goldberg, 2015; Adamsons and Pasley 2013). Adamsons and Pasley (2013) rely on Stryker and Burke's (2000) identity theory to explain internal processes of verification as they relate to social statuses, behaviors and social structures, showing the importance of the father role as associated with father involvement (Collett, Vercel and Boykin 2015; Kalil, 2004; Goldberg, 2015; Adamsons and Pasley 2013). Like these previous studies, I use three questions to form a fatherhood identity centrality scale. Each question is measured from 1 to 4, the greater the number the more central a father thinks fatherhood is to his identity. Fathers were asked, if they strongly agree, agree, disagree, or disagree with the statements: Being father is one of the most fulfilling experiences for a man, I want people to know I have a new child, and Not being a part of child's life would be one

of the worst things. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale is .731. I follow Goldberg's (2015) example by dichotomizing the variable into those who strongly agree that all three elements are important, due to the high frequency of complete agreeance (61%, reference) and those who did not (coded 1).

-Gender ideology

I use two questions about gender beliefs asked of mothers and fathers at the time of the birth of the focal child. Fathers were asked to respond to these statements about men and women's priorities to work and family: "It is better for everyone if the man earns the main living and woman cares for family," and "It is more important for man to spend time with his family than to work a lot." Responses include strongly agree (4) agree (3), disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1), and are recoded into dummy variables indicating whether fathers agree or disagree. I have reverse-coded the variable measuring attitudes about fathers prioritizing family time over work so that all dummy variables for gender ideology reflect the same direction. Each of the fatherhood identity and ideology variables should indicate less egalitarian attitudes: parents don't agree that fathers' caregiving is important, fathers do not have a strong fatherhood identity when the child is born, do agree that fathers should earn and women should care, and disagree that men's time with family is more important than working a lot (each coded 1), leaving attitudes that prioritize fatherhood, caregiving and family time as the reference.

Analytic Plan

In this dissertation, I investigate how fathers' early caregiving impacts later caregiving, in different family contexts, specifically ethnoracial category, education and work status, family status, and various gender ideologies. Since the independent variables

for father's early caregiving are continuous or dummy variables, and the dependent variable for father's later caregiving is continuous, I use multiple linear regression to look relationships within each topical area. Table 2.2 shows an overview of my plan of analysis. Regressions for each dependent variable will be run separately and include variables specific to that time point as indicated in the table, where the regression for caregiving at year three includes experiences up to that point, and for caregiving at year five, variables are included up to that time point. I include a basic weight (f1natwt) and a set of replicate weights from the first wave to make the results nationally representative.

In each chapter I include variables for that chapter's topical focus, as well as relevant control variables. In Chapter 3, I include fathers' caregiving at year one, and the key variables for family contexts, including parents' residency with each other, mothers' residency with a new partner, fathers' residency with the child, number of people in fathers' households at each time point, the presence of the father's mother in his home, fathers' additional children, and the child's gender, as well as control variables for fathers' work instability, parents' household poverty, parents' education, parents' age, whether father has been jailed.

In Chapter 4, I begin by including father's caregiving at year one and each of the variables for gender ideology: parental agreement about the importance of father's caregiving, fathers' fatherhood identity, fathers' attitudes about gendered work. Finally, I add control variables: parents' ethnoracial makeup, fathers' work instability, parents' household poverty, parents' education, parents' age, whether father has been jailed, parents' residency, mothers' residency with a new partner, fathers' residency with the

child, number of people in parents' households, and fathers' other children, child's gender and whether the father's mother resides with him.

In Chapter 5, I include variables for fathers' caregiving at time one, parents' ethnoracial makeup, as well as variables to control for fathers' work instability, parents' household poverty, parents' education, parents' age, whether father has been jailed, parents' residency, mothers' residency with a new partner, fathers' residency with the child, number of people in parents' households, and fathers' other children, child's gender and whether the father's mother resides with him.

[Table 2.2 about here]

Chapter 3: Caregiving in Family Contexts

Introduction

In this chapter, I test the relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving with a specific interrogation of variation by family context. I focus specifically on father's residency with the child, father's residency with the child's mother and the child, mothers' residency with new partners, and the number of adults and other children in the father's home. By exploring these family contexts, I hope to capture a broad sense of the family function around parenting and caregiving. I capture some of the contexts in which fathers' caregiving occurs alongside other coparents, grandparents, adults in the household, and other children. I also have access to measures of father's caregiving if the mother is in a new relationship with new partners. These multiple familial situations provide an opportunity to better understand how father's experiences inform their caregiving. I will discuss how previous literature has included and excluded different people in a child's life, definitions and measurements of families, and the impact of these people in children's lives.

Because the Fragile Families study is committed to following the parents of a child across the child's lifetime, the data allow us to have access to both residential and non-residential fathers. This chapter explores the impact of father's residency with his child over time and how the inclusion of additional family members impact father's caregiving.

Literature Review

Caregiving across the Life Course

Life-course research investigates the developmental trajectories of individuals across time and within the contexts of socially embedded lives (Elder 1994). In this study, I examine early caregiving as a predictor of fathers' participation in caregiving over the first five years of a child's life and within diverse family contexts. First, I will discuss previous research on fathers' involvement and factors that shape it.

In a study of emerging gender ideology and relationship ideals, Gerson (1994) found that 38% of men wanted to be "involved fathers" and valued family participation over paid work, and that their experiences of caregiving shaped the way men felt and thought about dividing earning and caregiving. Other research shows that men want closer relationships to children, that come through caregiving (Gerson 2010; Jacobs and Gerson 2004). However, when gender constraints make egalitarian arrangements difficult or masculinity is challenged by gender atypical situations, men may prefer to resort back to male-earner, female caregiver households (Brines 1994; Gerson 2010; 2015).

Early timing and involvement in caregiving is important for fathers' caregiving trajectories as they transition into fatherhood (Cabrera, Fagan and Farrie 2008). Cabrera, Fagan and Farrie (2008) demonstrate the strength of predicting fathers' later caregiving by looking at how much caregiving they provided to their partners while pregnant. They show the caregiving trajectories starting before the focal child is born and across the first three years of life. In this research, I continue to investigate the role of fathers' early caregiving across the life course and investigate the interconnectedness of the lives of individuals within these family contexts (Elder 1994). In this chapter, I examine early caregiving as a predictor of fathers' participation in caregiving as the child ages, and the role of family contexts in which that caregiving takes place.

Previous research finds that fathers' relationships with their children are mediated through the relationship that he has with a child's mother (Townsend 2002). Townsend (2002) found that men think of fatherhood as a "package deal," meaning that fatherhood is part of a whole scenario in which a man financially provides for a home for himself, and a wife to care for their biological children. As a package deal, each piece is reliant on the others, so that a failure in one area threatens all and successful fatherhood requires that men fulfill all four components of the package deal. Supporting this, Tach, Mincy and Edin (2010) found that unmarried fathers become less involved with their children when their relationship with the child's mother ends, demonstrating that men's identities as fathers are intertwined with their identities as partners (Tach, Mincy and Edin 2010).

Family Contexts

In most scholarship that examines the contemporary American family, there is a general consensus that changing social norms surrounding the definition of a family has opened the doors for deeper examinations of family forms. In this process, family scholars have been able to more easily include fragile family types in more mainstream research. The nuclear family has been an iconic social image: two opposite-sexed parents and children living in a single-family dwelling, generally with a male-earner and female-caregiver for home and children. However, contemporary family scholars have been documenting new postmodern family formations that are adaptive and provide evidence that the family is resilient as an institution (Stacey 1990; Bengtson 2001).

Gerstel (2011) points out that the overemphasis on marriage and two-parent households in family research disadvantages the poor, since those at the lower end of the socioeconomic spectrum are more reliant on extended kin networks for family functions

like parenting. In addition to two-parent married families, there has been an increasing number and variety of cohabiting unions, more multi-generational family settings, increasing co-parenting strategies, and increasing blended families that include step-child and half-sibling/family relationships (Gerstel 2011; Vespa, Lewis and Kreider 2013; Powell, Blozendahl, Geist, Carr Steelman 2012; Cherlin, Frogner, Ribar and Moffitt 2009; Keene, Yamashita, Prokos 2016). As such, researchers need to consider the changing nature of family formations when exploring caregiving and care networks among family and across time.

Previous research on family caregiving that only focuses on married couples dismisses the importance of nonmarital relationships, which are increasingly prevalent (Gerstel, 2011; Cherlin, Frogner, Ribar and Moffitt 2009). Previous research has shown that in some family arenas, such as father involvement, cohabiting fathers are more involved with children than married fathers (McClain and DeMaris 2013). McClain and DeMaris (2013) suggested that fathers in less institutionalized relationships may experience their role as parents differently than married fathers using Fragile Families study caregiving items such as singing songs, reading, playing inside, visiting relatives, communicating appreciation, affection, and love, playing imaginary games, playing outside, going on outings, feeding and putting the child to bed. Previous research has shown that while cohabitation is increasing, only a minority of cohabitators (15-25%) engage in serial cohabitation, and serial cohabitators tend to come from more economically and educationally marginalized groups and begin cohabiting earlier in life (Lichter 2012; Kroeger and Smock 2014; Lichter and Qian 2008; Cohen and Manning 2010; Lichter, Turner and Sassler 2010). Nonetheless, these non-marital arrangements

with partners introduce caregiving transitions to a home and presumably change the course of parental involvement for both mothers and fathers. Taking the entire cast of caregivers and other household members into account, the Fragile Families dataset allows us to take up Gerstel's (2011) challenge and focus on families as they are: complicated and diverse.

In this study, I investigate how diverse family contexts shape fathers' experiences of caregiving. Fagan and Palkovitz (2011) used Fragile Families data to demonstrate that nonresidential, nonromantic fathers reported more caregiving than married, cohabiting, or nonresidential, romantic partners, supporting the notion that father involvement is not limited to residential fathers. They show that fathers' early perceptions of coparenting support and relationship quality with the child's mother predicted father involvement later in the child's life. Results show that family context matters. Shannon, Cabrera, Tamis-LeMondac, and Lamb (2009) used data from the National Early Head Start Research and Evaluation Project, to investigate how often fathers see their children in later years. The authors found that father's coresidence at birth and prenatal involvement predicted whether fathers were around their children later on, though residency was less important and prenatal involvement was more important for black fathers (Shannon et al 2009). Fathers' residency may shape involvement, but other family and relationship factors matter, too, and perhaps differently across demographic groups. These two studies demonstrate the need to investigating how fathers' residency and involvement matters in different family contexts and in different communities (Cabrera, Hofferth, Chae 2008).

Another example of the importance of nuanced differences of family contexts is the role of child's gender on father involvement. Lundberg, McLanahan and Rose (2007)

found that unmarried fathers only had some difference in involvement by gender of child around one year later, more likely to give boys their name, but little difference later on, but for couples who were married at time of birth fathers were more likely to live with a son at one year. Another study using qualitative data from Fragile Families found that gender of the child can be a predictor of fathers' caregiving, specifically that cohabitating fathers of baby girls were less comfortable with intimate care like diapering, bathing and changing clothes than married fathers (Garfield and Chung 2006). Gerstel and Gallagher (2001) also found that men's caregiving is contingent on their family makeup, with wives and daughters drawing men into caregiving, and adult sisters acting as substitutes for them (Chang and White-Means 1991).

Using parenting couples from the Fragile Families study, Tach, Mincy and Edin (2010) found that when parents enter new relationships father involvement declines, especially when a mother starts a new relationship, and especially when the transition occurs when children are young. They identify this as support for Package Deal theory (Townsend 2002), which posits that men think of fatherhood as a package that includes marriage, children, employment and homeownership, and that a disruption of one impacts the whole deal. However, Laughlin, Farrie, and Fagan (2009) found that cohabiting fathers who had engaged in early caregiving continued high levels caregiving even if they do not remain in a relationship with the child's mother.

Research Questions

In this chapter, I focus on the factors that shape fathers' caregiving of their children in the first five years of their children's lives, specifically, the relationship

between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving, and fathers' family contexts. I have two primary research questions to address in this chapter:

- 1) Is there a relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving as the child ages from one to five years old?
- 2) How does the relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving differ across family contexts? More specifically, how might fathers' caregiving be shaped by their living situations, the people with whom they live, and other people who might be living in the home with their children?

Hypotheses

This study investigates the role of fathers' family contexts and their early caregiving on their trajectories of caregiving over the first five years of their child's life. Previous research has found that fathers' early participation predicted later participation in caregiving, and that coresidency was an important factor in predicting father's caregiving (Shannon, Cabrera, Tamis-LeMondac, and Lamb 2009; Cabrera, Fagan, and Farrie 2008). Previous research has also demonstrated the interconnectedness of fathers' lives with other family members, and the impact of those relationships on fathers' caregiving (Fagan and Palkovitz 2011; Garfield and Chung 2006; Gerstel and Gallagher 2001; Tach, Mincy and Edin 2010; Townsend's 2002). I hypothesize that an analysis of this data will support previous research that demonstrates caregiving trajectories and the role of fathers' linked-lives with others. I anticipate that this study will find that fathers' early caregiving will predict later caregiving, that residency with mothers and children will predict more caregiving by fathers, and that other adults will predict less caregiving

by fathers, specifically mothers' new partners, paternal grandmothers, and the number of people in fathers' households at each timepoint.

HYPOTHESIS 1: Fathers who performed more caregiving when their child was one-year old will perform more caregiving than other fathers when their child is three and five years old.

HYPOTHESIS 2a: Fathers who live stably with the child's mother will perform more caregiving than fathers who live with the child's mother unstably or not at all.

HYPOTHESIS 2b: Fathers who stably live with their child will perform more caregiving than fathers who do not live stably with their child.

HYPOTHESIS 3: Father caregiving will be lower in families where mothers have new partners at any time point compared to mothers who do not have a new partner over time.

HYPOTHESIS 4: Fathers who have other adults in his household will perform less caregiving than fathers who do not have others in the household.

Data and Methods

In order to address my questions and test these hypotheses, I focus on family contexts and paternal residency with the child and child's mother to predict father's caregiving when the child is 3 years old and 5 years old. I analyze various aspects of fathers' experiences that may impact their caregiving, including residency with their coparent and with their child, the effect of mothers living with new partners, other adults living with fathers, especially paternal grandmothers, fathers' other children, particularly children since the birth of the focal child and gender of the focal child. I investigate how family contexts shape father's caregiving, by investigating how fathers' link-lives with family and household members impact their caregiving trajectories.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, I use data from the Fragile Families study which is designed to study unmarried parents, their relationships and the well-being of their children (Fragile Families 2016). The nationally representative sample was collected from a multi-tiered random sample (cities, hospitals and individuals were all selected randomly) of parents interviewed at the birth of their child between 1998 and 2000 across twenty U.S. cities with populations over 20,000, from 75 hospitals, following the families of nearly 5,000 children over 15 years (Fragile Families 2016). For this analysis, I use the basic weight for couples at baseline and 33 replicate weights in a jackknife procedure, as recommended by the Fragile Families weight guidelines (Fragile Families 2008). After removing cases with missing data for variables analyzed in this chapter, my analytical sample is made up of 1,020 families.

In this study, I use three caregiving indexes comprised of multiple caregiving items that include fathers' participation in specific, age appropriate caregiving activities reported by fathers when the child is one, three and five years old. Each index is an average of the number of *days per week* that a father performed a particular caregiving task for the child. This analysis uses fathers' caregiving when their child is three and five years old as dependent variables for the analysis in each model, and uses fathers' prior caregiving as an independent variable. When caregiving at year three is the dependent variable, caregiving at year one is included as a predictor of caregiving at year three, and when caregiving at year five is the dependent variable, caregiving at both year one and year three are included as independent variables. The scores of these variables range from 0 to 7, an average number of days that week the father performed the caregiving tasks. The specific items are outlined below.

At year one, eight items are included: play games like peek-a-boo or gotcha with the child, sing songs or nursery rhymes to the child, read stories to the child, tell stories to child, play inside with the child with toys such as blocks or Legos, take the child to visit relatives, hug or show physical affection to the child, and put the child to bed. The Cronbach's alpha for these items together is .825. At year three, thirteen items are included: sings songs or nursery rhymes, reads stories, tells stories, play inside with child with toys such as blocks or Legos, take child to visit relatives, tell the child something they did was appreciated, hug or show child physical affection, tell child they love them, play imaginary games, play outside at a park or playground, take child to an outing, assist with feeding, and put child to bed. The Cronbach's alpha for these items together is .850. At year five, eight items are included: sing songs or nursery rhymes, read stories, tell stories, play inside with the child with toys such as blocks or Legos, tell the child something they did was appreciated, play outside in the yard, park or playground, take child on an outing, and watch television or a video together. The Cronbach's alpha for these items together is .831.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the items in the Caregiving Index change between Year 3 and Year 5, due to the changing nature of care as children get older. For example, in the first year, fathers are asked about playing peek-a-boo games, but not in later years. By year five, fathers are no longer asked about feeding or putting the child to bed, telling them they love them, showing physical affection or visiting relatives. At year five, fathers are asked about watching television or videos together, which was not included in previous years. Therefore, the two caregiving index means are not based on identical measures and cannot be compared side by side.

For independent variables, I include demographic data for families, as well as my key variables of interest that capture family context. I will outline each below, and further detail can be found in Chapter 2. In each analysis, the caregiving index for year one is included to control for prior caregiving and to investigate fathers' caregiving trajectories.

Control variables include basic demographics for race, age employment, education, and a history of incarceration. Race captures the ethnoracial makeup of the parenting couple: non-Hispanic white (reference), non-Hispanic black, Hispanic of any race, and Other, which includes Asians, Native-Americans, people in other categories, people with more than one ethnoracial identity, and couples of multiple categories. I include a continuous variable for parents' age. A dichotomous variable for employment indicates whether fathers were continuously employed for at least thirty hours per week for at least forty weeks of the previous year or not. Education is indicated by a set of dummy variables, one for mothers and another for fathers that include less than high school, finished high school but went no further (reference), some college or technical school, and finished a college or graduate degree. I include a dummy variable for whether or not (reference) fathers have been incarcerated by the time of the dependent variable used in the analysis, year three or five.

Family context variables include measures for fathers' residency with the mother of their child, mothers' new partners, fathers' coresidency with their child, other adults in the household, fathers' other children and the gender of the child. Fathers' residency with their child is measured by dichotomous variables that indicate whether (reference) or not a father stably lived with the mother of their child between year one and the year of the dependent variable used in that analysis (year three and five). Mothers' new partners are

measured by dichotomous variables that indicate whether or not (reference) mothers have had a new partner live with them between year one and the year of the dependent variable used in that analysis (year three and five). Fathers' coresidency with their child is measured by dichotomous variables that indicate whether (reference) or not fathers stably lived with their child "all the time" at each time point prior to the dependent variable or not. The presence of the fathers' own mother in the household is indicated by dichotomous variables that indicate whether or not the grandmother of the child ever lived in the house up to the timepoint of the dependent variable, year three and five. I also use a continuous measure of the number of adults in the household at years one, three and five. To account for the number of other children a father has, I include a continuous measure of the number of children the father has at the timepoint of the dependent variable, year three and five. The gender of the child is measured by a dichotomous variable indicating a boy or girl (reference).

In Table 3.1, I show mean scores of father's caregiving across my independent variables and across time. As mentioned above, Table 3.1 allows for a comparison between variable categories, but not across years, since caregiving indexes are different across years and care needs change as children age. For example, using this table, I can compare caregiving by fathers who were stable residents compared to unstable and nonresident fathers, but not changes between fathers between year three and five as far as total frequency of performing caregiving. Since most of the variables measure the presence of family members across years, up to the years three and five, averages are not included for year one, except in the case of gender, which is recorded at birth.

The table shows averages trending in the predicted direction. The table shows more caregiving by fathers who stably reside with their child (difference of .40 and .36), in families in which mothers do not have a new partner (.76 and .99), by fathers who lived stably with their child (.76 and .86), and father's whose own mother, the child's grandmother was not present (.21 and .13). Fathers who expect or have additional children did more caregiving for their child (.05 and .19), and fathers appear to do more caregiving for their female children at years one and three (.03 and .04), but less at year five (-.03), although these differences are small.

[Table 3.1 about here]

These preliminary results suggest that fathers' linked-lives embed them in social contexts that shape their caregiving, and that further investigation is merited, particularly for residency and household makeup. The greatest differences shown in fathers' caregiving are between families in which mothers did or did not have a new partner up to that point.

Table 3.2 is an analytic framework table that displays the models being used in my analysis and each of the corresponding variables being employed in each model. For each model in the analysis, I am predicting Father's Caregiving at *both* Year 3 and Year 5 of the child's life. In Model 1 I begin by including fathers' caregiving at year one, variables for fathers' residency with the child's mother, mothers' cohabitation with a new partner, and fathers' residency with the child. In Model 2 I keep those variables and add in the remaining family context variables, including the presence of a grandmother in the father's home, number of people in the household, fathers' additional children, and father's other children (year three measure for whether father has more children, and total

number of children in year five), and the gender of the child. In Model three, I add in control variables including: parents' ethnoracial makeup, fathers' work instability, parents' household poverty, parents' education, parents' age, and whether father has been incarcerated.

[Table 3.2 about here]

To move beyond descriptive patterns of father's caregiving, I employ a series of Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models to predict father's caregiving when the child is 3 years old and 5 years old. OLS regression is an analytic technique that estimates the relationship between independent variables and an independent variable using observed and predicted values. To interpret the results of the OLS regression, the coefficients should be understood as the amount of change predicted in the dependent variable for every unit measure of the independent variable.

Results

Results from the analysis are included in Table 3.3. Overall, I find support for fathers' caregiving trajectories where experiences of earlier caregiving predict later caregiving, at least in limited timeframes. As for family contexts, results do not support all of the hypotheses, but do indicate that some family context variables predict fathers' caregiving. Fathers' residency with their child up to year five, and the number of adults in the household when the child was one-year old both predicted fathers' caregiving in year five. Most of the family context variables failed to show a significant relationship with fathers' caregiving.

[Insert Table 3.3 here]

Fathers' Early Caregiving on Later Caregiving

HYPOTHESIS 1: Fathers who performed more caregiving when their child was one-year old will perform more caregiving than other fathers when their child is three and five years old.

Results from the analysis support Hypothesis 1, that fathers who reported greater levels of caregiving during year one also report greater levels of caregiving at year three and year five.

Fathers who perform caregiving for their young children perform more caregiving as their child gets older, compared to fathers who did less caregiving when their child was young. However, only the most recent measure of fathers' caregiving predicted later caregiving. In year five, father's more recent caregiving at year three, but not earlier at year one, predicted caregiving when their child was five years old. In Model 1, each time per week that a father did caregiving for their one-year-old predicted a .40 increase in caregiving in year three. In year five, this relationship is explained away by caregiving at year three, which predicts a .53 increase in caregiving at year five.

In Model 2, fathers' caregiving at year one also predicts a .40 increase in fathers' caregiving at year three. Again, in year five, the relationship between fathers' caregiving in year one is explained away by caregiving in year three, which predicts a .51 increase in caregiving in year five. In Model 3, the same pattern holds. Fathers' caregiving at year one predicts a .40 increase in fathers' caregiving at year three. In year five that relationship is explained away by caregiving in year three, which predicts a .49 increase in caregiving in year five. Fathers' earlier caregiving predicted fathers' later caregiving, but only fathers' most recent caregiving, meaning that prior caregiving may have a significant, short-range impact on the fathers' caregiving trajectories at each stage of their child's growth.

Table 3.3 shows that at both years three and five, the previous wave's measure of fathers' caregiving is associated with later caregiving. In Model 1, the regression shows that every day per week reported by fathers about their caregiving in the first year, we can expect an increase of .40 days of report caregiving per week by fathers when their child is three years old. For every one caregiving item that fathers perform when their child is three years old, there is an increase of caregiving by .53 days per week when the child is five years old. The relationship remains strong and significant after including additional family context measures and control variables. In Model 2, one day of caregiving per week when their child is one-year old predicts a .40 increase in fathers' caregiving when their child is three years old, and one act of caregiving when the child is three predicts a .51 increase in fathers' caregiving when their child is five years old. In Model 3, each additional day of caregiving per week when their child is one-year old predicts a .40 increase when the child is three years old and a .49 increase in when the child is five years old. In each of the models, the magnitude and significance of father's caregiving in year one is explained away by the more recent measure of caregiving in year three.

Father's Residency Stability

HYPOTHESIS 2a: Fathers who live stably with the child's mother will perform more caregiving than fathers who live with the child's mother unstably or not at all.

Results from the analysis show no support for Hypothesis 2a. There is no significant difference in fathers' caregiving between fathers who have stable residency with their child's mother and those who are not stable residents at any timepoint. These

results do not support previous research that fathers' coresidency with their child's mother is an important predictor of fathers' caregiving.

HYPOTHESIS 2b: Fathers who stably live with their child will perform more caregiving than fathers who do not live stably with their child.

Results from the analysis show partial support for Hypothesis 2b, that fathers who have stable residency with their child will perform more caregiving than those who are not stable residents. While father's residency with their child did not have a significant relationship with father's caregiving when their child was three years old, there is a significant relationship in year five. In each model, fathers who were unstable or nonresidents with their child did less caregiving when their child was five years old (Model 1, -.57, Model 2, -.63, Model 3, -.57), meaning that the relationship was not explained away by other variables. This finding supports the idea that fathers' coresidency with their child is an important predictor of fathers' caregiving. In theory, fathers who reside in the home have more access and regular exposure to their child. My finding for this when the child is five years old, but not when the child is three years old, might speak to the aging process of children and their specific caregiving needs.

Mother and New Partners

HYPOTHESIS 3: Father caregiving will be lower in families where mothers have new partners at any time point compared to mothers who do not have a new partner over time.

Results from the analysis show no support for Hypothesis 3, that fathers will do less caregiving in families where mothers have new partners. Despite preliminary, bivariate results, in this analysis, there was no significant relationship between families in which the mother has lived with a new partner and father's caregiving. The relationship

was in the expected direction, where in each model and at each year, fathers did less in families where mothers had new partners, and that the relationship was stronger when the child was three years old than when the child was one, but these relationships were not significant in any model.

Presence of Other Adults in Father's Home

HYPOTHESIS 4: Fathers who have other adults in his household will perform less caregiving than fathers who do not have others in the household.

Results from the analysis show partial support for the fourth hypothesis that fathers in families with other adults in the household, particularly grandmothers, will do less caregiving. Despite preliminary results, having a father's own mother in the home was not significantly related to later caregiving. However, the number of adults in the home when the child is one-year old was associated with fathers doing less (Model 2, -.26; Model 3, -.25). In Model 2, every additional child a father had since the birth of the focal child is associated with a small decrease in father's caregiving (-.14), but that difference is explained away when control variables are introduced in Model 3. Additional children and additional adults were both associated with less caregiving by fathers, but having a paternal grandmother in the home with the father was not associated with father's caregiving. Grandmothers in the home may be working, may be doing other types of caregiving, may be unable to perform caregiving for young children, or may not have access to nonresident grandchildren. Paternal grandmothers in the home might be valuable to the father and the child in other intrinsic and extrinsic ways, but might not change the way fathers perform child-specific caregiving. In any case, qualitative insights about the story of paternal grandmothers may help explain the story in this case.

An examination of the model fit statistics (r-squared) for each of the regressions in Table 3.3 show that Model 1 is significant and low-moderate, explaining 25% of the variation in fathers' caregiving in year three ($F(4, 29) = 16.32, p < .01$) and 30% of variation in year five ($F(5, 28) = 13.41, p < .01$). Model 2 R-Squared results show that the analysis explains 30% of variation in fathers' caregiving in year three ($F(9, 24) = 14.19, p < .01$) and 32% of variation in fathers' caregiving in year five ($F(12, 21) = 13.60, p < .01$). Model 3 explains 33% of variation in fathers' caregiving at year three ($F(24, 9) = 5.99, p < .01$), and 38% in year five ($F(27, 6) = 7.10, p < .05$). The significant, positive F statistic shows the explanatory power of the models. There was a significant effect in each model of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

Discussion

The results of this analysis demonstrate a relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving, which supports previous research from the life-course perspective that investigates the caregiving trajectories of fathers, and posits that early experiences are developmental for future outcomes (Elder 1994; Cabrera, Hofferth, Chae 2008). Consistent with the literature review (Shannon et al 2009; Cabrera, Hofferth, Chae 2008), I also found that while early caregiving is an important predictor of fathers' later caregiving, there is a linear time-limit to the visible reach of the effect. Early caregiving only predicts later caregiving when the two time-periods are consecutive. Caregiving when the child is one-year old only predicts caregiving when the child is three years old. It does not also predict caregiving when the child is five years old. This analysis has been able to identify important life stages in which fathers' caregiving trajectories may be shaped.

This analysis included numerous variables to capture the impact of fathers' linked-lives with others, and the interconnectedness of the lives of fathers' whose caregiving trajectories are played out within diverse family contexts and embedded in numerous relationships over their lives (Elder 1994). I also interrogated other questions drawn from previous research on how additional children might change involvement, how other adults in the household might draw fathers into care, or act as substitutes, and how residency with the mother, child, and the mother's new relationships might shape fathers' participation in caregiving.

After investigating father's caregiving trajectories and the human networks in which they are embedded, the overall results showed support for the importance of early caregiving for fathers' caregiving trajectories, where fathers' most recent caregiving performance is the most salient predictor of their current caregiving performance. This result evidences a linear pattern of caregiving performance starting from the very early stages of a child's life. If fathers are performing caregiving when their child is one-year old, then they are very likely to continue caregiving as their child ages. The implications of this caregiving pattern join important conversations about the importance of early father involvement in their child's life. If fathers' early caregiving experiences are crucial to later caregiving, what policies or cultural narratives might support and encourage that trend? Additionally, my findings speak to the potential negative effect of parental interruptions in caregiving. An interruption in caregiving could produce an unfortunate domino effect for fathers and caregiving. Easing the effect of parental interruptions for fathers is an important policy implication of this study. Interruptions might be caused by many reasons, but those involving long-distance residential separation could be mediated

through increased use of technological communication, such as video calls with children and having face-to-face interaction that substitutes for not physically being there. Results showed support for caregiving trajectories, but only select support for the impact of linked-lives with others on fathers' caregiving.

Father's Linked-Lives and Caregiving Trajectories

Controlling for other factors, fathers who had more adults in the household when their child was one-year old did less caregiving for their three-year-old's, and fathers who did not stably live with their child did less caregiving for their five-year-old's. Having more adults in the house during infant and toddler years might be impacted by the differences in the nature of required care at those ages. Fathers may have received more help from others with their infants, when care is more physical and direct, for example toddlers being fed, clothed, and changed. Fathers who were more involved in that first year may have set a pattern of involvement that was still detectable when that child was three years old. Differences in fathers' caregiving may be less notable for five-year-old's who may be in preschool, kindergarten, or taking on more independent tasks. It is important to note that fathers' early family contexts, when their child was only one, did predict their caregiving two years later, at which time, their caregiving for their three-year-old predicted their caregiving for their five-year-old.

Most variables measuring the impact of embedded social networks and linked-lives with other adults were not significant, including fathers' residency with mothers, mothers' new partners, the presence of fathers' own mothers in the home, number of adults in the household when the child was three and five, and whether father had or expected other children at year three.

While results show that the number of adults in the home may be derailing fathers' caregiving trajectories when the child is an infant or toddler, the lack of support for a relationship between resident grandmothers (the children's grandmother) and fathers' caregiving is inconsistent with previous research. For these fathers, there is no relationship between having their own mother in the home and their caregiving performance. Previous research has found that sisters and aunts replace fathers' caregiving (Gerstel and Gallagher 2001; Chang and White-Means 1991). Sisters and aunts may be among the total number of adults in the household that may be doing childcare in place of fathers. However, results showing no support for a connection between fathers' caregiving and resident grandmothers runs counter to the more general idea that women in men's lives substitute for them in caregiving. It may be that grandmothers both provide caregiving and facilitate fathers' caregiving, so that the relationship is masked. It is also likely that this relationship differs among fathers in the United States given the diverse racial/ethnic and cultural values for family involvement. Chapter 4 will interrogate racial and ethnic differences in father's caregiving for their children.

In addition to fathers' prior caregiving and the number of adults in fathers' households when the child is one year old, fathers' residency with their own child (and the child's mother) through year five was the only other family context variable that remained significant after controlling for other factors. Previous research suggests that fathers' residency with mothers and children would predict more caregiving because fathers are available to participate in caregiving and fathers may think of the fatherhood role as part of a package deal in which caregiving is tied to the relationship and residency

with a child's mother (Cabrera et al 2008; Shannon et al 2009; Tach et al 2010; Townsend 2002). Fathers who did not stably reside with their child until the child was five years old did less caregiving than fathers who did live stably with their child. Fathers' residency with mothers and children when the child was three years old did not have a significant relationship to fathers' caregiving, and neither did fathers' residency with the child when the child was three years old. The relationship between the number of children a father has and fathers' caregiving was explained away by the number of adults in the fathers' household when the child is five years old. My results on the relationship between father's residency and caregiving should be received with some caution. Prior studies have shown that accurately measuring residency in an era of multiple and quick family transition is a challenge for scholars. Studies have found that unmarried fathers often have ambiguous residency, coming and going between living with their child's mother and child and/or living with their child without the mother present (Waller and Jones 2014). Waller and Jones (2014) looked at discrepancies in reports of coresidency in Fragile Families data and found that over a third of unmarried parents disagreed about who their child lived with, especially when fathers stayed with mothers and when they kept children overnight by themselves. Future research needs to acknowledge the ambiguous living arrangements that are common among contemporary families, especially those in a fragile family status. Parenting and living arrangements are not mutually exclusive cross-sectional data points. The two are inextricably linked and ever changing over time, sometimes over the course of days and sometimes over the course of months and years.

Previous literature has found that father involvement declines when parents begin new relationships, especially when mothers begin new relationships. Likewise, father involvement declines when parents begin new relationships and the children are young, another theory in support of the package deal of fatherhood, where fathers participate in caregiving as an extension of their fatherhood role, which intertwines providership, marriage and fatherhood (Cabrera et al 2008; Tach et al 2010; Townsend 2002). Results from this analysis did not support those previous findings. Preliminary bivariate results suggested that there was a relationship between mothers having a new partner and fathers' caregiving, but that relationship was explained away by fathers' residency variables.

It may be useful to look across demographic groups to see if mothers' new partnerships are more important for some groups rather than others, particularly different socioeconomic and ethnoracial groups. Given previous research showing the diverse roles of family across ethnoracial groups, around gender and parenting ideology and the role of kith and kin networks, a more specific analysis should investigate differences by ethnoracial background (Shannon et al 2009; Vespa 2009). In Chapter 5 I will analyze family contexts as they vary by ethnoracial makeup of families in order to understand the diverse family contexts.

Previous literature found that unmarried fathers did less caregiving or felt less comfortable with caregiving for daughters than sons in the first year, but showed little difference later on, and that married fathers were more likely to live with a son in the first year compared to fathers with daughters (Lundberg, McLanahan and Rose 2007; Garfield and Chung 2006). Results from this analysis were unable to support those findings. Gender of child was not significant in this regression, but results from other analyses

suggest that the gender of the focal child may be more important for some groups than others, and it would be useful to investigate how the importance of child's gender varies by ethnoracial group.

Chapter 4: Caregiving and Gender Ideology

Introduction

In this chapter, I take advantage of a unique set of variables that explore men's gender ideology as it relates to fatherhood. I discuss previous research that has addressed gender ideology questions related to men's attitudes and identification with the fatherhood role, and their attitudes about gendered roles in work in relation to family and work. As described below, previous literature shows that gender ideology is interconnected with caregiving, and is also shaped by family contexts, ethnoracial groups and economic situations.

The Fragile Families dataset includes variables that measure mother and father's attitudes on the importance of fathers' caregiving, the importance of the fatherhood role to fathers, parent's attitudes on the importance of gendered roles in employment and caregiving, and fathers' priorities between work and family. Together, this combination is a promising set of measures for how gender ideology around fatherhood shapes fathers' caregiving.

After having investigated family contexts in the last chapter, this chapter investigates attitudes rather than behaviors, and how gender ideology around fatherhood roles might explain differences in caregiving. I investigate whether parents' mutual agreement on the importance of caregiving matters as to whether fathers engage in caregiving later on. I investigate the importance of gender ideology and fathers' identity as fathers on caregiving. I look at the relationship between the importance fathers' place on the role of fatherhood in their lives, parents' agreement on the role of fathers'

caregiving, and fathers' gender attitudes about men and women's roles in work and family.

Gender Ideology Literature Review

Ideas around fatherhood also make up part of the contexts in which families live their lives. Couples have ideas of what it means to perform gendered roles and interact with one another and with institutions to navigate their everyday lives. Using 61 qualitative interviews with parents from the qualitative data in the Fragile Families dataset, Collett, Vercel and Boykin (2015) find almost all fathers want to be involved and "there" for their children. However, fathers who are more specific about what a good father does, do more. They do more caregiving and household work, are more likely to notice a discrepancy between their evaluation of themselves and their own caregiving contributions, and are more likely to address that gap by making goals for improvement (Collett, Vercell and Boykin 2015). Other researchers using Fragile Families data have found that fathers who felt that fatherhood was more central to their identity, when asked at the birth of their child, were more likely to be involved two years later (Adamsons and Pasley 2013).

Recent research suggests that the plateau in progress toward egalitarian ideology in the U.S. that began in the 1990's has begun to gain ground again. Recent data from the General Social Survey has been presented by the Council on Contemporary Families that suggests that egalitarianism may be on the upswing, with increases in egalitarian attitudes particularly attributable to changes by more conservative-leaning people, as well as the entrance of Millennials who are more egalitarian than other cohort groups (Cotter, Hermsen and Vanneman 2011; 2014). For example, when the question of earning and

caretaking was first asked: whether it would be better for a man to be “the achiever outside the home” and for the woman “to care of the home and family,” only 44% of people disagreed (Cotter, Hermsen and Vanneman 2011:268). By the 90’s 62% of respondents disagreed, recently reaching an “all-time high” of 68% (Cotter, Hermsen and Vanneman 2011; 2014; Donnelly, Twenge, Clark, Shaikh, Beiler-May and Carter 2015). In contrast, Pepin and Cotters (2017) and Fate-Dixon (2017) recently reported to the Council on Contemporary Families that gender ideologies about roles at home are becoming less egalitarian about domestic roles like caregiving since the 90’s among Millennial’s, especially young men. Pepin and Cotter argue that gender ideology is multidimensional and that the stalled gender revolution is due to gendered attitudes about the family becoming less egalitarian, even as attitudes about women in the workplace become more egalitarian.

Some research has shown that men resist changing gender ideologies even when their life circumstances do not match their beliefs (Brines 1994; Coontz 2017; Cassino 2017; Tichenor 2005). Men may attempt to explain away or compensate for their own deviations from hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity is a culturally dominant version of masculinity to which all other versions are compared, but the standard itself is not challenged by other versions or experiences of masculinity (Connell 1987). For example, using data from 5000 men and women interviewed in the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Brines (1994) found that unemployed men enact “compensatory masculinity” by doing less domestic work than when they were employed. Through this resistance, they protect their threatened sense of masculinity (rooted in employment) rather than reframing domestic work into a positive sense of masculinity (Brines 1994).

In another study, qualitative interviews with 22 couples in the metropolitan U.S. found that men who earned less than their wives reframed the meaning of their care experiences as providership in order to preserve and perform their masculine identities (Tichenor 2005). Stykes' (2015) research uses the “critical masculinity” perspective in relation to caregiving in Fragile Families data, citing Connell’s (1987) theory of masculine identities which are constructed through agency, and in reaction to structural constraints and hegemonic masculinity. From this perspective, the experiences of individual fathers who are not performing fatherhood according to hegemonic norms, i.e. providership roles, would not impact their gender ideology around fatherhood.

In contrast to the research showing the persistence of masculine ideologies in the face of unfulfilled masculine ideals, men may actually adjust their beliefs about gender to match their life circumstances. In research investigating single-father families and egalitarian couples with children, Risman (1998, 2004) argues that gender functions as a social structure that influences behavior in family and work choices between heterosexual couples. For men who do not fulfill the ideals of hegemonic masculinity some studies show that men actually change their beliefs about gender. Men who earn less than their partners may embrace egalitarian ideologies to adjust their beliefs to match their experiences. Prior research has identified a reciprocal relationship between gendered behaviors and gender ideology. Zuo’s (2004) three-wave panel survey of 522 married men from the Marital Instability over the Life Course study suggests that husbands’ gender ideology shapes their contributions to their household labor and employment behaviors, which in turn, shapes their gender ideology.

Connell (2009) explains that gender is constantly recreated by individual interpretations, interactions, and by the institutions. Individuals interact with gender as an identity, with each other through gendered expectations, and with gendered institutions that reinforce gender. Workplaces assume a heteronormative breadwinner/homemaker model of the ideal worker (Acker 1990), which forces gendered compromises onto families who might have egalitarian ideals but still need to secure income and benefits (Davis and Greenstein 2009; Gerson 2010; Risman 1998). Families' choices to resist gender norms around dividing caregiving and paid work are constrained by these institutional realities. Apparent progress toward egalitarian arrangements for more privileged women often can actually be attributed to the commodification and appropriation of less privileged women's carework within and across nations rather than renegotiations within opposite-gendered couples (Parennas 2000). For example, a dual earner couple might outsource childcare to an immigrant nanny rather than balancing caregiving responsibilities between the two of them. Some research has also shown that wives' employment status is associated with husbands' more egalitarian gender attitudes (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Cunningham et al. 2005; Myers and Booth 2002; Ciabattari 2001; Davis and Greenstein 2009).

Gaunt's (2006) data from 209 interviews Israeli couples found that parents' attitudes about the father roles were associated with greater father involvement, but more general gender ideology questions were not. Evertsson (2014) found that fathers' gender ideology did have an impact on father involvement in Swedish couples. Bulanda's (2004) analysis of data from the National Survey of Family Households showed that fathers' gender ideology mattered for father involvement, but mothers' ideology did not. Meteyer

and Perry-Jenkins (2010) used longitudinal data from interviews with 153 couples in the Work and Family Transitions project and found that fathers' and mothers' traditional ideology did limit father involvement, except when women worked full time. Overall, there is reason to believe from recent research that ideology influences caregiving.

Research Questions

In this study I ask how gender ideology around fatherhood is related to fathers' caregiving trajectories. To what extent are gender ideologies and caregiving interrelated? Specifically, I ask three main questions. Are there differences in fathers' caregiving across families in which parents' have different attitudes about the importance of fathers' caregiving? How does fathers' caregiving differ between fathers who identify strongly with the fatherhood role? How are fathers' attitudes about the role of men and women in work and family related to fathers' caregiving?

Hypotheses

I hypothesize that parents' attitudes about fatherhood and fathers' caregiving will predict fathers' caregiving. Families in which fathers have more egalitarian attitudes about the gendered division of labor in the home families will have more caregiving performed by fathers. Families in which parents highly value fatherhood will have more actual caregiving performed by fathers, as evidenced by parental agreement that fathers' caregiving is very important and fathers who identify strongly as fathers.

HYPOTHESIS 1: Patterns of caregiving will vary by gender ideology such that fathers who subscribe to more egalitarian views about men's roles will do more caregiving than fathers who do not.

HYPOTHESIS 2: Patterns of caregiving will vary by parents' value of fatherhood such that fathers in families whose coparents agree on the value of fathers'

caregiving, and those in which fathers' have stronger identification with the fatherhood role will do more caregiving than fathers who do not identify strongly as fathers.

Data and Methods

To address my question and test my hypotheses, I focus on the relationship between fathers' caregiving and several key variables that demonstrate gender ideology about fatherhood in the family. These include both parents' attitudes about fathers' caregiving, fathers' own identity as fathers, and fathers' gender ideology about the gendered division of labor between work and caregiving, as measured at the time of the birth of the child. My dependent variables for fathers' caregiving is when the child is three and five years old are comprised of an average count of the number of days per week that fathers participate in multiple caregiving items. At year three, fathers' caregiving is measured by the number of days per week fathers report doing thirteen age-appropriate care items, including sings songs or nursery rhymes, reads stories, tells stories, play inside with child with toys such as blocks or Legos, take child to visit relatives, tell the child something they did was appreciated, hug or show child physical affection, tell child they love them, play imaginary games, play outside at a park or playground, take child to an outing like a restaurant, assist with feeding, and put child to bed (Cronbach's alpha .850).

At year five, the caregiving index includes an average number of days per week, from 0 to 7, that fathers engaged in eight age-appropriate care items, including sing songs or nursery rhymes to the child, read stories to the child, tell stories to child, play inside with the child with toys such as blocks or Legos, tell the child something they did was appreciated, plays outside in the yard, park or playground, take child on an outing such as

shopping, or to a restaurant, church, museum, or special activity or event, and watch TV or a video together (Cronbach's alpha .831).

For both of these indexes, I sum and average the reports to create an index from these questions that can be understood in terms of an average weekly frequency for fathers' caregiving. As described in Chapter 2, the items in the Caregiving Index change between Year 3 and Year 5, due to the changing nature of care as children get older. Therefore, the two Caregiving Index means are not based on identical measures and cannot be compared side by side.

I use four key independent variables in this chapter to investigate the relationship between gendered ideology about fatherhood and fathers' caregiving. They are further described in Chapter 2. To measure the parents' attitude about importance of fathers' caregiving, I've constructed a dummy variable indicating whether both parents rate fathers' caregiving as "very important" or not. The next variable indicates whether fathers identified strongly with the fatherhood role. Fathers were asked how much they agree with three statements that show fathering experiences were central to their own identity. These include: "Being father is one of the most fulfilling experiences for a man," "I want people to know I have a new child," and "Not being a part of child's life would be one of the worst things" (Cronbach's alpha .731). I combined the responses into a dummy variable indicating whether fathers strongly agree to all three statements, or not, as previous researchers have done (Goldberg 2015). The last two independent variables are standard gender ideology questions that ask about the gendered division of labor between work and caregiving, as measured at the time of the birth of the child. Fathers responded to statements about men and women's priorities to work and family: "It is better for

everyone if the man earns the main living and woman cares for family,” (reverse coded) and “It is more important for man to spend time with his family than to work a lot.”

These responses are recoded into dummy variables indicating whether fathers agree or disagree with the less egalitarian sentiment. Each of these dummy variables for gender ideology reflect the same direction with the reference representing more egalitarian or fatherhood-focused attitudes.

[Table 4.1 about here]

Drawing from the Fragile Families data, Table 4.1 shows differences in fathers' caregiving between families with different attitudes about fatherhood. As in other chapters, Table 4.1 allows for a comparison between variable categories, but not across years, since caregiving indexes include different caregiving items through different years and frequencies of different items may change due to changes in need as children age.

As shown in Table 4.1, there may be differences in fathers' caregiving by responses to fatherhood and caregiving ideology questions. For each question, in each year, responses are in the predicted direction, with only one exception. Fathers report more caregiving in families in which both parents agree that fathers' caregiving is “very important,” which is significant across all three time-points. Fathers report more caregiving when fathers have a strong fatherhood identity, which is significant in Year 3 and Year 5. Fathers who disagree that it's better for men to earn and women to care report more caregiving around the time of birth, but about equal in Year 3 and 5, although there was no significant difference found for any year. Fathers who agree that family time is more important than working a lot report less caregiving in around Year 1 and 3, and more in Year 5, although none of these were significant. Preliminary results for the

relationship between fathers' caregiving and parental agreement about the importance of fathers' childcare and fatherhood identity support of findings in previous research. The relationship between fathers' caregiving and fathers gender ideology about the roles of men and women are more ambiguous. Overall, there is reason to believe that parents' attitudes about fatherhood and fathers' caregiving will predict fathers' actual caregiving. [Table 4.2 about here]

Table 4.2 shows my plan of analysis for Chapter 4. As in other chapters, I run two analyses using OLS regression. In each model, the first regression will use variables that correspond to the year three analysis, and a second regression uses variables that correspond to year five. In Model 1 I include fathers' caregiving at time one, and all four of my fatherhood and gender ideology variables. In Model 2 I add in control variables parents' ethnoracial makeup, fathers' work instability, parents' household poverty, parents' education, parents' age, and whether father has been jailed. In Model 3 I add in control variables, including: parents' residency with each other, mothers' residency with a new partner, fathers' residency with the child, number of people in parents' households, number of fathers' other children, child's gender and whether the father's mother resides with him.

Results

Results show little support for a relationship between gender ideology around fatherhood and fathers' caregiving. Fathers' gender ideology, parents' agreement on the importance of fathers' caregiving, and the importance that fathers' place on the fatherhood role failed to show a significant different in fathers' caregiving. One exception to this is noted below for white fathers.

HYPOTHESIS 1: Patterns of caregiving will vary by gender ideology such that fathers who subscribe to more egalitarian views about men's roles will do more caregiving than fathers who do not.

Results from the analysis do not show support for Hypothesis 1. None of the gender ideology variables were significant across any of the models. In a separate analysis, Hispanic fathers who believe that men should earn, and women should do the caregiving when their child was five years old did slightly more caregiving than fathers who disagreed with the men as breadwinner model, but that difference was explained away when control variables were introduced. However, even after controlling for other variables, white fathers who believed that men should earn, and women should do caregiving did less caregiving for their five-year-olds than fathers who did not agree with the breadwinner/caregiver model, (-0.42, $p < .04$, analysis available upon request).

[Table 4.3 about here]

HYPOTHESIS 2: Patterns of caregiving will vary by parents' value of fatherhood such that fathers who have agree on the value of fathers' caregiving, and those in which fathers' have stronger identification with the fatherhood role will do more caregiving than fathers who do not identify strongly as fathers.

Results from the analysis do not show support for Hypothesis 2. There were no significant differences between fathers who did not have consensus with their coparent about the importance of the fatherhood role and those who did not. There were also no significant differences in caregiving between fathers who had a strong fatherhood identity at the time of the birth of their child and those who did not. In a separate analysis, black fathers who did not have a strong fatherhood identity at the time of the birth of a child did

less caregiving in year five, although, this result was only significant at .08 (analysis available upon request).

Consistent with the previous chapter, fathers' earlier caregiving predicts later caregiving, particularly the most recent measure of fathers' caregiving. In Table 4.3 Model 1 each day per week that a father participates in caregiving for their one-year-old child predicts a .40 increase in the number of days fathers report caregiving when the child is three years old, but that effect does not hold into year five, where only fathers' caregiving in year three predicts later caregiving (.54). After adding in control variables in Model 2, fathers' year one caregiving becomes significant, but then disappears again in Model 3, which includes family context variables. However, at year three, across all three models the most recent measure of fathers' caregiving has a significant impact on the dependent variable, or fathers' current caregiving. In each model, fathers' caregiving at year one predicts caregiving at year three (.40, .39, .39, Table 4.3), and fathers' caregiving at year three predicts caregiving at year five (.54, .53, .50, Table 4.3).

In Table 4.3 Model 3, two family context variables are significant. In year three a greater number of adults in a father's household predicts less caregiving (-.26), and at year five, not living stably with the child is associated with fathers doing less caregiving (-.59).

Looking at the R-Squared results for each of the regressions in Table 4.3, Model 1 is significant and low-moderate, explaining 26% of the variation in fathers' caregiving in year 3 ($F(5, 28) = 11.47, p < .01$) and 28% of variation in year five ($F(6, 27) = 16.35, p < .01$). Model 2 R-Squared results show that the analysis explains slightly more, 29% of variation in fathers' caregiving in year three ($F(20, 13) = 4.70, p < .01$) and 34% of

variation in fathers' caregiving in year five ($F(21, 12) = 5.46, p < .01$). Model 3 explains 34% of variation in fathers' caregiving ($F(28, 5) = 5.03, p < .05$). However, in Model 3 for year five, while the R-Squared value increases to explain 38% of variation in fathers' caregiving, the p-value for R-Squared also increases and is no longer significant ($F(31, 2) = 3.68, p > .05$). The significant, positive F statistic shows the explanatory power of the models. There was a significant effect in each model of the independent variables on the dependent variable, with the exception of Model 3, Year 5.

Discussion

In contrast to the majority of previous literature on gender ideology, and specifically the research on gender ideology done on the Fragile Families dataset, none of the gender identity and ideology variables were significant in this analysis (Evertson 2014; Bulanda 2004; Zou 2004). Adamsons and Pasley (2013) previously found that the centrality of identity as fathers was associated with fathers' reports of caregiving, but this analysis did not, which may be attributed to the differences between the two analyses. Their study looked at fathers' caregiving at years one and three and only some of the available caregiving items. Also, their analysis for year three did not control for caregiving at year one, which was one of the variables that explained away the relationship between fatherhood identity and later caregiving.

Previous research found that fathers give themselves positive evaluations and imagine themselves as being involved fathers in the abstract, but only those who have more specific concepts of what involved behavior looks like report more involvement (Collett, Vercel and Boykin 2015). Specificity may be a more general theme and concern for method design. Gaunt (2006) also found that more specific questions about gender

roles associated with greater father involvement, while more general gender ideology questions were not. It may be more useful to investigate the relationship between fathers' caregiving and the importance of fatherhood role or identity with more specific questions, at least as specific as the caregiving index items. Additionally, using fathers' own reports of caregiving limited the sample due to the steep attrition of fathers, particularly the most vulnerable. It may be useful to use other methods to account for missing data, or to use mothers' or the primary caregivers' account of fathers' caregiving to avoid losing families from the study due to fathers' attrition.

Meteyer and Perry-Jenkins (2010) pointed mother's employment reduced the limiting effect that breadwinner/caregiver gender ideologies had on father's involvement. This analysis does not include measures of mothers' employment, although such a finding may not be relevant in terms of diverse and fragile families. In any case, a more complex look at employment and ethnoracial categories may help to further investigate the role of gender ideology and fatherhood roles or identities in fathers' participation in caregiving (Meteyer and Perry-Jenkins 2010; Vespa 2009; Risman 1998, 2004).

The only result in this analysis to support the hypothesis that parent's attitudes about fatherhood and gender roles predicts fathers' participation in caregiving is that white fathers who believed that men should earn, and women should do caregiving did less caregiving than fathers who did not (-0.42, $p < .04$). This finding suggests that previous findings about the connection between fatherhood or gender ideology and fathers' caregiving may be more important in white families than families of other ethnoracial backgrounds.

It may be that white families have more opportunities to adjust their domestic situations to match their ideologies. It may be that because hegemonic masculinity is rooted in the white experience of masculinity that white men could feel more threatened by non-gender typical tasks like caregiving. White fathers' may have a unique cultural history and individual experiences that emphasize avoiding caregiving as part of hegemonic performance of masculinity.

Wight, Bianchi and Hunt (2013) discuss the impact of socioeconomic, cultural and historical experiences between racial groups to explain different gendered dynamics between men and women in the sharing employment and domestic work in explaining greater sharing by black, Hispanic and other families. They conclude that traditional theories for predicting who does housework do not work for all ethnoracial groups equally. Given how little gender ideology has served to explain fathers' childcare in this chapter, I do not include the variables for attitudes about fatherhood and gender ideology in the final chapter to keep a more parsimonious model, retain more participants in the analysis, and explore explanations that might be more relevant for other families of other ethnoracial groups.

Chapter 5: Caregiving by Race and Ethnicity

Introduction

In this chapter, I focus specifically on the racial and ethnic differences in fathers' caregiving. More specifically, I am testing the racial and ethnic differences in how fathers' early caregiving impacts later caregiving as the child ages. The Fragile Families dataset allows me to conduct a more nuanced analysis of family experiences, including more diverse, and precarious families. Vespa (2009) found that gendered family processes vary across family, racial, and economic contexts and are related to father's attitudes about gendered divisions of labor.

Families of different ethnoracial backgrounds may have different experiences of fatherhood and caregiving, given different traditions and conditions in their families, including extended kin-networks, multigenerational houses and disruptions of residency due to incarceration. This chapter considers these cultural differences and explores whether familial traditions across racial and ethnic groups manifests in different types of fathers' caregiving.

Race and Ethnicity Literature Review

In this section I will discuss diversity of fathers' caregiving experiences by couples' ethnoracial identity, education and work experiences. Fathers' involvement, caregiving, and gender ideology have all been shown to vary across ethnoracial groups (Vespa 2009; Jones and Mosher 2013; Cabrera, Hofferth and Chae 2011).

Ethnoracial Categories

Fathering is not a monolithic experience. Using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, Vespa (2009) examined gender ideology from a life-course perspective with a sample of 5,386 black and white individuals. He found that

varied experiences of family, work, gender, race and class have dynamic impacts on individuals' gender ideology. For example, Vespa (2009) found that marriage has a less egalitarian influence for white parents, parents of young children and affluent black men. However, he also found that marriage is associated with more egalitarian attitudes for black couples generally, especially when childless, for all single parents except white women, and for affluent black women, which shows that the relationship between parenthood and gender ideology is complicated (Vespa 2009). Both family configurations and work experiences shape gender ideology differently across combinations of race and class. His finding suggests that more intersectional analysis is necessary to understand the full context of different "configurations of life experiences" and how they relate to beliefs about gendered divisions of labor (Vespa 2009:369).

Gendered interpretations of fatherhood roles may also have important intersectional implications for caregiving. Recent reports by Jones and Mosher (2013) for the CDC have found specific combinations of race and marital status to be important for fathers' family involvement. For example, both coresidential and nonresidential black fathers are more involved in some ways than other groups of fathers (Jones and Mosher 2013). Cabrera, Hofferth and Chae (2011) studied ethnoracial differences in father engagement using data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort and found racial and ethnic differences in forms of father caregiving. They showed that black and Latino fathers did more caregiving and physical play with children than white fathers. They did not find any ethnoracial differences in verbal activities among fathers. These racial and ethnic patterns of caregiving provide evidence that using an intersectional framework to understand fathers' caregiving is important. It may be that

different cultural scripts, racialized economic disadvantage, and ethnoracial experiences of fatherhood serve important roles in shaping how men interact with their families and their children. Clearly, there is a need for more intersectional research to parse out ethnoracial variation in fathers' caregiving while taking other structural components of caregiving experiences into account. Below I will discuss the other variables that I will include to try to capture a broader context of caregiving in fragile families.

Caregiving in Context

Past research has found that men imagine their role as fathers as embedded in a more encompassing package, which includes being married, employed and owning a home (Townsend 2002). This cultural script is a situation that is not likely or even possible for, nor necessarily valued by all men (Cherlin 2010). Previous research has found that disparities between black men and women's education and employment, and men missing from communities as a result of mass incarceration are major factors in lower marriage rates for black families (Carbone and Cahn 2014; Lichter, McLaughlin and Landry 1992; Wilson 1987). While most families of any ethnoracial group do not live in poverty, black families are at a disproportional risk of experiencing poverty and intergenerational poverty (Pattillo-McCoy 1999). Even middle-class black families face greater financial strain and have more pull from resource-poor social networks than white families (Pattillo-McCoy 1999).

Non-white men have different lived experiences, and cultural inheritances due to racialized economic disadvantage that foster different gender ideologies around fatherhood. Throughout the history of the United States, Native, black, Latino, South Pacific and other families have adapted to maintain families through separation and role

shifts in the face of racism, nationalism and economic constraint. Adapting to strained access to the social ideals of family, non-white families have adapted by turning toward extended kinship networks and adjusting expectations and attitudes about particular elements of parenting roles (Gerstel 2011).

In the face of fewer or less desirable employment opportunities, or other external factors such as illness, men may adjust their ideas of success and renegotiate ideologies and caregiving arrangements (Davis and Greenstein 2009; Nelson 2004; Risman and Johnson-Sumerford 1998). (On the other hand, some research has found that lower and working-class men hold less egalitarian gender beliefs (Ciabattari 2001). However, Nelson's research (2004) on low-income fatherhood suggests that low-income fathers' constrained ability to fulfill a hetero-normative provider role may fuel a greater appreciation of the relational and emotional aspects of fatherhood.

Men's caregiving roles have changed over time in response to economic and family changes, and they can and will likely change again. Changes in the family have happened differently for different groups. Families in the U.S. are diverse and changing over time, yet the hegemonic image of the American family is based on the shadow of white, middle-class template that existed for a short period of time for a select group of privileged people in the post WWII economic boom (Kimmel 2004; Coontz 1992, 1997, 2000, 2005). Economic and social shifts resulting from white women's increased presence in the workplace have changed the nature of family dynamics, impacting the way that people in different social locations use marriage to facilitate childrearing (Cherlin 2004; Coontz 1992; Dill 1988). However, women of color have worked at higher rates throughout the century, and the cultural framing of the meaning of

successfully performing gender in parenting roles, including fathers' caregiving, is certainly different across racial and ethnic groups (Kimmel 2004; Coontz 1992, 2005; Dill 1988).

The expansion of paid domestic work in the United States and other wealthy nations has pulled mothers from colonized and economically disadvantaged countries from around the world (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2002). Caribbean, Central American, Eastern European, Indonesian, and especially Filipina women perform transnational motherhood relying on extended family to provide caregiving for children at home (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2002; Dreby 2010). Dill (1988) points out that separate sphere domestic arrangements were built up as an ideal for white families, while other families (especially black, Chinese and Chicano) were denied participation in this arrangement. Instead, in the face of racialized discrimination and economic inequality, non-white families became more reliant on extended kin and created families to care for children and maintain the family (Dill 1988; Gerstel 2011).

Women are working more in the workplace, but men's contributions at home have been slow to follow (Gerson 2010; Risman 1998). Women still do an overwhelming majority of care and domestic work; men are doing more, but not matching women's increases in paid labor (Hochschild 1997; Hochschild and Machung 2012). More attention is needed to find the structural conditions of work and law, family relationships, and identity construction that shape men's priorities and actions in shared carework (Campbell and Carroll 2007; Risman 1998).

Various researchers have found that the association between residency and caregiving is stronger for white fathers. Based on findings from Jones and Mosher (2013)

both black fathers are more involved in some ways than other groups of fathers, no matter their residency. Cabrera et al (2011) found that black and Latino fathers did more caregiving and physical play than white fathers but found no difference in verbal activities. Shannon et al (2009) also found that coresidence was less important for black fathers, instead prenatal involvement was more important. Lived experiences of fatherhood are be different across ethnoracial groups.

In a previous analysis of the Fragile Families dataset, Woldoff and Washington (2008) found that contact with the criminal justice system disproportionately disrupted fathers engagement for unmarried fathers and non-whites. Additionally, they found that the disruption incarceration was worse for black fathers than for white (Woldoff and Washington 2008). However, Swisher and Waller (2008) found that fathers who had been incarcerated saw their children less often, but that the effect was greater for white fathers than for black and Latino fathers.

Black and Latino families more likely to exchange resources and assistance in extended kin networks, while white families more likely to get financial help (Gerstel 2011; Hofferth 1984; Lareau, Weininger, Conley, and Velez 2011). Ethnoracial differences in family function are shaped by racialized economic disparities, and the definitions of family, which privilege nuclear families, normalize white family forms over other experiences (Gerstel 2011). However, there are advantages to these underrecognized family forms. Gerstel (2011) points out that unmarried people are more likely to be involved with their families than those who have ever been married, caring more for parents and siblings.

Research Questions

In this chapter, I investigate the relationship between fathers' caregiving, parents' ethnoracial identity, and family form. How does the relationship between fathers' early and later caregiving matter differently across ethnoracial groups? What variation in fathers' caregiving can we see across ethnoracial group as far as type and frequency? How does residency and family form impact fathers' caregiving differently across diverse families?

Hypotheses

Based on prior research findings on the ethnic and racial differences in fathers' caregiving, my analysis is guided by the following hypotheses:

HYPOTHESIS 1: The relationship between fathers' early and later caregiving vary by race, specifically, it will be stronger in white families than for families of other ethnoracial categories.

HYPOTHESIS 2: Fathers' frequency of caregiving will vary by race, with fathers in black coparenting couples doing more caregiving than fathers in families of other ethnoracial categories.

HYPOTHESIS 3: The relationship between caregiving and residency will differ by family's ethnoracial group, where residency will be a better predictor of fathers' caregiving in white families than families of other ethnoracial categories.

Data and Methods

To test my hypothesis, I investigate the relationship between fathers' early and later caregiving, and family contexts, across ethnoracial groups. I will be using data from the Fragile Families study in multiple regression models to predict fathers' caregiving. I will compare the role of fathers' early caregiving and family context across groups. My

dependent variable, fathers' caregiving, is reported by fathers when the child is three and five years old, shown as the average number of days per week that fathers participate in a variety of caregiving items. At year three, fathers' caregiving is measured by the number of days per week fathers report doing thirteen age-appropriate care items: sings songs or nursery rhymes, reads stories, tells stories, play inside with child with toys such as blocks or Legos, take child to visit relatives, tell the child something they did was appreciated, hug or show child physical affection, tell child they love them, play imaginary games, play outside at a park or playground, take child to an outing like a restaurant, assist with feeding, and put child to bed (Cronbach's alpha .850).

At year five, the caregiving index includes an average number of days per week, from 0 to 7, that fathers engaged in eight age-appropriate care items, including sing songs or nursery rhymes to the child, read stories to the child, tell stories to child, play inside with the child with toys such as blocks or Legos, tell the child something they did was appreciated, plays outside in the yard, park or playground, take child on an outing such as shopping, or to a restaurant, church, museum, or special activity or event, and watch TV or a video together (Cronbach's alpha .831).

For both of these indexes, I sum and average the reports to create an index from these questions that can be understood in terms of an average weekly frequency for fathers' caregiving. As described in Chapter 2, the items in the Caregiving Index change between Year 3 and Year 5, due to the changing nature of care as children get older. Therefore, the two Caregiving Index means are not based on identical measures and cannot be compared side by side.

Family context variables are described in detail in Chapters 2 and 3 and include measures for the presence and relationship of others in the household: fathers' residency with the child, fathers' residency with the mother, whether mothers' have new partners, presence of paternal grandmothers, number of adults in the household, number of children in the household, fathers' other children. Families are categorized by ethnoracial group by their racial and ethnic self-identification at the time of the birth of the child: Hispanic of any racial group, non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, non-Hispanic Asian and non-Hispanic Native, and others.

[Tables 5.1 and 5.2 about here]

Table 5.1 provides an average weekly report of each caregiving item by the parents' ethnoracial identities. I also include a column indicating whether there were significant differences between the average caregiving between the four ethnoracial groups.

For each year, fathers are asked about age-appropriate caregiving for their child. These are summed and averaged for easier understanding, caregiving in terms of number of days per week performed, but should not be compared across years. For example, in Table 5.1, the caregiving items are different, and the frequency of caregiving on any particular item may change over the years as needed. In year three, we see low frequencies for father taking child and outing, but that is not asked at year five, where instead, watching TV and videos together is more frequently reported. Another example, singing is measured at all three time-points, but parents may sing to their children less as children get older. For all tables that show caregiving by year, these tables can be used to compare averages between comparison variable categories, but not between years.

Table 5.1 shows ethnoracial differences in fathers' childcare activities. T-tests show significant differences between ethnoracial groups in fathers' caregiving for peek-a-boo, reading, telling stories, playing with toys, visiting family, showing affection and putting children to bed, but not for singing. When children were about one-year old, white fathers did more caregiving that involved playing peek-a-boo, reading, and playing with toys. In the first year, black fathers took children to bed more frequently than fathers in other groups and took children to visit family more than white and other fathers. During this time, Hispanic fathers took children to visit family, and showed affection more than fathers in other groups, and put children to bed more often than white and other fathers. Fathers in families with other, multiple and mixed ethnoracial identities reported caregiving middle range frequencies of caregiving. Overall, white fathers reported the most caregiving in Year one, then black fathers, others, then Hispanic fathers.

There were significant differences across ethnoracial groups for fathers' reports of showing affection, doing chores together, reading, playing with toys, visiting family, taking the child on outings, feeding and putting the child to bed. When children were three years old, white fathers showed the most affection, did more chores with children and played more with toys than fathers in other groups. At Year 3, Hispanic fathers took children on outings, fed and put kids to bed more than fathers in other groups, and also took children to visit family at high rates. Fathers of other, multiple, and mixed ethnoracial identities did the most reading to children, and also had high scores for visiting family and taking children on outings. Overall, white and other fathers did the more caregiving than black and Hispanic fathers when children were three-years old.

When children were five years old, fathers reported significant differences in reading, telling stories, playing outside together, and watching tv or video games together. White fathers did more reading, telling stories and played outside with children more frequently than fathers in other groups. Hispanic fathers watched tv or video games with their five-year-old's more frequently than other fathers, while white fathers reported the least amount of time in that activity. Overall, whites reported the most caregiving for five-year-old's. These results are discussed further in Hypothesis 2.

In Table 5.2, measures that use information across time points are constructed to match the time point. For example, In the column for caregiving at year three, the variable for fathers having unstable employment since year one is constructed from work experiences at year one and three, whereas the years one, three and five are considered in unstable unemployment in the column reporting caregiving at year five. Additionally remember, that these averages can be compared between variable attributes, but not across years. For example, in Table 5.2, one would compare reported frequencies between fathers with different educational backgrounds, not between time points.

Bivariate analysis in Table 5.2 shows significant difference in fathers' caregiving for one-year-old's by mother's education. Families with more educated mothers report more caregiving by fathers at each level of education. No other variables had significant relationships with caregiving, not even mothers' education that had been significant at Year 1. Preliminary averages show differences by ethnoracial group. White fathers report the most caregiving, then Hispanic, then black fathers. While not significant, fathers' education follows a similar pattern, with more educated fathers reporting more caregiving for their infants.

When children are three-years old, bivariate results show significant differences in caregiving across family contexts. Fathers who have resided with the child's mother provided more caregiving, 4.52 days per week compared to 4.11 for fathers living away from mothers. Families in which mothers had a new partner since the birth of a child reported less caregiving by fathers, 4.11 days per week compared to 4.45. Fathers who had resided with their child reported more caregiving, 4.55, compared to 3.68 for fathers without stable residency with their child. Fathers whose own mothers lived with them reported less caregiving, 4.25 days per week compared to 4.46 for homes without paternal grandmothers in the home.

When children are five years old, fathers' caregiving still has a significant relationship with fathers' residency with their coparent, mothers' new partners, and fathers' residency with their child, but not the presence of paternal grandmothers. Fathers who had lived with their coparent reported more caregiving, 4.00 days per week, compared to 3.44 for nonresidents. Families in which mothers had new partners had less caregiving by fathers, 2.90, compared to 3.90 for families where mothers had no new partner. Fathers who lived with their child also reported more caregiving, 4.03, compared to 3.16 for fathers not stably living with their child. Fathers did less caregiving for five-year-old's if their own mother lived with them, but the relationship was not significant. None of the variables for race, employment, poverty, or education had significant relationships with caregiving for children at Year 1, 3, or 5, with the exception of mother's education at Year 1.

To address my questions and test these hypothesis, I employ multiple linear regressions to examine ethnoracial variation in fathers' caregiving, with separate

regressions for families with parents who are white, black, Hispanic and other or mixed ethnoracial categories. Table 5.3 describes my modeling plan for this analysis. Since my two dependent variables of fathers' caregiving are at different time points, many of the variables in my regression will be constructed separately for each dependent variable. Each model in the analysis has distinct time periods of caregiving. First, I predict caregiving when the child is three years old based on a two-year time period between the one-year and three-year old ages. Second, I predict caregiving when the child is five-years old based on *both* a two-year time period between the three-year old and five-year old ages and also a four-year time period between the one-year and five-year old ages. Table 5.3 details which variables will be included for each dependent variable, within each model.

[Table 5.3 about here]

I begin in Model 1 by including father's caregiving at year one and parents' ethnoracial category as predictors of father's caregiving at years three and five. In Model 2, I add in independent control variables for fathers' work instability and both parents' household poverty. The regression model that predicts caregiving when the child is three years old will include constructed variables from experiences between year one and three. The regression model that predicts caregiving when the child is five years old will include variables that measure experiences that took place between year one and year five. Lastly, Model 3 includes control variables (i.e. parents' age and education) and family context variables, (whether father has been jailed, parents' residency, mothers' residency with a new partner, fathers' residency with the child, number of people in

parents' households, and fathers' other children, child's gender and whether the father's mother resides with him).

Results

Results for the regressions are shown in Tables 5.4 through 5.9, where Table 5.4 shows the three-model regression for all groups together, controlling for ethnoracial group. Tables 5.5 through 5.8 show the three-model regression for each ethnoracial group run separately. Table 5.9 combines Model 3 for each group into one table for easier comparison between groups.

Comparisons between ethnoracial groups

Looking at the results of all the analysis models, I find ethnic and racial differences in fathers' caregiving. I discuss the results using inter-racial comparisons below.

[Table 5.4 about here]

[Table 5.5 about here]

[Table 5.6 about here]

[Table 5.7 about here]

[Table 5.8 about here]

[Table 5.9 about here]

Black-White

First, I compare the results between black and white families (Table 5.5 and 5.6). Generally speaking, black and white fathers do not show much difference in their caregiving patterns. Both black and white fathers' early caregiving positively predicts their later caregiving, meaning that regardless of race, black and white men who

participated in caregiving when their child is young still maintain caregiving roles as their child ages. However, the strength of this relationship is slightly larger for white men than for black men. Across each model, white families show a stronger relationship between earlier and later caregiving. In year three, Model 3 of Table 5.5, caregiving by white fathers in year one is associated with a .41 increase in caregiving when their child is three years old, while black fathers reported a .27 increase in Model 3, year three on Table 5.6.

The black-white difference is the largest when the child is five years old. In Model 1, before the controls are included, I show that more caregiving when the child was three-years-old predicted an increase in caregiving of .47 days per week for black fathers compared to an increase of .74 for white fathers. The black-white difference in caregiving increases as control variables are entered in the analysis. By Model 3, increased caregiving for a three-year-old predicts a .35 time per week increase in fathers' caregiving for black fathers while the associated increase remains at .74 days per week for white fathers. The racial gap increase from Model 1 to Model 3 is explained by a decrease in the relationship between black fathers' caregiving as the child gets older, and not from an increase in white fathers' caregiving.

Other notable black-white differences are shown in the role of father's education on caregiving. Table 5.6 shows that for black fathers, having some college education is associated with an increase in fathers' caregiving when their child is five years old (.83). This could reveal less availability due to more work opportunities for black fathers with more education. For white fathers, the effect of education of caregiving shows a different pattern. I find that education is only significant for white fathers with less than a high school education in the early years of caregiving. Between the one-year old and three-

year old age, these fathers show an increase in caregiving (1.01, Table 5.5). White fathers with less education may have fewer job prospects, or lower pay scales that make caregiving part of solution for families navigating work and caregiving. As this shows, the role of education on fathers' caregiving differs among black and white fathers. Not only does the level of education matter, but the level of education across ages of the child matters, and that the role of education on father caregiving operates differently for black and white men.

The last notable black-white difference in caregiving is based on father's residency with the child. For white fathers, residency status does not significantly predict caregiving at any age. White father's caregiving is not impacted by residential instability with their child. However, black father's residency status significantly affects their caregiving in the early years of their child's life. Between the one-year old and three-year old ages, black fathers who have an unstable residency with their child show a decrease in caregiving (-1.04). Black fathers' instability in the early years of their child's life seems to impact their ability to provide caregiving until the child is three years old. For black fathers, the significant effect of residential instability on caregiving disappears by the time the child is five-years old. This finding is in contrast to previous literature that suggests that the relationship between residency and father's involvement is less important for black fathers (Jones and Mosher 2013; Shannon et al 2009).

Hispanic-White

The differences between Hispanic and non-Hispanic white families can be seen by comparing tables 5.5 and 5.7. Models 1 and 2 for year three show that early caregiving may be more important for Hispanic families, but the difference is neutralized as

variables are added, reducing the strength of relationship from .46 to .41 for Hispanic families, and increasing from .38 to .41 for white families. By Model 3 caregiving by both white and Hispanic fathers when their child is one year old predicts a .41 increase in caregiving at year three.

As mentioned above, in year five, caregiving at year three explains away the significance of the relationship between year one and year five caregiving. The relationship between caregiving at year three and year five is stronger for white families (.74) than for Hispanic families (.38), with little wavering across models. White fathers may be more likely to distance themselves from caregiving responsibilities without early caregiving experiences. This might be a pivotal, time-specific experience for their caregiving trajectories that is unique to their cultural experience of whiteness.

For Hispanic families, there were no significant relationships with any of the demographic variables, as there were for white families. As mentioned above, for white fathers' being older was associated with less caregiving for five-year old's, and having less education was associated with more caregiving for three-year old's. There may be cohort differences for white men, with older white men having fewer experiences or expectations of caregiving for children.

In the regression for Hispanic families, the only significant variable outside of caregiving was the number of adults in the father's household when the child was one year old. For every additional person in the household, Hispanic fathers did .24 (Table 5.7) less caregiving when their child was three years old. Hispanic families may have greater expectations that additional family members or household members step in to do childcare in place of fathers.

Other-White

Other families include parents who are Asian, Native, more than one ethnoracial identity, couples of different identities, and others. This disparate group, looks fairly similar to white and Hispanic families in terms of the role of early caregiving on later caregiving when the child is three years old, around a .39 increase (Table 5.8). However, the relationship between caregiving at year three is only significant for other families in Model 2, where fathers' increased caregiving for their three-year-old predicts a .46 increase when the child is five years old.

Model 2 of Table 5.8 and 5.5 show that both white families and families of other ethnoracial backgrounds reported a decrease in fathers' caregiving for five-year old's, the older that fathers were, so that for other fathers, every ten years older a father is would predict a once per week decrease in the frequency of caregiving, compared to a .80 decrease for white fathers. However, in Model 3, this relationship is explained away by adding family context variables.

For other families, there was a relationship between mothers with less than high school education and more caregiving by fathers (1.25, Table 5.8), whereas for white families, more caregiving is associated with fathers with less education, although this relationship is also explained away by family context variables in Model 3. For other families, the only remaining significant relationship in Model 3 is between fathers' caregiving in year one and year three (.39, Table 5.8). The diversity within the category may mask relationships between ethnoracial identity and fathers' caregiving, but more research should be done to explore these experiences.

Hispanic-Black

Results in Tables 5.6 and 5.7 show a slightly stronger relationship between early and later caregiving for Hispanic families than for black families. Demographic and family context variables explain away some of the strength of the relationship for both groups across the models. Results in Model 3 show that for fathers' caring for their three-year old's, previous caregiving predicts a .41 increase (Table 5.7) in fathers' caregiving for Hispanic families and a .27 increase (Table 5.6) for black families. The difference is less dramatic when the child is five years old. Increased caregiving in year three predicted a .38 increase (Table 5.7) in father's caregiving for Hispanic families, and a .35 increase (Table 5.6) for black families.

For Hispanic families, the only family context variable that had a significant relationship with fathers' caregiving was the number of people in the household, where for every additional person in the household, fathers could be expected to do .24 fewer (Table 5.7) items of caregiving per week. The number of people in the household had no relationship with caregiving in black families. There may be cultural differences in the expectation of fathers' participation between the households. Black fathers who did not live stably with their child did do 1.04 fewer items of caregiving per week for their three-year old's than those who did, but no such relationship existed for Hispanic families. The addition of family context variables also revealed a relationship between fathers' having attended some college and an increase in black fathers' caregiving (.83, Table 5.6), but no differences by education were found for Hispanic fathers.

Other-Black

Father's early caregiving is more strongly related to later caregiving for other families than for black families when children are three years old. When the focal child is

three years old, fathers' increased caregiving for a one year old is associated with a .39 increase (Table 5.8) in father's caregiving for other families, and a .27 increase (Table 5.6) for black families. When the child is five years old, black fathers' caregiving at year three predicts a .35 increase (Table 5.6) in caregiving at year five, but for other families, the significance of the relationship is explained away by adding family context variables in Model 3 (Table 5.8).

For other families, the only other significant relationships are with demographic variables, and are explained away by adding family context variables in Model 3. For black families, the addition of family context variables revealed a relationship between fathers with less education and caregiving for five-year old's, where men with less than a high school education could be expected to do .83 more (Table 5.6) caregiving per week than men with a high school education. Additionally, in black families, fathers who do not stably live with their child are expected to do caregiving items 1.04 fewer days per week than those who do. No family context variables were significant for other families. Other fathers not stably living with living with their child came the closest to showing a significant relationship (-1.33, Table 5.8). Stable residency was the major significant predictor of fathers' caregiving in black families, but was just shy of being significant in other families.

Other-Hispanic

The results of Tables 5.8 and 5.7 show that the strength of the relationship between fathers' early and later caregiving when children are three years old is very similar between other and Hispanic families, with Hispanic families having a slightly stronger relationship (.41) than other families (.39). The relationship between early and

later caregiving is not significant for other families at year five, for either year three or year one caregiving, but the pattern looks similar. None of the demographic variables were significant for Hispanic families, and none of the family context variables were significant for other families. For other families, fathers' age and mother's education show significant relationships in Model 2, but are explained away by family context variables (Table 5.8). For Hispanic families, the only significant variable, other than fathers' prior caregiving, is the number of adults in the household, but no such relationship was shown for other families. For every additional person in the fathers' household, the father can be expected to do caregiving .24 fewer (Table 5.7) days per week.

Discussion of Hypotheses

HYPOTHESIS 1: The relationship between fathers' early and later caregiving vary by race, specifically, it will be stronger in white families than for families of other ethnoracial categories.

The results show support for Hypothesis 1. I find that for every racial and ethnic group, fathers' caregiving at year one predicts their caregiving at year three. The relationship is strongest for white and Hispanic parents (.41), then other parents (.39), and weakest for black parents (.27). Fathers who cared for their children when they were one-year old continue to provide caregiving when the child is three years old.

As the child gets older, I show that fathers' caregiving at the age of three continues to predict their caregiving at the age of five for white, black, and Hispanic fathers. While the relationship between earlier caregiving and later caregiving is much stronger for white parents (.74), it still remains positive for Hispanic (.38) and black parents (.35). Even after controlling for socioeconomic variables, age, fathers' residency,

and presence of other adults in the home, a racial gap of nearly two times still remains. For parents with other ethnoracial backgrounds, early caregiving was only significant in Model 2 (.46).

HYPOTHESIS 2: Fathers' frequency caregiving will vary by race, with fathers in black coparenting couples doing more play than fathers in families of other ethnoracial categories.

Hypothesis 2 is not supported by the findings. In Table 5.4, results show a difference in fathers' caregiving by ethnoracial makeup of the couple, where fathers in black families did caregiving items .34 fewer days per week compared to white fathers. However, the difference in black fathers' caregiving was explained away in Models 2 and 3 with the addition of family context and control variables. There was no significant difference between white families and Hispanic or families who identified as other, mixed or multiple ethnoracial categories.

Looking at individual caregiving activities, a different type of analysis might reveal significant differences across race on particular caregiving items. Looking back at Table 5.1, we can see some variation in the types of activities fathers of different ethnoracial backgrounds participate in, though these are only unweighted means, not regressions. Black and Hispanic fathers report more frequently taking their one and three-year-old to visit family, telling infants they are appreciated, taking a three-year-old on outings, playing imagination games, putting a one and three-year-old to bed, and watching television with a five-year-old. Black fathers report more frequently telling their three-year-old that they are appreciated, while Hispanic fathers report more frequently singing to one and five-year-olds, showing a one-year-old affection and feeding a three-year-old. Fathers in other, mixed or multiple ethnoracial categories also reported more

frequent social outings like visiting family and taking children on outings, affection and imaginative play, but also sang more to their three and five-year-old.

Across the years of caregiving, white fathers consistently read the most to their child and played with toys with their child more often (in years one and three when there were significant differences) than other groups of fathers. Black fathers took children to visit family more often than other groups of fathers in years one and three when that was reported. Congruent with previous research, these findings support the idea that family and extended kin networks are especially important for black families. Black and Hispanic fathers reported putting children to bed in the years that item was reported. Differences in putting children to bed may be due to differences in mothers' employment in non-white households. Other fathers were about in the middle on most caregiving items. More specific categorization of families in these ethn racial categories may show clearer results. These bivariate results do show different patterns of caregiving across ethn racial groups, and further analysis, with full regressions using caregiving items as dependent variables may show demonstrate more detail about these differences.

HYPOTHESIS 3: The relationship between caregiving and residency will differ by family's ethn racial group, where residency will be a better predictor of fathers' caregiving in white families than families of other ethn racial categories.

Results show some support for Hypothesis 3. Results show differences by ethn racial group, however, residency and household makeup seemed to matter more for black and Hispanic families than for white and other families. Father's caregiving for five-year-old's was related to fathers' stable residency for black fathers. Black fathers who were not stable residents with their child did less caregiving for their three-year-old compared to black fathers who lived with their child consistently (-1.04, Table 5.6), but

the relationship does not continue in year five. Other adults present in the fathers' household when the child was one was associated with less caregiving by Hispanic fathers. Among Hispanic parents, having more people in the household when the child was one year old was associated with less caregiving (-.24, Table 5.7) by fathers when the child was three years old, but not at five.

In families with white parents, fathers' age at birth is significant but weak in Models 2 and 3 (-.08, Table 5.5), where older fathers appear to do a small but significant amount less caregiving. Models 2 and 3, for white couples only, fathers' lower education, less than high school, was associated with greater caregiving (.87 and 1.01, Table 5.5) compared to white fathers who had a high school education. In families with black parents, fathers' college education was associated with increased caregiving by fathers (.83, Table 5.6). Families whose parents with other ethnoracial makeups had a strong, positive association between mothers' lower education and fathers' caregiving (1.25), a small negative association with fathers age (-.10), and a moderate, positive relationship between fathers' caregiving at year three and caregiving at year five, as seen in Model 2, Table 5.8. However, all three relationships disappear in Model 3, leaving only a negative relationship between father's age and fathers' caregiving.

The R-Squared values increase as variables are added in each model, although some R-Squared values and F-Statistics were not significant. In Table 5.4, which includes all families, the three models for explained the variation in fathers' caregiving when the child is three years old. The variables explained 26% of variation in Model 1, 28% in Model 2 and 33% in Model 3. The three models predicting fathers' caregiving when the

child is five explain 27%, 33% and 37%, respectively. Each of the R-Squared values and F Statistic for this table were significant at the .05 or smaller.

The models in Table 5.5, which includes white families also show increasing R-Squared values as variables are added, in Year 3 (21%, 29%, 35%) and in Year 5 (36%, 44%, 49%). Each of these regressions has a significant R-Squared and F -Statistic, except Model 3 Year 5 (49%), for which neither was significant.

The regressions in Table 5.6, which includes black families, also explained moderate amounts of fathers's caregiving in Year 3 (21%, 27%, 38%) and Year 5 (24%, 42%, 54%), though R-Squared values and F-Statistics were not significant for Models 2 and 3 when the child was three-years old (27% and 38%).

The regressions in Table 5.7 explained moderate amounts of Hispanic fathers' caregiving as well, and each model in each year did have a significant R-Squared and F-Statistic. Models predicted 27%, 39% and 49% of fathers' caregiving in Year 3, and 22%, 35% and 41% of fathers' caregiving when their children were five-years old.

Table 5.8 shows that for families of other ethnoracial backgrounds, the models explained 29%, 35% and 47% of fathers' caregiving in Year 3, although R-Squared and the F-Statistic for Model 3 (47%) was not significant. In Year 5, the models explained 20%, 51% and 68% of variation in fathers' caregiving, and were each significant.

Discussion

We see from the results that there is a relationship between early caregiving and later caregiving for all ethnoracial groups of parents. This holds true from the span between the child's first and third birthday, as well as between the first and fifth birthday, when the difference in strength of relationship is even more marked. These findings are

consistent with Cabrera, Fagan and Farrie (2008) who found that fathers' prenatal caregiving for the mother was associated with later caregiving for the child.

The relationship between early and later caregiving is strongest for families with white parents- twice as strong as for black and Hispanic parents at year five. There was no significant difference between fathers' caregiving by ethnoracial group at year three or five, after including control variables.

For families with black parents, the relationship between early caregiving and later caregiving is weaker than for other groups, at years three and five. At year three, black fathers who are unstably resident with their child are doing less than black residential fathers, but at year five, the only remaining factor is fathers' education, which is positively associated with fathers' caregiving. Findings suggest that black fathers may be more resilient to interruptions in caregiving than other groups, or that their reasons for not participating in caregiving are more related to factors outside of caregiving trajectories. Future qualitative research would be beneficial to investigate the circumstances and framing of fathers' interrupted and restarted childcare across ethnoracial groups to understand those processes. These findings support Vespa (2009) and others who encourage the investigation of intersectional contexts that result in diverse experiences of family. Previous researchers have found that black and Hispanic fathers do not do less caregiving and in some types of caregiving do more than white fathers (Cabrera, Hofferth and Chae 2011). The results of this study also support that non-white fathers do not do less caregiving, and in preliminary results, seem to do more in some areas.

Hispanic families, like white and black families, did have a relationship between early and later caregiving through both time periods, although it was not as strong as for white families, particularly in year five. Families whose parents identified as being of other, mixed or multiple ethnoracial categories only showed a relationship between early and later caregiving when children were three years old. The small number and wide diversity of the group may explain the lack of relationships in the results for “other” families. While it might be convenient to exclude this group, I want to include what data we do have for these families to encourage more detailed research in the future. In addition to groups with small numbers, there is still the issue of attrition and missing data for the most vulnerable in the population. This research could be improved upon by using imputation or other methods to avoid the impact of attrition. This data set was designed specifically to collect information from difficult to track families, particularly fathers, but the problem remains.

Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusions

Overview

This dissertation uses data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing (Fragile Families) study to explore factors that predict fathers' caregiving for children up to five years old. I study the role of social contexts in fathers' caregiving trajectories for their young children, including family dynamics and parent's gender ideology, across ethnoracial groups. This longitudinal analysis includes data from both mothers and fathers over time, regardless of their relationship status or living arrangements. While prior studies have examined fatherhood accessibility, contact, involvement, presence, and caregiving, this study is the first, to my knowledge, to explore fathers' specific caregiving activities over time. The sample in this study includes a diverse pool of fathers, particularly from vulnerable and underrepresented populations. I investigate how fathers' early caregiving experiences, their linked-lives with others, and their attitudes about the fatherhood role predict later caregiving for their children, and how those patterns vary between families with different ethnoracial backgrounds.

Contributions

This study offers a number of key contributions to the body of knowledge about fathers' caregiving using an intersectional life-course framework. Life-course methods focus on how stages and trajectories are experienced within the linked-lives of fathers' social networks for a fuller understanding of the contexts of their caregiving. This study aimed to inform the fatherhood caregiving literature about how unique family forms and gender ideology shape the caregiving time-specific experiences of fathers from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Based on a large body of fatherhood scholarship, I

recognized gaps in the area of father's caregiving, especially among our most vulnerable fathers who are more likely to experience interruptions in their child's life. Their fatherhood experiences are not monolithic, requiring scholars to expand their investigations of fatherhood to be much more intersectional. As gendered expectations change over time with cultural shifts, understanding the social contexts of caregiving in families allows us to better inform effective and supportive family policies and make a more humane world for caregivers and those they care for.

Researchers have identified men's participation in childcare as a linchpin in advancing the gender revolution, and progress towards equity at home and in the workplace (England 2010; Hochschild and Machung 2012; Ferree 2010; Gerson 2002). Men's participation in the domestic sphere is a necessary foundation to navigate work/family conflicts that arise from gendered roles and stereotypes about who should work and who should do caregiving. This research helps to define and address problems created by men's lesser participation in caregiving, especially for women whose work is complicated by disproportionate caregiving responsibilities.

The significant contributions from my research findings are discussed below and organized by the research questions that guided this study. Findings from this study can be used to guide family policy in the United States, especially with regard to father involvement and caregiving in their children's lives. This research is important in understanding the processes that surround fathers' participation in the lives of their children. I will discuss the main contributions gained by addressing my overarching research questions as well as other key findings that emerged during my analysis.

Timing, aging, and continuity of fathers' caregiving

Recent Caregiving Best Predicts Future Caregiving

My first research question explores the relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving as the child ages from one to five years old. Not surprisingly, earlier caregiving predicts later caregiving. Fathers who provide caregiving to their one-year old are likely to still be providing caregiving to the same child at age three. Fathers providing caregiving when the child is three years old are likely to be providing caregiving when the child is five years old. In essence, without caregiving interruptions, fathers who begin caregiving at early ages (within first year of the child's life) generally show continuity in their caregiving over time. This pattern of continuity challenges scholars and family policy to move beyond comparing fathers against each other based on their caregiving (those who provide care versus those who do not) and recognizing that each stage of caregiving is a new opportunity for fathers to change their caregiving trajectories.

Supportive family policies should focus on two strategies for increasing fathers' caregiving in children's lives. First, if early caregiving predicts later caregiving, then ensuring that fathers are included in caregiving from a child's *birth* is central to future involvement and the caregiving cycle. Societal norms about father caregiving during infant stages often depict a role where men are limited in the ways they can provide care and/or are intimidated by the 24-hour demands of a new baby and infant. For breastfed babies, men may feel excluded from caregiving or helpless in providing the primary needs of a new baby. However, even if breastfeeding, most care can be provided by either parent, if they imagine themselves involved in, and then provide that caregiving for their

child, and to the benefit of the mother (Wolf 2007). Fathers may not know how to involve themselves in specific caregiving as fathers (Collett, Vercell and Boykin 2015). It is important for fathers to know how to remain active and supportive during the early stages of a child's life.

Culturally, a shift in gender norms around parenting might further help fathers to see themselves as able and necessary in caregiving for children. Valuing caregiving overall would not only help women, who are disproportionately under or unpaid for caregiving, but it would also help men to see their own caregiving as a valued, respected, and prestigious activity. While some men participating in some ways might be praised as going above and beyond for caregiving activities that women do regularly, overall, men's participation in caregiving is not expected or appreciated in the same way that mothering is made synonymous with compulsory caregiving.

Media, social programs, churches, and schools can model men's *continuous* involvement as valuable, capable, and respectable. Campaigns can work within existing gender frameworks to foster men's positive view of fatherhood identities. Themes might include, "I'm there for you," "Whatever you need, whenever you need it," "Ready to tag in," etc, can be paired with images of competent fathering to support the idea of continuous fatherhood being about providership, integrity, loyalty, and reliability. Some campaigns have already moved this direction, for example, advertisements for Cheerios, selling their wares as a tool of competent, involved fathers in "Cheerios- How to Dad" (General Mills 2004). This advertisement was a Canadian import that shows a Competent father getting his kids ready for school in the morning. It emphasizes pride in fatherhood, being unfettered by rowdy children, knowledgeable in comments to children, nurturing in

talking about being compassionate for hurt or disciplined children, being looked up to, and mentoring (General Mills 2004). With minimal stereotypes thrown in, selling Cheerios is also promoting an image of involved fatherhood that fathers might be interested in identifying with, in contrast to bumbling Homer Simpson tropes in other examples.

Men may not know where to start without the same early gender socialization that women get to provide caregiving. Early caregiving experiences can be encouraged in schools and youth groups to give young men experience and confidence in caregiving. The idea that caregiving builds character, fosters responsibility, maturity and leadership can be utilized to support early experiences. Programs can model fathering in gender-palatable ways, demonstrating care as skill building. Previous research shows that fathers with more specific ideas about what fatherhood involves were more likely to be involved (Collett, Vercell and Boykin 2015). Programs that help fathers see themselves as caregivers can be more effective by helping fathers get specific about how they imagine fathering their children.

Such activities can be presented in ways that describe caregiving as translatable to other valued work and characteristics. Activities like creating and managing checklists and arranging/keeping appointments are managerial. Gathering resources like donated clothes and supplies, keeping inventory and supply of food and diapers is about organizing provisions and navigating strategy and preparedness. Preparing meals, maintaining the house, and providing supervision protects mothers' rest and self-care time. Withstanding emotional strain of sick and crying children shows self-control, discipline, mastery. Developing children's minds and bodies through stories and

experiences makes you a trainer. All of these descriptions of caregiving demonstrate specific caregiving activities, presented in verbiage and imagery that are compatible with masculine gender identities, support mothers in caregiving, and value fathering.

Second, family policies should focus on bringing father's back in to the caregiving cycle, regardless of the child's age or prior caregiving activity. This research suggests that at any age, policies to support fathers' current caregiving can shape future caregiving. Policies, programs, media should avoid a strict characterization of fathers as either dead-beat dads or involved fathers. Such characterization may make it easier for fathers to write off the idea of beginning caregiving after an interruption. We should be careful to craft descriptions of fathers as dynamic, rather than static over time and subject to change. It might be prudent for institutions that control access between parents and children, such as visitation and custody decision makers, to consider that fathers may become involved later on. It has been suggested that child support systems should incorporate caregiving in a "hybrid child support system" that would include both caregiving and economic provision as child support (Roberts 2005). This would help break the idea that fathers are only responsible for financial support, leaving mothers to do caregiving.

Narratives around fathering can describe fathering as a jumpstart to future fathering. Fatherhood campaigns can focus on today, helping fathers to imagine themselves stepping into caregiving. Communities might consider putting an emphasis on fathers' involvement where interaction between parents and institutions might already occur. Schools that provide food or school supplies for families in need to take home could encourage fathers to stock up, bring home the goods, or otherwise step up to

specific tasks. Community centers could promote classes for fathers to take with their children, such as hair styling/cutting lessons, vehicle maintenance, art, dance, finance, etc. These community groups could encourage fathers to begin something new with their children. Encouraging fathers to sign up with other fathers they know, friends or family, could help keep fathers involved.

HUD and other organizations are already fighting perceptions about risking their housing if fathers are around (HUD 2013; Gordy 2011). Ongoing programs like their training, educational support, parenting classes, and court assistance for fathers could help fathers to maintain involvement. Annual family events like their Father's Day celebration can help break down myths and get fathers information to get involved in more sustained ways. In addition to strategies to increase fathers' caregiving, resources should also be directed to institutional support for mothers in need of child care, knowing, that mothers do and will provide a disproportionate amount of caregiving for children at the same time as navigating the workforce. Both informal and institutional caregiving solutions can help to address the bottleneck for women who do both paid work and unpaid caregiving.

Age of child as stages of caregiving

As expected, caregiving demands change as children grow up. The opportunities for fathers to be involved in caregiving change over time as children move through different stages of life and development. Therefore, the onset of caregiving may not be the only important stage to consider in the course of fatherhood, but rather changes in types of caregiving over time. For example, in Chapter 3, results showed that fathers living with their five-year-old did more caregiving than nonresident fathers, but there was

no difference when the child was three. There are a few things that might explain this. It may be that factors other than residency are more pertinent when a child is younger. Fathers may not be participating because of how they see their role. The types of caregiving they imagine themselves participating in may be more available with older children. It may be that nonresidency in earlier years derailed fathers' caregiving, leaving them out of caregiving for five-year-olds. It may be that when children are five-years old and starting school, it is more difficult for nonresidential parents to be involved, due to more rigid or involved schedules.

Policies that might support fathers' involvement should also be staged according to age. Points of contact with new parents such as doctor offices, hospitals, welfare and WIC offices could provide materials suggesting ways that fathers can be involved, specific to children's ages. Parental leave is not available to many mothers, let alone fathers, but in addition to making paid parental leave available to all parents, provisions could be included to allow for some leave to only be available to fathers while mothers are working, helping to solidify independent fathering experiences.

Interruptions in Caregiving

My findings indicate that interruptions in caregiving can be negative for long-term caregiving. In addition to my results that caregiving seems to have a time-based sequential pattern, caregiving that experiences interruptions shows a pattern that negatively impacts later caregiving. Results from this study lead to important questions about how to prevent, or mediate, the impact of father interruptions on caregiving. We can consider policies to support fathers' continuous, age-graded caregiving to keep

fathers in trajectories of caregiving, to get fathers back into caregiving, minimize interruptions, and to mediate them.

In considering caregiving, it is fair to imagine that fathers have more disruptions in caregiving than mothers. Fathers may feel less social pressure to provide continuous caregiving, particularly for nonresident fathers. Some fathers may experience more disruption than others, for example, those struggling with poverty, involved in illegal activity, incarcerated, those who are not living with children and/or who experience housing transitions, homelessness or who transportation issues. Fathers' vulnerability to poverty, discrimination, unemployment, incarceration and such, all interact to complicate and exacerbate interruptions. Men may experience more caregiving interruptions due to incarceration, with men making up 93.2% of the prison population in the US (BOP 2018). Addressing the interrelated disadvantage experiences by vulnerable fathers can help inform policy to support fathers' caregiving.

Current welfare policies include an access to a cell phone to facilitate job searches for those in poverty, but could also be used to support families. If phone services included data plans that could support using applications for video chat, nonresident fathers would be able to participate in some early caregiving activities, even from afar, such as singing to children, reading them stories, expressing affection, and perhaps even helping with homework. Currently, phones stop working when minutes are gone. Perhaps, phones available to those in need could follow other phone plan models where phone calls to verified family members or people in caregiving networks would be unlimited to encourage care and communication. These opportunities might also help mitigate the lost parenting opportunities for fathers who are incarcerated. Some prisons

are already using email for communications, which could easily be extended to video visits with family, especially children.

Fathers' caregiving varies by family contexts

My second research question asks how the relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving differ across family contexts, and specifically, how fathers' caregiving might be shaped by their living situations. Fewer people in a fathers' household predicts more caregiving by fathers when their child is three, and consistent residency matters when their child is five.

While some previous research has found that fathers who are neither living with, nor romantically involved with mothers do more caregiving than other fathers, other research finds that coresidential fathers' do more caregiving, especially black fathers (Fagan and Palkovitz 2011; Shannon et al 2009). Differences by early caregiving experiences may be masking differences by residency. Laughlin, Farrie, and Fagan (2009), found that cohabiting fathers involved in early caregiving continued to report high levels of involvement after terminating romantic ties with their coparent.

A different analysis comparing nonresidential fathers whose coparent has, and has not, begun living with a new partner may reveal more differences. Investigating the role of new partners on nonresidential fathers' caregiving may clear up the fragmented results of previous research as to how fathers' residency predicts caregiving. More detailed contexts might help clarify results. It may also be, however, that notions of fatherhood as a "package deal," or set of interconnected identities as a spouse, provider, and father, may be breaking up (Townsend 2002). Fatherhood as conceived as a "package deal" may be less applicable to vulnerable populations with less access to its successful fulfillment of

expectations of marriage, employment, and homeownership discussed in previous literature (Townsend 2002).

The presence of resident, paternal grandmothers were expected to reduce fathers' participation in caregiving but did not. Grandmothers' participation may be more complicated than simply replacing fathers' caregiving. Grandmothers in the home don't seem to matter, on the surface. How can this be reconciled with previous research? There are a few possibilities. Previous research has shown a wide variety of forms, experiences and reasons for grandmothers living with their adult children and/or grandchildren (Prokos & Keene 2012). Multigenerational households often form out of economic crisis, as in a case where adult children and dependents move in with grandparents, and when grandparents lose a spouse or are struggling with health issues (Keene & Batson 2010). Reasons for living together may factor into caregiving roles within the household.

Paternal grandmothers in this study may be facilitating as well as substituting for fathers' caregiving, masking the impact of both influences. Grandmothers may teach and involve their sons in caregiving for their children, for example, telling them and showing them how they cared for the fathers' generation, how they prepared food, dealt with fevers, fussiness or bedtime rituals, in effect, modeling and mentoring caregiving. In this way, grandmothers might draw men into caregiving, as some research suggests (Gerstel and Gallagher 2001; Chang and White-Means 1991). At the same time, possibly even within the same families, grandmothers may substitute for fathers' caregiving by watching children, volunteering, or being volunteered for supervision, singing, reading, feeding, and other caregiving.

Another scenario involving grandparents may be that the role of grandparents in caregiving has changed over time, or that grandparent involvement in caregiving manifests somewhat differently in “fragile” families. Fathers may be living with grandmothers for a variety of reasons. Perhaps grandmothers are living with fathers because of few resources or ailing health, rather than fathers living with parents who support them. If fathers are financially dependent on their own mothers, grandmothers may be working, unavailable to help with caregiving. If fathers are supporting mothers who are not able to work, they may also not be able to provide caregiving. It may be that physically or economically, grandmothers are unable to care for children, especially in these early years of childhood. A different, and perhaps qualitative approach may better discover the role of grandmothers in fathers’ homes as they impact fathers’ caregiving.

One possibility to consider is that accounting only for paternal grandmothers living with fathers may not draw a complete picture of the role of grandmothers in caregiving, as it has been emphasized in previous research. For example, children of nonresidential fathers, and children of cohabiting and/or married parents may receive caregiving from maternal grandmothers who live with mothers that would not be measured by the paternal grandmother variable. It may also be that maternal grandmothers provide different caregiving than paternal grandmothers.

As shown by other scholars, the introduction of new partners in a coparenting arrangement is associated with less involvement by fathers (Tach, Mincy and Edin 2010). My study was unable to find a relationship between father’s caregiving and mothers who have new romantic partners living with them. This lack of relationship in my study between mothers’ new partners and fathers’ caregiving may be due to the small number

of mothers reporting *living* with new partners. Future research might seek to look at differences between nonresidential fathers whose coparent is involved with, as well as living with, a new partner.

Few differences in fathers' caregiving by gender ideology

My third research question asks how the relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving differ among families who do not share similar gender ideologies. Chapter 4 investigates gender ideology as a predictor of fathers' caregiving. I focus on the relationship between fathers' caregiving and several measures of gender ideology related to fatherhood: the importance of fatherhood to a fathers' identity, parents' agreement on the importance of fathers' caregiving, and the fathers' gender ideology about the role of men and women in work and caregiving. Gender ideology, including ideology around the fatherhood identity, did not, for the most part, predict fathers' caregiving. Ethnoracial background of the parents did help reveal different experiences of family contexts around fathers' caregiving, as discussed below. Attention should be paid to experiences and gender ideology around fatherhood by ethnoracial background. Additionally, further analysis should be done to avoid limiting the sample by fathers' attrition, thereby retaining more families in the analysis. It is possible that the limited sample may make it difficult to see significant differences between families with different gender ideologies around fatherhood.

Differences in caregiving across ethnoracial groups

My last research question asks how the relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving differ across racial and ethnic families, and whether racial and ethnic cultural differences in family forms manifest through fathers' caregiving

patterns. Chapter 5 interrogates the relationship between fathers' caregiving and family contexts across ethnoracial categories. Families' ethnoracial backgrounds do inform the context of fathers' caregiving. Both family contexts and gender ideology mattered differently for families of different ethnoracial backgrounds. Each of these contributions are detailed below.

Residency matters differently across ethnoracial groups

Results from this study support previous research that shows father residency matters differently across ethnoracial groups, with unique experiences and social locations (Shannon, Cabrera, Tamis-LeMondac, and Lamb 2009; Vespa 2009; Jones and Mosher 2013; Cabrera, Hofferth and Chae 2011). Black fathers who did not consistently live with their child did less caregiving for their three-year-old's than stably resident black fathers. Contrary to previous research, I find that residency is more important to caregiving for black fathers than for fathers of other ethnoracial groups (Jones and Mosher 2013; Shannon et al 2009). Shannon's study controlled for prenatal involvement, which was also shown to be more important for black fathers' caregiving, compared to other groups. Overall, they found that prenatal involvement explained most of the differences by residency. A future analysis should include prenatal caregiving to see whether black fathers' prenatal caregiving might explain why other studies have shown residency to be less important for black father's caregiving, while this study found it to be more important (Shannon et al).

For Hispanic fathers, having more people in the household was associated with less caregiving for their three-year-old's. Hispanic families may have stronger expectations that non-parent members of the household contribute to caregiving, or

stronger expectations that fathers should not do caregiving. For both black fathers who are not stable residents, and for Hispanic fathers with more people in the household, the result of lesser caregiving by fathers only showed up when the child was three years old, but not five years old. This may show resilience to caregiving interruptions, or it may be evidence of an age-specific interruption. Perhaps the types of caregiving provided to three-year-old's are more difficult, or less embraced by fathers than caregiving for a five-year-old. It may be that having more people in the household, or lack of residency make participating in caregiving a little bit harder, less-preferred caregiving for a three-year-old is forgone, but more-entertaining caregiving for an older child is embraced. An analysis of individual caregiving tasks by age may help to answer those questions.

Support and encouragement for Hispanic fathers may be aided by emphasizing the importance of fathers specifically participating in caregiving to foster the idea that their role is an important part of the makeup of childcare. It may be valuable to include suggestions for Hispanic fathers that include others but cannot be substituted by others. For example, people and institutions providing support to families might suggest that fathers teach children stories or activities that will be a surprise for when the family gets together.

Gender Ideology and Ethnoracial Differences

In Chapter 4, I found few differences in fathers' caregiving across gender ideology. Previous research has shown gender ideologies as important predictors of fathers' caregiving, but this study shows that gender ideology does not function similarly across ethnoracial groups (Bulanda 2004; Meteyer and Perry-Jenkins 2010; Adamsons and Pasley 2013; Gaunt 2006; Zou 2004). White fathers were the only group for whom

gender ideology variables had a significant relationship with caregiving. White fathers who agreed that men should work, and women should care, did less caregiving. The relationship between gender ideology and fathers' caregiving may be driven by white fathers, who are most often overrepresented in research, over fathers of other ethnoracial backgrounds.

As discussed in Chapter 4, white families may experience some privilege that allows them more opportunities to adjust to match their experiences to match their ideologies. Since hegemonic masculinity is based in experiences of white masculinity, white fathers who believe in separate spheres gender roles could have a greater aversion to gendered tasks like caregiving, as it threatens their gender performance. The cultural narrative of separate spheres itself has a unique cultural history and individual white fathers' masculine performance may be more strongly invested in avoiding performing caregiving.

How does these ethnoracial differences inform policy decisions? Adherence to gender norms about working fathers and caring mothers may be related to the previously mentioned finding that early caregiving has a stronger relationship to fathers' later caregiving for white fathers. White fathers' early experiences of caregiving may change their perceptions of the meaning of caregiving to their gender performance. Larger differences in fathers' caregiving between more and less egalitarian fathers among white families may signal a cultural or philosophical divide that is more pronounced between white families. Changing expectations about men's responsibility to work may be uneven across different groups of white fathers.

Black fathers with some college education did more caregiving for five-year-old's. It may be that black families are more supportive of black fathers with education being involved with children, encouraging, rather than gatekeeping fathers' caregiving. It may be that education might increase black fathers' own valuation of fathers' caregiving. Supporting education for young black men may have an indirect effect of bolstering their position within the family as caregivers.

Further research should recognize white fathers' own ethnoracially-specific experiences and avoid generalizing trends common to majority groups as true for all groups. Studies may have more success studying the role of gender ideology within groups, and there-by be better able to recognize more salient factors for fathers' caregiving for non-white fathers. If earlier experiences are especially important for white fathers, more can be done to encourage and foster those experiences. Or, more broadly, specific efforts to interject a cultural script of caregiving in hegemonic masculinity may speak to particular audiences of fathers. Interventions can use language that couches caregiving in more stereotypically masculine terms and concepts, such as providing care, being a teacher/mentor/role model, routine caregiving as part of the role of a guardian, coach, protector or provider.

Whether through ads, movies, education or celebrity, popularizing a positive, hegemonically-successful image of a caregiving father may help fathers to see themselves in that role. Seeding and encouraging cultural scripts that recognize and appreciate continuous and reliable caregiving by fathers would also help to value women's unpaid carework. Carework, generally, is often devalued in pay and prestige.

Working to raise the standards and status of carework would help the women who are disproportionately responsible for it, and, conversely, to incentivize men to participate.

Overall, findings from this research suggest that families would benefit from policies that support fathers' early caregiving, and encourage collaborative care, especially in the first few years, that would bring fathers into caregiving experiences. Additionally, appeals to participation in fatherhood that draw on fatherhood ideology should include diverse ethnoracial experiences of fatherhood, and be adaptive and inclusive of experiences within families of various forms, especially those with nonresidential fathers.

Limitations and Future Work

The Fragile Families data used in the study are limited. I faced several challenges based on data availability and the structure of the dataset. Questionnaire design and the diversity of families included in the sample are two challenges that I experienced in my analysis.

First, due to the panel-design of the Fragile Families Study, questionnaires are modified at each data collection period to reflect the aging of children and their parents over time. As such, the questions asked to parents about their caregiving are adjusted over time. This produces slightly different summative index measures for caregiving. There are two solutions that could address this limitation that I have considered for future research. One, I could standardize fathers' caregiving into z-scores in the dependent variable, rather than weekly averages, so that comparisons could be made across years. Standardizing scores would mean that the dependent variable would reflect fathers' caregiving, relative to the caregiving of other fathers in that given year. Additionally, an

ordinal regression may better be able to reflect changes over time in fathers' caregiving, showing whether fathers moved to a higher order category of caregiving, rather than showing their average caregiving across years.

While my current analysis shows a relationship between early and later caregiving, and patterns across group, I am unable to test the causal relationship between early caregiving and later caregiving. I hope to do more research in the future to explore how fathers' experiences might increase or decrease their caregiving with more specificity given to the conditions around fathers' caregiving improvements.

Second, I was challenged by the data's limitations on racially and ethnically mixed families. The United States has a growing mixed-race population that needs representation in family scholarship. In my analysis, I was unable to isolate any particular variable that predicts caregiving for fathers in the "Other" ethnoracial category. This includes all fathers who identify as anything other than white, black, or Hispanic. The diversity of the group altogether, along with their small sample size in this study, limit the results from this group. Family scholars might consider oversampling techniques that better capture diverse fathers in the United States. Likewise, family scholars might need to use qualitative investigation of mixed-race fathers to better understand the role that racial identity (of fathers and their children) might play in fatherhood involvement.

Parents of different racial and ethnic backgrounds introduce their children to different cultural and familial traditions, including those surrounding parenting, motherhood, fatherhood, gender roles, and family involvement in children's lives. The sample of mixed families in the Fragile Families study is limited. Despite this limitation, I feel it is important not to exclude small or inconvenient populations, but instead hope

that the limited findings will spur more quantitative and qualitative studies of these families.

The work that I have done here is a small increment toward understanding the processes, and social contexts in which families form, change, and provide caregiving. I hope it offers steps forward to more inclusive and nuanced research that can offer suggestions and policies to support families as they really are.

Appendix: Tables

Table 2.1: Descriptive Statistics for Variables

	Year 0/1			Year 3				Year 5			
	Min	Mean or %	SD	Min	Max	Mean or %	SD	Min	Max	Mean or %	SD
Father's self-report of caregiving per week	0.00	4.53	(1.24)	0.00	7.00	4.38	(1.02)	0.00	7.00	3.86	(1.20)
Parents' Ethnoracial category											
Parents are white (reference)		42%	(0.49)								
Parents are Black		14%	(0.35)								
Parents are Hispanic		28%	(0.45)								
Parents are other or multiple categories		16%	(0.37)								
Father has unstable employment at since year 1											
No (reference)						77%	(0.42)			65%	(0.48)
Yes						23%	(0.42)			35%	(0.48)
Father's household in poverty at all since year 1											
No (reference)						76%	(0.43)			73%	(0.45)
Yes						24%	(0.43)			27%	(0.45)
Mother's household in poverty at all since year 1											
No (reference)						74%	(0.44)			70%	(0.46)
Yes						26%	(0.44)			30%	(0.46)
Father's age at birth	16	30.89	(6.33)								
Mother's age at birth	15	28.01	(5.76)								
Father's education at birth											
Father has less than HS education		17%	(0.38)								
Father has HS or equal education (reference)		26%	(0.44)								
Father has some college or tech education		33%	(0.47)								
Father has college or grad degree		23%	(0.42)								
Mother's education at birth											
Mother has less than HS education		19%	(0.39)								
Mother has HS or equal education (reference)		28%	(0.45)								
Mother has some college or tech education		25%	(0.44)								
Mother has college or grad degree		27%	(0.45)								
Father has ever spent time in jail by time of interview											
No (reference)						93%	(0.25)			93%	(0.25)
Yes						7%	(0.25)			7%	(0.25)
Parents' residency since year 1											
Stable resident (reference)						89%	(0.31)			81%	(0.39)
Unstable or Nonresident						11%	(0.31)			14%	(0.35)
Mother resided with a new partner at any year since year 1											
No (reference)						99%	(0.12)			95%	(0.23)
Yes						1%	(0.12)			5%	(0.23)
Father's lived some time apart from child since year 1											
Stable resident (reference)						90%	(0.30)			85%	(0.35)
Unstable or Nonresident						10%	(0.30)			15%	(0.35)
Grandmother present in father's household since year 1											
No (reference)						87%	(0.33)			84%	(0.37)
Yes						13%	(0.33)			16%	(0.37)
Number of people in father's household	1	2.23	(0.72)	1	10	2.21	(0.67)	1	7	2.21	(0.62)
Number of children father has at year 5								1	10	2.51	(1.18)
Father expects or has had additional children at year 3											
No (reference)						68%	(0.47)				
Yes						32%	(0.47)				
Child's Gender											
Girl (reference)		43%	(0.50)								
Boy		57%	(0.50)								
Parent's do not both agree that father's caregiving is "very im											
No (reference)		72%	(0.45)								
Yes		28%	(0.45)								
Father's Identity Centrality is strong at birth											
Yes (reference)		67%	(0.47)								
No		33%	(0.47)								
Father's agrees that it is better for men to earn and women to care											
No (reference)		60%	(0.49)								
Yes		40%	(0.49)								
Father disagrees that men's family time is more important than working a lot											
No		16%	(0.37)								
Yes (reference)		84%	(0.37)								

Source: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, using flnatwt

N=1020 except for the gender ideology questions, which are N= 1013, 1011, 1014 and 1008 respectively.

Table 2.2: Analytic Plan Overview: Variables Utilized in Each Chapter

		Chapter 3		Chapter 4		Chapter 5	
		Year 3	Year 5	Year 3	Year 5	Year 3	Year 5
IV	Father's report of father's care at year 1	X	X	X	X	X	X
DV	Father's report of father's care at year 3	X	X	X	X	X	X
DV	Father's report of father's care at year 5		X		X		X
	Parent's Ethnoracial category	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Father unstably employed between year 1 and 3	X		X		X	
	Father unstably employed between year 1 3 and 5		X		X		X
	Father's household in poverty between years 1 and 3	X		X		X	
	Father's household in poverty between years 1 3 and 5		X		X		X
	Mother's household in poverty between years 1 and 3	X		X		X	
	Mother's household in poverty between years 1 3 and 5		X		X		X
	Father's age at birth	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Mother's age at birth	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Father's education at birth	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Mother's education at birth	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Father has ever spent time in jail by his three-year interview	X		X		X	
	Parents' residency between years 1 and 3	X		X		X	
	Parents' residency between years 1 3 and 5		X		X		X
	Mother resided with a new partner at year 1 or 3	X		X		X	
	Mother resided with a new partner at any year 1 3 or 5		X		X		X
	Father's residency with child between years 1 and 3	X		X		X	
	Father's residency with child between years 1 3 and 5		X		X		X
	Grandmother present in father's household years 1 or 3	X		X		X	
	Grandmother present in father's household years 1 3 or 5		X		X		X
	Number of people in father's household at year 1	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Number of people in father's household at year 3	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Number of people in father's household at year 5		X		X		X
	Number of children father has at year 5		X		X		X
	Father expects or has had additional children at year 3	X		X		X	
	Child's Gender	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Parent's both agree that father's caregiving is "very important"			X	X	X	X
	Father's Identity Centrality is strong at birth			X	X	X	X
	Father's attitude on whether it is better for men to earn and women to care			X	X	X	X
	Father's attitude on whether men's family time is more important than working a lot			X	X	X	X

Source: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, N = 1020 1020 988 988 1020 1020
X indicates that the variable in the row will be utilized in the analysis listed in the column above

Table 3.1: Father's Mean Caregiving by Variables in Chapter 3: Caregiving in Family Contexts						
	Year 1	SD	Year 3	SD	Year 5	SD
Father's residency with child since year 1						
Stable resident (reference)	-	-	4.52	(1.05)	4.00	(1.19)
Unstable or Nonresident	-	-	4.12	(1.38)	3.44	(1.50)
Mother resided with a new partner at any year since year 1						
No (reference)	-	-	4.45	(1.11)	3.90	(1.25)
Yes	-	-	3.68	(1.73)	2.90	(1.78)
Father's lived some time apart from child since year 1						
Stable resident (reference)	-	-	4.55	(1.02)	4.03	(1.19)
Unstable or Nonresident	-	-	3.79	(1.46)	3.16	(1.51)
Grandmother present in father's household since year 1						
No (reference)	-	-	4.46	(1.07)	3.86	(1.30)
Yes	-	-	4.26	(1.40)	3.73	(1.37)
Father expects or has had additional children at year 3						
No (reference)	-	-	4.41	(1.15)	3.77	(1.34)
Yes	-	-	4.46	(1.13)	3.96	(1.27)
Child's Gender						
Girl (reference)	4.26	(1.64)	4.45	(1.16)	3.81	(1.37)
Boy	4.23	(1.59)	4.41	(1.13)	3.84	(1.27)

Source: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, N=1020

Table 3.2: Analytic Plan and Regression Modeling for Chapter 3: Caregiving in Family Contexts

		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
		Year 3	Year 5	Year 3	Year 5	Year 3	Year 5
IV	Father's report of father's care at year 1	X	X	X	X	X	X
DV	Father's report of father's care at year 3	X	X	X	X	X	X
DV	Father's report of father's care at year 5		X		X		X
	Parent's Ethnoracial category					X	X
	Father unstably employed between year 1 and 3					X	
	Father unstably employed between year 1 3 and 5						X
	Father's household in poverty between years 1 and 3					X	
	Father's household in poverty between years 1 3 and 5						X
	Mother's household in poverty between years 1 and 3					X	
	Mother's household in poverty between years 1 3 and 5						X
	Father's age at birth					X	X
	Mother's age at birth					X	X
	Father's education at birth					X	X
	Mother's education at birth					X	X
	Father has ever spent time in jail by his three-year interview					X	
	Father has ever spent time in jail by his five-year interview						X
	Parents' residency between years 1 and 3	X		X		X	
	Parents' residency between years 1 3 and 5		X		X		X
	Mother resided with a new partner at year 1 or 3	X		X		X	
	Mother resided with a new partner at any year 1 3 or 5		X		X		X
	Father's residency with child between years 1 and 3	X		X		X	
	Father's residency with child between years 1 3 and 5		X		X		X
	Grandmother present in father's household years 1 or 3			X		X	
	Grandmother present in father's household years 1 3 or 5				X		X
	Number of people in father's household at year 1			X	X	X	X
	Number of people in father's household at year 3			X	X	X	X
	Number of people in father's household at year 5				X		X
	Father expects or has had additional children at year 3			X		X	
	Number of children father has at year 5				X		X
	Child's Gender			X	X	X	X
	Parent's both agree that father's caregiving is "very important"						
	Father's Identity Centrality is strong at birth						
	Father's attitude on whether it is better for men to earn and women to care						
	Father's attitude on whether men's family time is more important than working a lot						

Source: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, N=1020

X indicates that the variable in the row will be utilized in the analysis listed in the column above

Table 3.3: Father's Early Caregiving Predicting later Caregiving by Family Contexts

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3									
	Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5							
	R ²	F	R ²	F	R ²	F	R ²	F	R ²	F	R ²	F						
	0.25	16.32	**	0.30	13.41	**	0.30	14.19	**	0.32	13.60	**	0.33	5.99	*	0.38	7.10	*
	Coef.	Std. Err.		Coef.	Std. Err.		Coef.	Std. Err.		Coef.	Std. Err.		Coef.	Std. Err.		Coef.	Std. Err.	
Father's report of father's care at year 1	0.40	(0.06)	**	0.08	(0.06)		0.40	(0.06)	**	0.05	(0.06)		0.40	(0.06)	**	0.09	(0.06)	
Father's report of father's care at year 3				0.53	(0.09)	**				0.51	(0.09)	**				0.49	(0.08)	**
Black parents													0.04	(0.15)		-0.16	(0.20)	
Hispanic parents													-0.25	(0.20)		-0.02	(0.24)	
Other parents													0.08	(0.19)		0.01	(0.17)	
Father unstably employed between													0.08	(0.10)		0.03	(0.14)	
Father's household in poverty													0.08	(0.19)		0.24	(0.23)	
Mother's household in poverty													0.00	(0.16)		0.11	(0.28)	
Father's age at birth													0.00	(0.01)		-0.03	(0.02)	
Mother's age at birth													0.00	(0.01)		0.02	(0.02)	
Father has less than HS degree													0.14	(0.17)		0.06	(0.22)	
Father has some college													0.05	(0.19)		0.28	(0.19)	
Father has a college degree													-0.11	(0.18)		0.05	(0.22)	
Mother has less than HS degree													0.14	(0.13)		0.26	(0.22)	
Mother has some college													0.25	(0.17)		0.33	(0.20)	
Mother has a college degree													-0.02	(0.23)		0.22	(0.27)	
Father has been to jail													-0.13	(0.17)		0.56	(0.40)	
Father unstable or nonresident with mother	0.12	(0.23)		0.05	(0.33)		0.12	(0.19)		0.15	(0.38)		0.03	(0.20)		-0.02	(0.32)	
Mother has had a new partner since birth	-0.49	(0.51)		-0.37	(0.52)		-0.41	(0.52)		-0.37	(0.57)		-0.53	(0.56)		-0.23	(0.61)	
Father is unstable or nonresident with child	-0.18	(0.37)		-0.57	(0.25)	*	-0.14	(0.31)		-0.63	(0.28)	*	-0.16	(0.33)		-0.57	(0.25)	*
Father's own mother has lived in household							0.12	(0.17)		-0.20	(0.23)		0.11	(0.18)		-0.14	(0.22)	
Number of adults in house at year one							-0.26	(0.09)	**	-0.05	(0.10)		-0.25	(0.10)	*	-0.06	(0.11)	
Number of adults in house at year three							-0.09	(0.06)		0.01	(0.11)		-0.09	(0.07)		-0.04	(0.12)	
Number of adults in house at year five										0.06	(0.14)					0.04	(0.15)	
Number of children father has at year three							0.20	(0.12)		-0.06	(0.14)		0.22	(0.13)		-0.08	(0.15)	
Number of children father has at year five										-0.14	(0.06)	*				-0.11	(0.06)	
Child is a boy							-0.12	(0.12)		0.10	(0.16)		-0.12	(0.12)		0.08	(0.15)	
constant	2.56	(0.25)	**	1.28	(0.39)	**	3.33	(0.37)	**	1.76	(0.48)	**	3.33	(0.53)	**	1.57	(0.60)	*

Source: Fragile Families & Child Well Being Study, N=1020.

*p<.05, **p<.01.

Table 4.1: Father's Mean Caregiving by Variables in Chapter 4: Caregiving by Gender Ideology

	Year 1	St Err	Year 3	St Err	Year 5	St Err
Parent's both agree that father's caregiving is "very important"						
Yes (reference)	4.65	(0.09) **	4.44	(0.09) **	3.94	(0.12) **
No	4.24	(0.19) **	4.24	(0.14) **	3.70	(0.16) **
Father's Identity Centrality is strong at birth						
Yes (reference)	4.66	(0.09)	4.49	(0.09) **	3.92	(1.32) **
No	4.29	(0.17)	4.15	(0.12) **	3.79	(1.33) **
Father feels is better for men to earn and women to care						
Disagree (reference)	4.61	(0.13)	4.32	(0.09)	3.82	(1.41)
Agree	4.43	(0.16)	4.31	(0.11)	3.83	(1.17)
Father feels that men's family time is more important than working a lot						
Agree (reference)	4.51	(0.09)	4.34	(0.70)	3.89	(1.32)
Disagree	4.65	(0.24)	4.58	(0.20)	3.73	(1.36)

Source: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, N=993

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

Table 4.2: Analytic Plan and Regression Modeling for Chapter 4: Caregiving by Gender Ideology

		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
		Year 3	Year 5	Year 3	Year 5	Year 3	Year 5
IV	Father's report of father's care at year 1	X	X	X	X	X	X
DV	Father's report of father's care at year 3	X	X	X	X	X	X
DV	Father's report of father's care at year 5		X		X		X
	Parent's Ethnoracial category			X	X	X	X
	Father unstably employed between year 1 and 3			X		X	
	Father unstably employed between year 1 3 and 5				X		X
	Father's household in poverty between years 1 and 3			X		X	
	Father's household in poverty between years 1 3 and 5				X		X
	Mother's household in poverty between years 1 and 3			X		X	
	Mother's household in poverty between years 1 3 and 5				X		X
	Father's age at birth			X	X	X	X
	Mother's age at birth			X	X	X	X
	Father's education at birth			X	X	X	X
	Mother's education at birth			X	X	X	X
	Father has ever spent time in jail by his three-year interview			X		X	
	Father has ever spent time in jail by his five-year interview				X		X
	Parents' residency between years 1 and 3					X	
	Parents' residency between years 1 3 and 5						X
	Mother resided with a new partner at year 1 or 3					X	
	Mother resided with a new partner at any year 1 3 or 5						X
	Father's residency with child between years 1 and 3					X	
	Father's residency with child between years 1 3 and 5						X
	Grandmother present in father's household years 1 or 3					X	
	Grandmother present in father's household years 1 3 or 5						X
	Number of people in father's household at year 1					X	X
	Number of people in father's household at year 3					X	X
	Number of people in father's household at year 5						X
	Father expects or has had additional children at year 3					X	
	Number of children father has at year 5						X
	Child's Gender					X	X
	Parents do not agree that father's caregiving is "very important"	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Father's Identity Centrality is not strong at birth	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Father believes it is better for men to earn and women to care	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Father does not believe that men's family time is more important than working a lot	X	X	X	X	X	X

Source: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, N=993

X indicates that the variable in the row will be utilized in the analysis listed in the column above

Table 4.3: Father's Early Caregiving Predicting Later Caregiving by Gender Ideology

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Father's report of father's care at year 1	0.40	(0.06) **	0.10	(0.06)	0.39	(0.06) **	0.13	(0.05) *	0.39	(0.06) **	0.10	(0.06)
Father's report of father's care at year 3			0.54	(0.09) **			0.53	(0.08) **			0.50	(0.09) *
Black parents					0.02	(0.19)	-0.29	(0.21)	0.05	(0.17)	-0.15	(0.21)
Hispanic parents					-0.32	(0.24)	0.04	(0.25)	-0.22	(0.21)	-0.01	(0.25)
Other parents					0.07	(0.19)	-0.02	(0.19)	0.09	(0.19)	0.00	(0.18)
Father unstably employed between					0.09	(0.10)	-0.01	(0.15)	0.07	(0.11)	0.04	(0.14)
Father's household in poverty					-0.05	(0.20)	0.19	(0.21)	0.08	(0.21)	0.12	(0.20)
Mother's household in poverty					0.04	(0.18)	-0.04	(0.24)	-0.01	(0.17)	0.17	(0.22)
Father's age at birth					0.00	(0.01)	-0.03	(0.02)	0.00	(0.01)	-0.03	(0.02)
Mother's age at birth					0.00	(0.01)	0.03	(0.02)	0.00	(0.01)	0.02	(0.02)
Father has less than HS degree					0.16	(0.18)	0.06	(0.25)	0.12	(0.17)	0.08	(0.23)
Father has some college					0.16	(0.21)	0.27	(0.21)	0.03	(0.19)	0.26	(0.20)
Father has a college degree					0.05	(0.20)	0.06	(0.24)	-0.10	(0.18)	0.02	(0.24)
Mother has less than HS degree					0.09	(0.14)	0.40	(0.21)	0.15	(0.13)	0.34	(0.22)
Mother has some college					0.18	(0.17)	0.39	(0.21)	0.27	(0.18)	0.32	(0.19)
Mother has a college degree					-0.07	(0.24)	0.30	(0.23)	-0.02	(0.24)	0.24	(0.26)
Father has been to jail					-0.12	(0.17)	0.60	(0.43)	-0.16	(0.17)	0.57	(0.40)
Father unstable or nonresident with mother									0.02	(0.20)	-0.01	(0.35)
Mother has had a new partner since birth									-0.51	(0.56)	-0.33	(0.56)
Father is unstable or nonresident with child									-0.18	(0.34)	-0.59	(0.24) *
Father's own mother has lived in household									0.16	(0.18)	-0.15	(0.21)
Number of adults in house at year one									-0.26	(0.09) **	-0.05	(0.12)
Number of adults in house at year three									-0.08	(0.06)	-0.03	(0.13)
Number of adults in house at year five											0.04	(0.15)
Number of children father has at year three									0.24	(0.13)	-0.08	(0.16)
Number of children father has at year five											-0.11	(0.06)
Child is a boy									-0.13	(0.11)	0.06	(0.15)
Parent's do not agree that father's caregiving is "very important"	0.00	(0.14)	0.16	(0.15)	-0.04	(0.16)	0.11	(0.14)	-0.03	(0.16)	0.17	(0.15)
Father's Identity Centrality is not strong at birth	-0.18	(0.16)	-0.07	(0.16)	-0.15	(0.16)	-0.02	(0.15)	-0.18	(0.17)	0.01	(0.14)
Father believes it is better for men to earn and women to care	-0.04	(0.13)	-0.05	(0.17)	0.01	(0.15)	-0.15	(0.15)	0.02	(0.16)	-0.17	(0.15)
Father does not believe that men's family time is more important than working a lot	-0.16	(0.19)	0.32	(0.26)	-0.15	(0.20)	0.21	(0.23)	-0.14	(0.20)	0.15	(0.20)
constant	2.80	(0.30) **	0.76	(0.38)	2.76	(0.50) **	0.39	(0.47)	3.53	(0.61) **	1.31	(0.60) *
F-Statistic	(5, 28)=11.47	**	(6, 27)=16.35	**	(20, 13)=4.70	**	(21, 12)=5.46	**	(28, 5)=5.03	*	(31, 2)=3.68	
R^2	0.26	**	0.28	**	0.29	**	0.34	**	0.34	*	0.38	

Source: Fragile Families & Child Well Being Study, N=993.

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

Table 5.1: Father's Caregiving Activities by Race and Ethnicity ANOVA

	White		Black		Hispanic		Other	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Fathers' year one caregiving								
Playing peek-a-boo or gotcha	6.18	(1.53)	5.44	(2.05)	5.66	(2.04)	6.01	(1.71) **
Singing	4.37	(2.56)	4.12	(2.59)	4.47	(2.57)	4.32	(2.57)
Reading	3.80	(2.61)	3.30	(2.42)	2.70	(2.55)	3.29	(2.58) **
Telling stories	3.71	(2.68)	3.24	(2.55)	2.92	(2.50)	3.39	(2.77) **
Playing with toys	5.98	(1.73)	5.34	(2.15)	5.73	(1.99)	5.66	(2.06) **
Visiting family	2.08	(1.89)	2.69	(2.01)	3.12	(2.21)	2.42	(2.12) **
Showing affection	6.70	(1.17)	6.43	(1.47)	6.75	(1.00)	6.66	(1.14) *
Putting to bed	4.67	(2.32)	5.37	(2.24)	5.26	(2.23)	4.93	(2.35) **
Total	4.40	(1.49)	4.35	(1.57)	4.18	(1.57)	4.26	(1.57)
Fathers' year three caregiving								
Singing	3.78	(2.37)	3.48	(2.28)	3.56	(2.24)	3.80	(2.34)
Showing affection	6.81	(0.87)	6.39	(1.42)	6.66	(1.10)	6.68	(1.09) **
Telling child they are loved	6.75	(0.99)	6.54	(1.31)	6.68	(1.07)	6.63	(1.18)
Doing chores with child	4.92	(2.22)	4.49	(2.45)	4.31	(2.57)	4.88	(2.41) **
Playing imagination games	4.50	(2.29)	4.52	(2.33)	4.56	(2.42)	4.67	(2.37)
Reading	4.45	(2.28)	3.84	(2.22)	3.41	(2.36)	3.90	(2.40) *
Telling stories	3.80	(2.46)	3.60	(2.42)	3.47	(2.33)	3.93	(2.66)
Playing with toys	5.37	(1.94)	4.96	(2.24)	4.85	(2.19)	5.02	(2.30) *
Telling child they are appreciat	5.84	(1.76)	5.89	(1.84)	5.58	(1.90)	5.83	(1.88)
Visiting family	1.85	(1.92)	3.13	(2.21)	3.03	(2.17)	2.60	(2.38) **
Taking child on an outing	1.47	(1.12)	1.85	(1.44)	2.21	(1.53)	1.95	(1.55) **
Feeding	3.78	(3.00)	2.79	(3.00)	3.84	(2.89)	3.45	(3.07) *
Putting to bed	4.90	(2.21)	4.91	(2.31)	5.46	(2.21)	4.77	(2.39) *
Total	4.48	(1.07)	4.34	(1.18)	4.43	(1.14)	4.47	(1.21)
Fathers' year five caregiving								
Singing	2.84	(2.23)	2.80	(2.24)	2.94	(2.10)	3.30	(2.53)
Reading	3.70	(2.14)	2.90	(2.04)	3.05	(2.08)	3.10	(2.18) **
Telling stories	3.78	(2.27)	3.17	(2.36)	3.32	(2.12)	3.43	(2.47) **
Playing with toys	4.42	(2.27)	4.22	(2.34)	4.23	(2.25)	4.52	(2.34)
Telling child they are appreciat	5.96	(1.59)	5.73	(1.87)	5.65	(1.84)	5.62	(1.96)
Play outside	3.80	(1.98)	3.40	(1.99)	3.63	(2.03)	3.26	(1.96) *
Take child on an outing	2.71	(1.60)	2.52	(1.60)	2.81	(1.79)	2.79	(1.75)
Watch TV or a video together	4.41	(2.26)	4.71	(2.21)	5.00	(2.13)	4.74	(2.38) *
Total	3.95	(1.27)	3.68	(1.39)	3.83	(1.21)	3.85	(1.44)

Source: Fragile Families & Child Well Being Study, N=1020.

*p< .05. **p< .01. □

Table 5.2: Father's Mean Caregiving by Variables in Chapter 5: Caregiving by Race and Ethnicity

	Year 1		Year 3		Year 5	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Parent's Ethnoracial category						
Couple is White (reference)	4.40	(1.49)	4.48	(1.07)	3.95	(1.27)
Couple is Black	4.35	(1.57)	4.34	(1.18)	3.68	(1.39)
Couple is Hispanic	4.18	(1.57)	4.43	(1.14)	3.83	(1.21)
Couple is Other or Multiple Categories	4.26	(1.57)	4.47	(1.21)	3.85	(1.44)
Father has unstable employment at since year 1						
No (reference)	-	-	4.42	(1.14)	3.84	(1.28)
Yes	-	-	4.44	(1.14)	3.80	(1.39)
Father's household in poverty at all since year 1						
No (reference)	-	-	4.45	(1.12)	3.84	(1.27)
Yes	-	-	4.37	(1.18)	3.80	(1.42)
Mother's household in poverty at all since year 1						
No (reference)	-	-	4.45	(1.10)	3.88	(1.26)
Yes	-	-	4.39	(1.22)	3.75	(1.40)
Father's education at birth						
Father has less than HS education	4.27	(1.55)	4.46	(1.16)	3.89	(1.32)
Father has HS or equal education (reference)	4.29	(1.53)	4.34	(1.15)	3.67	(1.42)
Father has some college or tech education	4.32	(1.61)	4.44	(1.17)	3.89	(1.30)
Father has college or grad degree	4.37	(1.48)	4.48	(1.07)	3.89	(1.18)
Mother's education at birth						
Mother has less than HS education	4.06	(1.58) *	4.36	(1.20)	3.77	(1.29)
Mother has HS or equal education (reference)	4.38	(1.55) *	4.42	(1.12)	3.83	(1.32)
Mother has some college or tech education	4.44	(1.51) *	4.47	(1.14)	3.83	(1.40)
Mother has college or grad degree	4.33	(1.52) *	4.44	(1.11)	3.90	(1.25)
Father has ever spent time in jail by interview date						
No (reference)	-	-	4.45	(1.13)	3.83	(1.28)
Yes	-	-	4.29	(1.22)	3.75	(1.46)
Father has stably resided with mother since birth						
Yes (reference)	-	-	4.52	(1.05) **	4.00	(1.19) **
No	-	-	4.11	(1.38) **	3.44	(1.50) **
Mother has new partner since birth						
No (reference)	-	-	4.45	(1.11) **	3.90	(1.25) **
Yes	-	-	3.68	(1.73) **	2.90	(1.78) **
Father has stably resided with child since birth						
Yes (reference)	-	-	4.55	(1.02) **	4.03	(1.19) **
No	-	-	3.79	(1.46) **	3.16	(1.51) **
Father's own mother has lived in household						
No (reference)	-	-	4.46	(1.07) *	3.86	(1.30)
Yes	-	-	4.25	(1.40) *	3.73	(1.37)

Source: Fragile Families & Child Well Being Study, N=1020.

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

Table 5.3: Analytic Plan and Regression Modeling for Chapter 5: Caregiving by Race and Ethnicity

		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
		Year 3	Year 5	Year 3	Year 5	Year 3	Year 5
IV	Father's report of father's care at year 1	X	X	X	X	X	X
DV	Father's report of father's care at year 3	X	X	X	X	X	X
DV	Father's report of father's care at year 5		X		X		X
	Parent's Ethnoracial category	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Father unstably employed between year 1 and 3			X		X	
	Father unstably employed between year 1 3 and 5				X		X
	Father's household in poverty between years 1 and 3			X		X	
	Father's household in poverty between years 1 3 and 5				X		X
	Mother's household in poverty between years 1 and 3			X		X	
	Mother's household in poverty between years 1 3 and 5				X		X
	Father's age at birth			X	X	X	X
	Mother's age at birth			X	X	X	X
	Father's education at birth			X	X	X	X
	Mother's education at birth			X	X	X	X
	Father has ever spent time in jail by his three-year interview			X		X	
	Father has ever spent time in jail by his five-year interview				X		X
	Parents' residency between years 1 and 3					X	
	Parents' residency between years 1 3 and 5						X
	Mother resided with a new partner at year 1 or 3					X	
	Mother resided with a new partner at any year 1 3 or 5						X
	Father's residency with child between years 1 and 3					X	
	Father's residency with child between years 1 3 and 5						X
	Grandmother present in father's household years 1 or 3					X	
	Grandmother present in father's household years 1 3 or 5						X
	Number of people in father's household at year 1					X	X
	Number of people in father's household at year 3					X	X
	Number of people in father's household at year 5						X
	Father expects or has had additional children at year 3					X	
	Number of children father has at year 5						X
	Child's Gender					X	X
	Parent's both agree that father's caregiving is "very important"						
	Father's Identity Centrality is strong at birth						
	Father's attitude on whether it is better for men to earn and women to care						
	Father's attitude on whether men's family time is more important than working a lot						

Source: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, N=1020

X indicates that the variable in the row will be utilized in the analysis listed in the column above

Table 5.4: Father's Caregiving at Year Three and Five Predicted by Earlier Caregiving, All Families

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3							
	Year 3	Year 5	Year 3	Year 5	Year 3	Year 5						
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.						
Father's report of father's care at year 1	0.40	(0.05) *	0.09	(0.06)	0.41	(0.06) *	0.13	(0.06) *	0.40	(0.06) *	0.09	(0.06)
Father's report of father's care at year 3			0.54	(0.08) *			0.52	(0.07) *			0.49	(0.08) *
BlackCoupleDummy	0.06	(0.15)	-0.34	(0.16) *	0.02	(0.17)	-0.29	(0.20)	0.04	(0.15)	-0.16	(0.20)
HispCoupleDummy	-0.26	(0.17)	-0.02	(0.16)	-0.35	(0.23)	0.03	(0.23)	-0.25	(0.20)	-0.02	(0.24)
OtherCoupleDummy	0.08	(0.16)	0.02	(0.25)	0.07	(0.18)	0.00	(0.19)	0.08	(0.19)	0.02	(0.17)
Father unstably employed between					0.10	(0.09)	0.00	(0.15)	0.08	(0.10)	0.04	(0.14)
Father's household in poverty					-0.07	(0.19)	0.17	(0.21)	0.08	(0.19)	0.11	(0.20)
Mother's household in poverty					0.05	(0.18)	-0.03	(0.24)	0.00	(0.16)	0.16	(0.23)
Father's age at birth					0.00	(0.01)	-0.03	(0.02)	0.00	(0.01)	-0.02	(0.02)
Mother's age at birth					0.00	(0.01)	0.03	(0.02)	0.00	(0.01)	0.02	(0.02)
Father has less than HS degree					0.18	(0.18)	0.05	(0.24)	0.14	(0.17)	0.07	(0.22)
Father has some college					0.17	(0.20)	0.27	(0.21)	0.05	(0.19)	0.25	(0.20)
Father has a college degree					0.04	(0.20)	0.08	(0.22)	-0.11	(0.18)	0.01	(0.23)
Mother has less than HS degree					0.08	(0.14)	0.36	(0.22)	0.14	(0.13)	0.28	(0.22)
Mother has some college					0.16	(0.18)	0.41	(0.21)	0.25	(0.17)	0.34	(0.20)
Mother has a college degree					-0.07	(0.24)	0.31	(0.25)	-0.02	(0.23)	0.23	(0.28)
Father has been to jail					-0.11	(0.16)	0.58	(0.43)	-0.13	(0.17)	0.55	(0.40)
Father is not stably living with mother									0.03	(0.20)	-0.01	(0.34)
Mother has had a new partner since birth									-0.53	(0.56)	-0.23	(0.62)
Father is not stably living with child									-0.16	(0.33)	-0.60	(0.25) *
Father's own mother has lived in household									0.11	(0.18)	-0.12	(0.22)
Number of adults in house at year one									-0.25	(0.10) *	-0.07	(0.11)
Number of adults in house at year three									-0.09	(0.07)	-0.02	(0.12)
Number of adults in house at year five											0.04	(0.15)
Father's other children									0.22	(0.13)	-0.12	(0.06) *
Child is a boy									-0.12	(0.12)	0.08	(0.15)
constant	2.62	(0.24) *	1.12	(0.36) *	2.55	(0.47) *	0.62	(0.52) *	3.33	(0.53) *	1.52	(0.63) *
R ²	0.26	*	0.27	*	0.28	*	0.33	*	0.33	*	0.37	*
F Statistic	(4, 29)=20.15	**	(5, 28)=15.34	**	(16, 17)=5.21	**	(17, 16)=5.33	**	(24, 9)=5.99	**	(26, 7)=6.04	*

Source: Fragile Families & Child Well Being Study, N=1020 (White, N=316; Black, N=292; Hispanic, N=248; Other, N=165)

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

Table 5.5: Father's Caregiving at Year Three and Five Predicted by Caregiving Year One, White Families

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Father's report of father's care at year 1	0.38	(0.10) **	0.00	(0.09)	0.38	(0.09) **	-0.01	(0.11)	0.41	(0.11) **	-0.04	(0.12)
Father's report of father's care at year 3			0.74	(0.14) **			0.72	(0.13) **			0.74	(0.15) **
Father unstably employed between					-0.03	(0.28)	0.23	(0.30)	-0.01	(0.25)	0.26	(0.29)
Father's household in poverty					0.40	(0.57)	-0.21	(1.16)	0.85	(0.64)	-0.35	(0.98)
Mother's household in poverty					0.05	(0.54)	-0.14	(1.15)	-0.33	(0.73)	0.32	(0.93)
Father's age at birth					0.01	(0.03)	-0.08	(0.03) **	0.01	(0.03)	-0.08	(0.03) **
Mother's age at birth					0.00	(0.03)	0.06	(0.04)	0.02	(0.04)	0.05	(0.04)
Father has less than HS degree					0.87	(0.40) *	0.13	(0.66)	1.01	(0.46) *	0.13	(0.67)
Father has some college					0.53	(0.35)	0.02	(0.39)	0.42	(0.41)	-0.07	(0.33)
Father has a college degree					0.39	(0.38)	-0.14	(0.32)	0.33	(0.41)	-0.13	(0.33)
Mother has less than HS degree					-0.14	(0.43)	0.11	(0.47)	0.01	(0.49)	0.23	(0.65)
Mother has some college					0.42	(0.40)	0.41	(0.46)	0.41	(0.47)	0.44	(0.47)
Mother has a college degree					0.20	(0.42)	0.02	(0.38)	0.08	(0.51)	-0.13	(0.44)
Father has been to jail					-0.61	(0.30)	-0.39	(0.60)	-0.52	(0.32)	-0.03	(0.64)
Father is not stably living with mother									0.12	(0.86)	-1.03	(0.85)
Mother has had a new partner since birth									-0.55	(1.04)	-0.01	(0.96)
Father is not stably living with child									0.25	(0.89)	-0.31	(0.70)
Father's own mother has lived in household									0.64	(0.68)	-0.01	(0.52)
Number of adults in house at year one									-0.44	(0.39)	-0.29	(0.46)
Number of adults in house at year three									-0.26	(0.26)	-0.01	(0.32)
Number of adults in house at year five											-0.02	(0.40)
Number of children father has at year three									0.32	(0.32)	-0.07	(0.11)
Child is a boy									-0.17	(0.22)	0.10	(0.22)
constant	2.72	(0.47) **	0.66	(0.59)	1.68	(0.90)	1.39	(0.85)	2.56	(1.47)	2.72	(1.40)
R ²	0.21	**	0.36	**	0.29	*	0.44	*	0.35	**	0.49	
F Statistic	(1, 32)=13.95	**	(2, 31)=16.65	**	(13, 20)=3.01	*	(14, 19)=2.37	*	(21, 12)=4.97	**	(23, 10)=1.48	

Source: Fragile Families & Child Well Being Study. White Families, N=316)

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

Table 5.6: Father's Caregiving at Year Three and Five Predicted by Caregiving Year One, Black Families

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Father's report of father's care at year 1	0.33	(0.07) **	0.14	(0.11)	0.34	(0.10) **	0.16	(0.11)	0.27	(0.09) **	0.15	(0.11)
Father's report of father's care at year 3			0.47	(0.10) **			0.46	(0.13) *			0.35	(0.13) *
Father unstably employed between					0.07	(0.18)	0.32	(0.21)	0.19	(0.21)	0.26	(0.22)
Father's household in poverty					0.11	(0.46)	0.40	(0.36)	0.09	(0.25)	0.40	(0.26)
Mother's household in poverty					0.18	(0.39)	0.16	(0.30)	0.26	(0.30)	0.18	(0.34)
Father's age at birth					0.01	(0.02)	0.00	(0.03)	0.00	(0.02)	0.01	(0.02)
Mother's age at birth					0.00	(0.02)	0.00	(0.03)	-0.01	(0.02)	-0.01	(0.02)
Father has less than HS degree					-0.38	(0.31)	0.02	(0.35)	-0.51	(0.33)	-0.09	(0.23)
Father has some college					0.14	(0.35)	0.79	(0.46)	0.19	(0.33)	0.83	(0.38) *
Father has a college degree					-0.24	(0.46)	0.27	(0.63)	-0.35	(0.45)	0.21	(0.60)
Mother has less than HS degree					0.06	(0.34)	-0.16	(0.35)	0.05	(0.29)	-0.07	(0.38)
Mother has some college					0.01	(0.32)	0.37	(0.33)	-0.04	(0.28)	0.13	(0.29)
Mother has a college degree					-0.28	(0.45)	0.77	(0.58)	-0.12	(0.46)	0.53	(0.54)
Father has been to jail					-0.15	(0.42)	0.30	(0.39)	-0.23	(0.31)	0.42	(0.33)
Father is not stably living with mother									0.30	(0.22)	-0.09	(0.31)
Mother has had a new partner since birth									-0.06	(0.95)	-0.65	(0.42)
Father is not stably living with child									-1.04	(0.27) **	-0.35	(0.33)
Father's own mother has lived in household									-0.21	(0.37)	-0.25	(0.31)
Number of adults in house at year one									-0.03	(0.19)	-0.13	(0.23)
Number of adults in house at year three									0.11	(0.20)	0.54	(0.30)
Number of adults in house at year five									0.05	(0.30)	0.21	(0.18)
Number of children father has at year three											-0.06	(0.09)
Child is a boy									-0.12	(0.23)	0.04	(0.23)
constant	2.98	(0.36) **	0.93	(0.59)	2.60	(0.55) **	0.02	(1.14)	3.41	(0.89) **	-0.10	(1.17)
R ²	0.21	**	0.24	**	0.27	**	0.42	**	0.38		0.54	**
F Statistic	(1, 32)=19.81	**	(2, 31)=14.37	**	(13, 20)=3.78		(14, 19)=7.57	**	(21, 12)=2.40		(23, 10)=8.49	**

Source: Fragile Families & Child Well Being Study, N=1020. Black Families, N=292)

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

Table 5.7: Father's Caregiving at Year Three and Five Predicted by Caregiving Year One, Hispanic Families

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Father's report of father's care at year 1	0.46	(0.08) **	0.14	(0.10)	0.43	(0.08) *	0.13	(0.08)	0.41	(0.09) *	0.11	(0.07)
Father's report of father's care at year 3			0.36	(0.16) *			0.40	(0.11) **			0.38	(0.12) **
Father unstably employed between					0.15	(0.27)	-0.38	(0.31)	0.15	(0.28)	-0.24	(0.32)
Father's household in poverty					-0.21	(0.29)	0.04	(0.21)	-0.23	(0.25)	0.04	(0.24)
Mother's household in poverty					-0.03	(0.24)	-0.14	(0.22)	0.04	(0.25)	0.02	(0.20)
Father's age at birth					-0.02	(0.02)	0.00	(0.01)	-0.04	(0.02)	0.02	(0.03)
Mother's age at birth					0.01	(0.03)	0.00	(0.02)	0.02	(0.03)	-0.02	(0.04)
Father has less than HS degree					0.22	(0.27)	0.41	(0.28)	0.16	(0.26)	0.36	(0.28)
Father has some college					0.09	(0.35)	0.21	(0.32)	-0.09	(0.34)	0.09	(0.25)
Father has a college degree					-0.35	(0.46)	0.45	(0.50)	-0.45	(0.49)	0.43	(0.53)
Mother has less than HS degree					0.16	(0.25)	-0.09	(0.27)	0.19	(0.26)	-0.18	(0.28)
Mother has some college					0.28	(0.33)	0.29	(0.48)	0.36	(0.37)	0.22	(0.40)
Mother has a college degree					-0.50	(0.74)	0.70	(0.68)	-0.56	(0.79)	0.63	(0.71)
Father has been to jail					0.41	(0.45)	0.24	(0.38)	0.47	(0.49)	0.47	(0.50)
Father is not stably living with mother									-0.21	(0.50)	-0.42	(0.38)
Mother has had a new partner since birth									-1.34	(3.72)	0.11	(1.02)
Father is not stably living with child									-0.68	(0.53)	-0.18	(0.48)
Father's own mother has lived in household									0.33	(0.23)	-0.17	(0.31)
Number of adults in house at year one									-0.24	(0.11) *	-0.07	(0.16)
Number of adults in house at year three									-0.03	(0.12)	0.00	(0.17)
Number of adults in house at year five											0.06	(0.20)
Number of children father has at year three									-0.09	(0.25)	-0.12	(0.10)
Child is a boy									-0.12	(0.17)	0.15	(0.21)
constant	2.08	(0.38) **	1.65	(0.63) *	2.56	(1.04) *	1.28	(0.64)	3.71	(0.86) **	1.83	(0.89) *
R ²	0.27	**	0.22	**	0.39	*	0.35	*	0.49	*	0.41	*
F Statistic	(1, 32)=33.28	**	(2, 31)=6.63	**	(13, 20)=2.53	*	(14, 19)=3.20	*	(21, 12)=2.64	*	(23, 10)=2.96	*

Source: Fragile Families & Child Well Being Study, N=1020. Hispanic Families N=248.

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

Table 5.8: Father's Caregiving at Year Three and Five Predicted by Caregiving Year One, Other Families

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Father's report of father's care at year 1	0.42	(0.10) **	0.24	(0.17)	0.38	(0.13) *	0.29	(0.18)	0.39	(0.14) *	0.26	(0.20)
Father's report of father's care at year 3			0.40	(0.23)			0.46	(0.20) *			0.39	(0.22)
Father unstably employed between					0.11	(0.24)	0.26	(0.37)	0.07	(0.23)	0.26	(0.39)
Father's household in poverty					-0.22	(0.62)	-0.11	(0.43)	0.10	(0.51)	-0.45	(0.57)
Mother's household in poverty					-0.09	(0.52)	0.37	(0.42)	-0.19	(0.50)	0.67	(0.74)
Father's age at birth					-0.01	(0.03)	-0.10	(0.05) *	0.01	(0.04)	-0.06	(0.05)
Mother's age at birth					-0.01	(0.03)	0.07	(0.07)	-0.03	(0.04)	0.08	(0.05)
Father has less than HS degree					-0.35	(0.61)	-0.17	(0.70)	0.05	(0.45)	-0.65	(0.64)
Father has some college					-0.22	(0.47)	0.54	(0.48)	-0.47	(0.39)	0.32	(0.50)
Father has a college degree					-0.17	(0.41)	0.11	(0.57)	-0.41	(0.45)	-0.43	(0.47)
Mother has less than HS degree					-0.08	(0.37)	1.25	(0.61) *	-0.06	(0.33)	1.13	(0.73)
Mother has some college					-0.33	(0.37)	-0.09	(0.47)	-0.10	(0.33)	-0.27	(0.43)
Mother has a college degree					-0.31	(0.52)	0.39	(0.47)	-0.02	(0.48)	0.09	(0.44)
Father has been to jail					-0.19	(0.28)	0.56	(1.06)	-0.38	(0.27)	-0.51	(0.91)
Father is not stably living with mother									0.45	(0.63)	0.76	(0.86)
Mother has had a new partner since birth									-1.15	(0.97)	-0.37	(1.12)
Father is not stably living with child									-0.12	(0.69)	-1.33	(0.69)
Father's own mother has lived in household									-0.35	(0.58)	0.35	(1.09)
Number of adults in house at year one									-0.21	(0.29)	0.13	(0.50)
Number of adults in house at year three									-0.25	(0.27)	-0.50	(0.29)
Number of adults in house at year five											-0.14	(0.48)
Number of children father has at year three									0.30	(0.31)	-0.19	(0.16)
Child is a boy									-0.04	(0.25)	-0.16	(0.44)
constant	2.60	(0.53) **	1.06	(1.01)	3.95	(1.06) **	1.05	(1.23)	4.62	(1.55) **	2.43	(1.51)
R ²	0.29	**	0.20	*	0.35	*	0.51	*	0.47		0.68	**
F Statistic	(1, 32)=16.00 **		(2, 31)=3.96 *		(13, 20)=2.25 *		(14, 19)=2.52 *		(21, 12) 1.65		(23, 10)=12.28 **	

Source: Fragile Families & Child Well Being Study. Families whose parents are More than one race, Mixed Race and Other, N=165.

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

Table 5.9: Father's Caregiving at Year Three and Five Predicted by Earlier Caregiving, Ethnoracial comparison

	All Families		White Families				Black Families				Hispanic Families				Other Families					
	Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5		Year 3		Year 5	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Father's report of father's care at year 1	0.40	(0.06) **	0.09	(0.06)	0.41	(0.11) **	-0.04	(0.12)	0.27	(0.09) **	0.15	(0.11)	0.41	(0.09) **	0.11	(0.07)	0.39	(0.14) **	0.26	(0.20)
Father's report of father's care at year 3			0.48	(0.09) **			0.74	(0.15) **			0.35	(0.13) *			0.38	(0.12) **			0.39	(0.22)
	0.07	(0.11)	0.03	(0.14)	-0.01	(0.25)	0.26	(0.29)	0.19	(0.21)	0.26	(0.22)	0.15	(0.28)	-0.24	(0.32)	0.07	(0.23)	0.26	(0.39)
Father's household in poverty	0.08	(0.19)	0.12	(0.20)	0.85	(0.64)	-0.35	(0.98)	0.09	(0.25)	0.40	(0.26)	-0.23	(0.25)	0.04	(0.24)	0.10	(0.51)	-0.45	(0.57)
Mother's household in poverty	-0.04	(0.17)	0.16	(0.24)	-0.33	(0.73)	0.32	(0.93)	0.26	(0.30)	0.18	(0.34)	0.04	(0.25)	0.02	(0.20)	-0.19	(0.50)	0.67	(0.74)
Father's age at birth	0.00	(0.01)	-0.02	(0.02)	0.01	(0.03)	-0.08	(0.03) **	0.00	(0.02)	0.01	(0.02)	-0.04	(0.02)	0.02	(0.03)	0.01	(0.04)	-0.06	(0.05)
Mother's age at birth	0.00	(0.01)	0.02	(0.02)	0.02	(0.04)	0.05	(0.04)	-0.01	(0.02)	-0.01	(0.02)	0.02	(0.03)	-0.02	(0.04)	-0.03	(0.04)	0.08	(0.05)
Father has less than HS degree	0.04	(0.16)	0.07	(0.22)	1.01	(0.46) *	0.13	(0.67)	-0.51	(0.33)	-0.09	(0.23)	0.16	(0.26)	0.36	(0.28)	0.05	(0.45)	-0.65	(0.64)
Father has some college	0.03	(0.19)	0.28	(0.19)	0.42	(0.41)	-0.07	(0.33)	0.19	(0.33)	0.83	(0.38) *	-0.09	(0.34)	0.09	(0.25)	-0.47	(0.39)	0.32	(0.50)
Father has a college degree	-0.13	(0.18)	0.04	(0.21)	0.33	(0.41)	-0.13	(0.33)	-0.35	(0.45)	0.21	(0.60)	-0.45	(0.49)	0.43	(0.53)	-0.41	(0.45)	-0.43	(0.47)
Mother has less than HS degree	0.15	(0.13)	0.29	(0.23)	0.01	(0.49)	0.23	(0.65)	0.05	(0.29)	-0.07	(0.38)	0.19	(0.26)	-0.18	(0.28)	-0.06	(0.33)	1.13	(0.73)
Mother has some college	0.28	(0.17)	0.33	(0.19)	0.41	(0.47)	0.44	(0.47)	-0.04	(0.28)	0.13	(0.29)	0.36	(0.37)	0.22	(0.40)	-0.10	(0.33)	-0.27	(0.43)
Mother has a college degree	0.03	(0.22)	0.23	(0.26)	0.08	(0.51)	-0.13	(0.44)	-0.12	(0.46)	0.53	(0.54)	-0.56	(0.79)	0.63	(0.71)	-0.02	(0.48)	0.09	(0.44)
Father has been to jail	-0.06	(0.15)	0.56	(0.42)	-0.52	(0.32)	-0.03	(0.64)	-0.23	(0.31)	0.42	(0.33)	0.47	(0.49)	0.47	(0.50)	-0.38	(0.27)	-0.51	(0.91)
Father is not stably living with mother	0.09	(0.21)	-0.03	(0.33)	0.12	(0.86)	-1.03	(0.85)	0.30	(0.22)	-0.09	(0.31)	-0.21	(0.50)	-0.42	(0.38)	0.45	(0.63)	0.76	(0.86)
Mother has had a new partner since birth	-0.50	(0.53)	-0.22	(0.62)	-0.55	(1.04)	-0.01	(0.96)	-0.06	(0.95)	-0.65	(0.42)	-1.34	(3.72)	0.11	(1.02)	-1.15	(0.97)	-0.37	(1.12)
Father is not a stable resident with child	-0.14	(0.33)	-0.60	(0.25) *	0.25	(0.89)	-0.31	(0.70)	-1.04	(0.27) **	-0.35	(0.33)	-0.68	(0.53)	-0.18	(0.48)	-0.12	(0.69)	-1.33	(0.69)
Father's own mother has lived in household	0.11	(0.20)	-0.14	(0.23)	0.64	(0.68)	-0.01	(0.52)	-0.21	(0.37)	-0.25	(0.31)	0.33	(0.23)	-0.17	(0.31)	-0.35	(0.58)	0.35	(1.09)
Number of adults in house at year one	-0.27	(0.10)	-0.06	(0.11)	-0.44	(0.39)	-0.29	(0.46)	-0.03	(0.19)	-0.13	(0.23)	-0.24	(0.11) *	-0.07	(0.16)	-0.21	(0.29)	0.13	(0.50)
Number of adults in house at year three	-0.12	(0.06)	-0.02	(0.12)	-0.26	(0.26)	-0.01	(0.32)	0.11	(0.20)	0.54	(0.30)	-0.03	(0.12)	0.00	(0.17)	-0.25	(0.27)	-0.50	(0.29)
Number of adults in house at year five			0.04	(0.15)			-0.02	(0.40)	0.05	(0.30)	0.21	(0.18)			0.06	(0.20)			-0.14	(0.48)
Father's other children	0.24	(0.13)	-0.13	(0.06)	0.32	(0.32)	-0.07	(0.11)			-0.06	(0.09)	-0.09	(0.25)	-0.12	(0.10)	0.30	(0.31)	-0.19	(0.16)
Child is a boy	-0.14	(0.12)	0.07	(0.16)	-0.17	(0.22)	0.10	(0.22)	-0.12	(0.23)	0.04	(0.23)	-0.12	(0.17)	0.15	(0.21)	-0.04	(0.25)	-0.16	(0.44)
constant	3.30	(0.48) **	1.48	(0.61) *	2.56	(1.47)	2.72	(1.40)	3.41	(0.89) **	-0.10	(1.17)	3.71	(0.86) **	1.83	(0.89) *	4.62	(1.55) **	2.43	(1.51)
R ²	0.32	**	0.37	**	0.35	**	0.49		0.38		0.54	**	0.49	*	0.41	*	0.47		0.68	**
F-Statistic	(24, 9)=5.99	**	(26, 7)=6.04	*	(21, 12)=4.97	**	(23, 10)=1.48		(21, 12)=2.40		(23, 10)=8.49	**	(21, 12)=2.64	*	(23, 10)=2.96	*	(21, 12) 1.65		(23, 10)=12.28	**

Source: Fragile Families & Child Well Being Study, N=1020 (White, N=316; Black, N=292; Hispanic, N=248; Other, N=165)

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

Additional Tables

Table A.1: Research Questions

- 1) Is there a relationship between fathers' early caregiving and later caregiving as the child ages from one to five years old?
- 2) How does the relationship between early caregiving and later caregiving differ across family contexts? More specifically, how might fathers' caregiving be shaped by their living situations, the people with whom they live, and other people who might be living in the home with their children?
- 3) How does the relationship between early caregiving and later caregiving differ among men who do not share similar gender ideologies? How might a father's gender ideology shape their caregiving and to what extent are gender ideologies and caregiving interrelated?
- 4) How does the relationship between early caregiving and later caregiving differ across racial and ethnic families? In essence, do racial and ethnic cultural differences in family forms manifest through fathers' caregiving patterns?

Table A.2: Hypotheses for Each Analytic Chapter

Chapter 3	H1) Fathers who performed more caregiving when their child was one-year old will perform more caregiving than other fathers when their child is three and five years old.
	H2a) Fathers who live stably with the child's mother will perform more caregiving than fathers who live with the child's mother unstably or not at all.
	H2b) Fathers who stably live with their child will perform more caregiving than fathers who do not live stably with their child.
	H3) Father caregiving will be lower in families where mothers have new partners at any time point compared to mothers who do not have a new partner over time.
Chapter 4	H4) Fathers who have other adults in his household will perform less caregiving than fathers who do not have others in the household.
	H1) Patterns of caregiving will vary by gender ideology such that fathers who subscribe to more egalitarian views about men's roles will do more caregiving than fathers who do not.
Chapter 5	H2) Patterns of caregiving will vary by parents' value of fatherhood such that fathers in families whose coparents agree on the value of fathers' caregiving, and those in which fathers' have stronger identification with the fatherhood role will do more caregiving than fathers who do not identify strongly as fathers.
	H1) The relationship between fathers' early and later caregiving vary by race, specifically, it will be stronger in white families than for families of other ethnoracial categories.
	H2) Fathers' frequency of caregiving will vary by race, with fathers in black coparenting couples doing more caregiving than fathers in families of other ethnoracial categories.
	H3) The relationship between caregiving and residency will differ by family's ethnoracial group, where residency will be a better predictor of fathers' caregiving in white families than families of other ethnoracial categories.

Table A.3 Available Variable Responses for Items of Interest

M= Mother, F=Father, NRF=Nonresidential Father	Birth	Year 1	Year 3	Year 5
Fathers' caregiving				
During the baby's mother's pregnancy, did you give her money or buy things for the baby/babies?	M	F		
Did you help her in other ways, such as providing transportation to the prenatal clinic or help with chores?	M	F		
Were you present at the birth?		F		
Did you want to be involved in raising your child(ren) in the coming years?	M	F		
Does baby's mother want you to be involved in rearing your child in the coming years?	M	F		
How many days a week did you play games like peek-a-boo or gotcha with the baby?	M	F	NRF	
sings songs or nursery rhymes	M	F	NRF	M F NRF
reads stories	M	F	NRF	M F NRF
tells stories	M	F	NRF	M F NRF
plays inside with toys such as blocks or legos	M	F	NRF	M F NRF
takes child to visit relatives	M	F	NRF	
changes his/her diaper	M			
feed or give a bottle to him/her	M			
hugs shows physical affection	M	F	NRF	M F NRF
puts child to bed	M	F	NRF	
tell child you love him or her			M	F NRF
let child help you with household chores			M	F NRF
play imaginary games with child			M	F NRF
tell child you appreciate what he or she did			M	F NRF
go to a restaurant with the child			M	F NRF
assist the child with eating			M	F NRF
plays outside in the yard, park or playground				M F NRF
take child on an outing such as shopping, or to a restaurant, church, museum, or special activity or event				M F NRF
Help child with homework or school assignments				M F NRF
Fatherhood Ideology				
How important is providing direct care, such as feeding, dressing and child care?	M	F		
How important is providing direct care, such as child care, transportation, tending basic needs?				
Fatherhood Identity Centrality				
Being a father and raising children is one of the most fulfilling experiences a man can have		F		
I want people to know that I have a new child		F		
Not being part of my child's life would be one of the worst things that could happen to me		F		
Gender ideology				
It is much better for everyone if the man earns the main living and the woman takes care of the home and family	M	F		
It is more important for a man to spend time with his family than to work as many hours as he can	M	F		
Father availability				
How much of the time does the child live with you?		M F		M F
In the last year, how many weeks did you work at a regular job?	F	M F		M F
When you last worked, how many hours per week did you work?	M F	M F		M F
Constructed variables				
Focal child is a boy	M			
Age	M F	M F		M F
Parents' relationship	M F	M F		M F
Mother has a new partner		M		M
Race	M F			
Household income	M F	M F		M F
Poverty category	M F	M F		M F
Baseline education	M F	M F		M F
Number of kids in the household	M F	M F		M F
Number of kids total	M F	M		F
Fathered or expecting a child since focal child's first birthday				F
Number of adults in the household	M F	M F		M F
Baby's grandma in the house	M F	M F		M F
Baby's grandpa in the house	M F	M F		M F
Father ever in jail during the study		F		F

Source: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

M= Mother, F=Father, NRF= Nonresidential father

End notes

- 1) In considering which caregiving measures to use as dependent variables, I decided against using the year nine data on fathers' caregiving. Father's caregiving at year nine is reported by a primary caregiver, which is most often the mother (91%), but could also be a father (4%) or nonparental caregiver (4%). Stykes (2015) used only two measures from the father's caregiving index in years 1, 3 and 5 limiting his analysis to only variables that were available and identical at those time points. McClain and DeMaris's (2013) utilized standardized scores of summed totals of fathers' caregiving items in order to avoid problems comparing noncomparable measures over study waves.

Like other authors publishing from this data, I do not use reports of father's caregiving at year nine because of differences in measurement, reporting and to avoid problems with further attrition (Stykes 2015). Additionally, Cabrera, Fagan and Farrie (2008) found that the impact of fathers' prenatal caregiving decreased between year one and three, and so nine years is likely too long to expect an effect. For these reasons, I use fathers' reports at years one, three and five.

Bibliography:

- Acker, J. 1990. "Hierarchies, Bodies, and Jobs." *Gender & Society* 4(2): 139–158.
- Adamsons, Kari and Kay Pasley. 2013 "Parents' Fathering Identity Standards and Later Father Involvement." *Journal of Family Issues* 37(2): 221-244.
- Anderson, Elijah. 2000. *Code of the Street. Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York, New York: Norton & Company.
- Bengtson, V. L. (2001). "Beyond the Nuclear Family: The Increasing Importance of Multigenerational Relationships in American Society. The 1998 Burgess Award Lecture." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 63(1): 1-16.
- Bourgois, Phillipe. 2002. *In Search of Respect*. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brewster, K. L. and I. Padavic. 2000. "Change in Gender Ideology, 1977-1996: The Contributions of Intracohort Change and Population Turnover." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62(2): 477–487.
- Brines, Julie. 1994. "Economic Dependency, Gender, and the Division of Labor at Home." *American Journal of Sociology* 100(3): 652-688.
- Brooks, Clem and Catherine Bolzendahl. 2004. "The Transformation of US Gender role Attitudes: Cohort Replacement, Social-structural Change, and Ideological Learning." *Social Science Research* 33: 106-33
- Bolzendahl, C. I. and D.J. Myers. 2004. "Feminist Attitudes and Support for Gender Equality: Opinion Change in Women and Men, 1974-1988." *Social Forces* 83(2): 759–789.
- BOP. 2018. "Statistics: Inmate Gender." Federal Bureau of Prisons. February 24, 2018.

- https://www.bop.gov/about/statistics/statistics_inmate_gender.jsp
- Bulanda, Ronald E. 2004. "Paternal Involvement with Children: The Influence of Gender Ideologies." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66: 40-45.
- Cabrera, Natasha J., Sandra L. Hofferth, and Soo Chae. 2011. "Patterns and Predictors of Father–Infant Engagement across Race/Ethnic Groups." *Early Child Research Quarterly* 26(3): 365–375.
- Cabrera, Natasha J., Jay Fagan and Danielle Farrie. 2008. "Explaining the Long Reach of Fathers' Prenatal Involvement on later Paternal Engagement." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70: 1094–1107.
- Campbell, Lori D. and Michael P. Carroll. 2007. "The Incomplete Revolution: Theorizing Gender When Studying Men Who Provide Care to Aging Parents." *Men and Masculinities* 9(4): 491-508.
- Carbone, June and Naomi Cahn. 2014. *Marriage Markets: How Inequality is Remaking the American Family*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carlson, Marcia and Sara McLanahan. 2001. "Shared Parenting in Fragile Families." Center for Research on Child Wellbeing Working Paper #01-16-FF
- Carlson, Marcia, Sara McLanahan and Paula England. 2004. "Union Formation in Fragile Families." *Demography* 41(2): 237-261.
- Cassino, Dan. 2017. *Some Men Feel the Need to Compensate for Relative Loss of Income to Women. How They Do So, Varies*. (Online Symposia March 30, 2017). Council on Contemporary Families. Accessed Oct 3, 2017. (<https://contemporaryfamilies.org/3-cassino-men-compensate-for-income-to-women/>)

- Chang, Cyril F. and Shelley I. White-Means. 1991. "The Men Who Care: An Analysis of Male Primary Caregivers Who Care for Frail Elderly at Home." *Journal of Applied Gerontology* 10(3): 343-358.
- Cherlin, Andrew J. 2004. "The Deinstitutionalization of American Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66: 848-861
- Cherlin, A. 2010. "Demographic Trends in the United States: A Review of Research in the 2000's." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(3): 403-419.
- Cherlin, Andrew J., Bianca Frogner, David Ribar and Robert Moffitt. 2009. "Welfare Reform in the Mid-2000s: How African-American and Hispanic Families in Three Cities are Faring." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 621: 178-201.
- Ciabattari, T. 2001. "Changes in Men's Conservative Gender Ideologies: Cohort and Period Influences." *Gender & Society* 15(4): 574-591.
- Collett, Jessica, Vercel, Kelcie and Boykin, Olevia. 2015. Using Identity Processes to Understand Persistent Inequality in Parenting. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 78(4): 345-364.
- Coltrane, Scott. 1996. *Family Man: Fatherhood, Housework, and Gender Equity*. Oxford, NY: University Press.
- Connell, Raewyn. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, The Person and Sexual Politics*. Standford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, Raewyn. 2009. *Gender: Short Introductions*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Coontz, Stephanie. 1997. *The Way We Really Are: Coming to Terms with America's Changing Families*. New York: Basic Books.

- Cohen, Jessica A. and Wendy D. Manning. 2010. "The Relationship Context of Premarital Serial Cohabitation." *Social Science Research* 39: 766-776.
- Coontz, Stephanie. 2017. "CCF Gender and Millennials Online Symposium: Overview." (Online Symposia March 30, 2017). Council on Contemporary Families. Accessed Oct 3, 2017. (<https://contemporaryfamilies.org/coontz-overview/>)
- Coontz, Stephanie. 2005. *Marriage, a History: From Obedience to Intimacy, or How Love Conquered Marriage*. New York: Viking.
- Coontz, Stephanie. 1992. 2000. *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap*. New York: Basic Books.
- Correll, Shelley J. 2001. "Gender and the Career Choice Process: The Role of Biased Self-Assessments." *American Journal of Sociology* 106(6): 1691-1730.
- Cotter, David and Joan Hermsen. 2014. "Brief: Back on Track? The Stall and Rebound in Support for Women's New Roles in Work and Politics, 1977-2012" Brief by *Council on Contemporary Families*. Accessed Oct 28, 2015. (<https://contemporaryfamilies.org/gender-revolution-rebound-brief-back-on-track/>)
- Cotter, David, Hermsen, Joan M. and Reeve Vanneman. 2011. "The End of the Gender Revolution? Gender Role Attitudes from 1977 to 2008." *American Journal of Sociology* 117(1): 259-89.
- Crittenden, Ann. 2001. *The Price of Motherhood: Why the Most Important Job in the World Is Still the Least Valued*. New York: Henry Holt and Co.
- Crompton, Rosemary. 2001. "Gender Restructuring, Employment, and Caring." *Social Politics* 8(3): 266-291.

- Cunningham, M., A.M. Beutel, J.S. Barber and A. Thornton. 2005. "Reciprocal Relationships between Attitudes about Gender and Social Contexts During Young Adulthood." *Social Science Research* 34(4): 862–892.
- Davis, S. N. and T.N. Greenstein. 2009. "Gender Ideology: Components, Predictors, and Consequences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35: 87–105.
- Dill, Bonnie Thornton. 1988. "Our Mothers' Greif: Racial-Ethnic Women and the Maintenance of Families." *Journal of Family History* 13: 415-431.
- Donnelly, Kristin, Jean M. Twenge, Malissa A. Clark, Samia K. Shaikh, Angela Beiler-May, and Nathan T. Carter. 2015. "Attitudes toward Women's Work and Family Roles in the United States, 1976-2013." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* first published June 26, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0361684315590774
- Dreby, Joanna. 2010. *Divided by Borders: Mexican Migrants and Their Children*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Elder, Glen H., Jr. 1994. "Time, Human Agency and Social Change: Perspectives on the Life Course." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 57: 4-15.
- England, Paula. 2005. "Emerging Theories of Care Work." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31: 381-399.
- England, Paula. 2010. "The Gender Revolution: Uneven and Stalled." *Gender & Society* 24(2): 149-166.
- Evertsson, Marie. 2014. "Gender Ideology and the Sharing of Housework and Child Care in Sweden." *Family Studies* 35(7): 927-949.
- Fagan, Jay and Rob Palkovitz. 2011. "Coparenting and Relationship Quality Effects on Father Engagement: Variations by Residence, Romance" *Journal of Marriage*

- and Family* 73(3): 637–653.
- Fate-Dixon, Nika. 2017. *Are Some Millennials Rethinking the Gender Revolution? Long-Range Trends in Views of Non-Traditional Roles for Women*. (Online Symposia March 30, 2017). Council on Contemporary Families. Accessed Oct 3, 2017. (<https://contemporaryfamilies.org/7-fate-dixon-millennials-rethinking-gender-revolution/>)
- Ferree, Myra Marx. 2010. “Filling the Glass: Gender Perspectives on Families.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(3): 420–439.
- Fragile Families. 2016. “About the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study.” <http://www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/about> accessed April 3, 2016.
- Fragile Families. 2008. “Fragile Families & Child Wellbeing Study: A Brief Guide to Using the Mother, Father, and Couple Replicate Weights for Core Telephone Surveys Waves 1-4. Accessed Oct 20, 2017. (https://fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/sites/fragilefamilies/files/ff_using_wgts.pdf)
- Folbre, Nancy. 2001. *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values*. New York: The New Press.
- Garfield, Craig F. and Paul J. Chung. 2006. “A Qualitative Study of Early Differences in Fathers’ Expectations of Their Child Care Responsibilities.” *Ambulatory Pediatrics* 6(4): 215-220.
- Gaunt R. 2006. “Biological Essentialism, Gender Ideologies, and Role Attitudes: What Determines Parents’ Involvement in Child Care?” *Sex Roles* 55: 523-33.
- Geller, Amanda. 2013. “Paternal Incarceration and Father–Child Contact in Fragile Families” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75: 1288–1303.

- General Mills. 2004. "Cheerios- How To Dad" by Tribal Worldwide, Directed by Michael Clowater. Retrieved from <https://vimeo.com/106825946>.
- Gerson, Kathleen. 1993. *No Man's Land: Men's Changing Commitments to Family and Work*. New York, New York: Basic Books.
- Gerson, Kathleen. 2002. "Moral Dilemmas, Moral Strategies, and the Transformation of Gender: Lessons from Two Generations of Work and Family Change." *Gender & Society* 16(1): 8–28.
- Gerson, Kathleen. 2010. *The Unfinished Revolution: How a New Generation is Reshaping Family, Work and Gender*. Oxford, NY: University Press.
- Gerson, Kathleen. 2015. "Falling Back on Plan B" Pp. 378-392 in *Families as They Really Are 2nd ed.* Edited by Barbara J Risman and Virginia B Rutter. New York: Norton.
- Gerstel, Naomi. 2011. "Rethinking Families and Community: The Color, Class and Centrality of Extended Kin Ties." *Sociological Forum* 26(1): 1-20.
- Gerstel, Naomi and Sally K. Gallagher. 2001. "Men's Caregiving: Gender and the Contingent Character of Care." *Gender & Society* 15(2): 197-217.
- Goldberg, Julia. 2015. "Identity and Involvement among Resident and Nonresident Fathers" *Journal of Family Issues* 36(7): 852-879.
- Goldscheider, Frances, Eva Berhnhardt and Trude Lappegård. 2015. "The Gender Revolution: A Framework for Understanding Changing Family and Demographic Behavior." *Population and Development Review* 41(2): 207-239.
- Gordy, Cynthia. 2011. "Welfare, Fathers and Those Persistent Myths." *The Root*. June 17, 2011. <https://www.theroot.com/welfare-fathers-and-those-persistent-myths->

1790864434.

- Hernandez, Daphne C. and Rebekah Levine Coley. 2007. "Measuring Father Involvement within Low-Income Families: Who is a Reliable and Valid Reporter?" *Parenting: Science and Practice* 7(1): 69-97.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1997. *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hochschild, Arlie and Anne Machung. 2012. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Hofferth, Sandra L. 1984. "Kin Networks, Race, and Family Structure." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 46: 791-806.
- Hofferth, Sandra L. and Francis Goldscheider. 2010. "Does Change in Young Men's Employment Influence Fathering?" *Family Relations* 59(4): 479-493.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierette. 2002. "Families on the Frontier: From Braceros in the Fields to Braceras in the Home." Pp. 259-273 in *Latinos: Remaking America* by Marcelo M. Suarez and Mariela M. Paez. Eds. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- HUD. 2013. Father;s Day 2013. US Department of Housing & Urban Development <https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/RFD2013slidesho.pdf>.
- Jacobs, Jerry A. and Kathleen Gerson. 2004. *The Time Divide: Work, Family, and Gender Inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jones, Jo and William D. Mosher. 2013. "Fathers Involvement with Their Children: United States, 2006-2010." *National Health Statistics Reports* 71: 1-22.
- Keene, Jennifer, Reid, and Christie Batson. "Under One Roof: A Review of Research on Intergenerational Coresidence and Multigenerational Households in the United

- States.” *Sociology Compass* 4(8): 642-657.
- Keene, Jennifer Reid, Takashi Yamashita, and Anastasia Prokos. 2016.
“Multigenerational Households.” In *The Encyclopedia of Adulthood and Aging*, 3
edited by Susan Krauss Whitbourne. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781118521373.wbeaa179>
- Keene, Jennifer Reid and Jill S. Quadagno. 2004. “Predictors of Perceived Work-Family
Balance: Gender Difference or Gender Similarity.” *Sociological Perspectives*
47(1): 1-24.
- Kimmel, Michael S. 2004. “A Very Brief History of the American Family” Pp. 113-121
in *The Gendered Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kroeger, Rhiannon, and Pamela J. Smock. 2014. “Cohabitation: Recent Research and
Implications.” Pp. 217-233 in *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of
Families* edited by Judith Treas, Jaqueline Scott and Martin Richards. Hoboken.
NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lareau, Annette, Elliot Weininger, Dalton Conley and Melissa Velez. 2011. “Unequal
Childhoods in Context: Results from a Quantitative Analysis.” Pp. 353-34 in
Unequal Childhoods 2nd ed. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Laughlin, L., D Farrie and J Fagan. 2009. “Father Involvement with Children Following
Marital and Non-Marital Separations.” *Fathering* 7: 226-248.
- Lee, Yeonjung and Fengyan Tang. 2013. “More Caregiving, Less Working: Caregiving
Roles and Gender Difference.” *Journal of Applied Gerontology* 34(4): 465-483.
- Lichter, Daniel T., 2012. “Chapter 13: Childbearing among Cohabiting Women, Race,
Pregnancy, and Union Transitions.” *National Symposium on Family Issues 2:*

- 209-219.
- Lichter, Daniel T., Diane K. McLaughlin, George Kephart and David J. Landry. 1992. "Race and the Retreat from Marriage: A Shortage of Marriageable Men?" *American Sociological Review* 57(6): 781-799.
- Lichter, Daniel T., Richard N. Turner and Sharon Sassler 2010. "National Estimates of the Rise in Serial Cohabitation." *Social Science Research* 39(5): 754-765.
- Lichter, Daniel T. and Zhenchao Qian. 2008. "Serial Cohabitation and the Marital Life Course." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70(4): 861-878.
- Lundberg, Sara McLanahan and Elaina Rose. 2007. "Child Gender and Father Involvement in Fragile Families." *Demography* 44(1): 79-92.
- Meteyer, Karen and Maureen Perry-Jenkins. 2010. "Father Involvement among Working-Class, Dual Earner Couples." *Fathering* 8(3): 379-403.
- McClain, L. R. and DeMaris, A. (2013). A Better Deal for Cohabiting Fathers? Union Status Differences in Father Involvement." *Fathering* 11: 199-220.
- Meyer, Madonna Harrington. 2000. *Care Work: Gender, Labor, and the Welfare State*. New York: Routledge.
- Mikelson, Kelly S. 2008. "He Said, She Said: Comparing Mother and Father Reports of Father Involvement." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70: 613-624.
- Moen, P. and S. Sweet. 2004. "From 'Work-Family' to 'Flexible Careers': A Life Course Reframing" *Community, Work, & Family* 7: 209-226.
- Myers, Monika J.U. 2013. "A Big Brother: New Findings on How Low-Income Fathers Define Responsible Fatherhood" *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 34(3): 253-264.

- Myers, S. and A. Booth. 2002. "Forerunners of Change in Nontraditional Gender Ideology." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 65(1): 18–37.
- National Alliance of Caregivers and AARP. 2015. "Caregiving in the US." *Public Policy Institute*. June 4.
- Nelson, T. J. 2004. "Low Income Fathers." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 427–451.
- Orbuch, Terri L., James S. House, Richard P. Mero and Pamila S. Webster. 1996. "Marital Quality over the Life Course." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59(2): 162-171.
- Parennas, Rhacel Salazar. 2000. "Migrant Filipina Domestic Workers and the International Division of Reproductive Labor" *Gender & Society* 14: 560-580.
- Patillo-McCoy, Mary. 1999. *Black Picket Fences: Privilege and Peril among the Black Middle Class*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pepin, Joanna and David Cotter. 2017. *Trending Towards Traditionalism? Changes in Youths' Gender Ideology*. (Online Symposia March 30, 2017). Council on Contemporary Families. Accessed Oct 3, 2017. (<https://contemporaryfamilies.org/2-pepin-cotter-traditionalism/>)
- Pleck, J.H. (1997). "Paternal Involvement: Levels, Sources, and Consequences." Pp. 66-103 in *The Role of the Father in Child Development 3rd ed* edited by M.E. Lamb. New York: Wiley.
- Powell, Brian, Catherine Blozendahl, Claudia Geist and Lala Carr Steelman. 2012. *Counted Out; Same-Sex Relations and Americans' Definitions of Family*. Russel-Sage Foundation.
- Prokos, Anastaia H. and Jennifer Reid Keene. 2012. "Life Course Cumulative

- Advantage: Poverty among Grandmother-headed Families.” *Research on Aging* 34(5): 592-621.
- Rios, Victor. 2011. *Punished: Policing the Lives of Black and Latino Boys*. New York University Press.
- Risman, Barbara J. 1998. *Gender Vertigo*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Risman, Barbara J. 2004. “Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Social Change.” *Gender & Society* 18(4): 429–450.
- Risman, Barbara J. 2010. *Families as They Really Are*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Risman, Barbara J. and D. Johnson-Sumerford, 1998. “Doing it Fairly: A Study of Postgender Marriages.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 60(1): 23–40.
- Risman, Barbara J. and Virginia E Rutter. 2015. *Families as They Really Are 2nd ed*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Roberts, Jessica L. 2005. "Conclusions from the Body: Coerced Fatherhood and Caregiving as Child Support." *Yale Journal of Law & Feminism* 17(2):501-516.
- Sayer, Liana C., Suzanne M. Bianchi and John P. Robinson. 2004. “Are Parents Investing Less in Children? Trends in Mothers’ and Fathers’ Time with Children.” *American Journal of Sociology* 110(1): 1-43.
- Shannon, Jacqueline D., Natasha J. Cabrera, Catherine Tamis-LeMondac and Michael E. Lamb. 2009. “Who Stays and Who Leaves? Father Accessibility Across Children's First 5 Years” *Parenting: Science and Practice* 9(1-2): 78-100.
- Stacey, Judith. 1990. *Brave New Families: Stories of Domestic Upheaval in Late-Twentieth-Century America*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Stryker, Sheldon and Peter J Burke. 2000. “The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity

- Theory.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63(4): 284-297.
- Stykes, J. Bart. 2015. “What Matters Most? Money, Relationships, and Visions of Masculinity as Key Correlates of Father Involvement.” *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers* 13(1): 60-79.
- Swisher, Raymond R. and Maureen R. Waller. 2008. “Incarceration and Paternal Involvement Among Nonresident White, African-American, and Latino Fathers.” *Journal of Family Issues* 29(8): 1067-1088.
- Tach, Laura, Ronald B. Mincy, and Kathryn Edin. 2010. Parenting as a “Package Deal”: Relationships, Fertility, and Nonresident Father Involvement among Unmarried Parents.” *Demography* 47(1): 181-204.
- Tamborini, Christopher R., Howard M. Iams and Kevin Whitman. 2009. “Marital History, Race, and Social Security Spouse and Widow Benefit Eligibility in the United States.” *Research on Aging* 31: 577-605.
- Thompson, Edward H. 2002. “What’s Unique about Men’s Caregiving?” Pp. 20-47 in *Men as Caregivers: Theory, Research, and Service Implications* edited by Betty J. Kramer and Edward H. Thompson, Jr. New York, New York: Springer Publishing.
- Tichenor, V. J. 2005. *Earning More and Getting Less: Why Successful Wives Can’t Buy Equality*. New Brunswick, NY: Rutgers.
- Townsend, N. W. 2002. *The Package Deal: Marriage, Work, and Fatherhood in Men’s Lives*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Vespa, Jonathan. 2009. “Gender Ideology Construction: A Life Course Intersectional Approach.” *Gender & Society* 23(3): 363-97.

- Vespa, Johnathan, Lewis, Jamie M. and Rose M Kreider. 2013. "America's Families and Living Arrangements: 2012, Population Characteristics." Issued August 2013. U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau. <https://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/p20-570.pdf>
- Waller, Maureen R. 2009. "Family Man in the Other America: New Opportunities, Motivations, and Supports for Paternal Caregiving." *Annals of American Academic Political and Social Science* 624(1): 156–176.
- Waller, Maureen R. and Maggie R. Jones. 2014. "Who Is the Residential Parent? Understanding Discrepancies in Unmarried Parents' Reports." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 76(1): 73-93.
- Wight, Vanessa R., Suzanne M. Bianchi and Bijou R. Hunt. 2013. "Explaining Racial/Ethnic Variation in Partnered Women's and Men's Housework: Does One Size Fit All?" *Journal of Family Issues* 34(1): 394-427.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Woldoff, Rachel A. and Heather M. Washington. 2008. "The Criminal Justice System, Race, and Father Engagement." *The Prison Journal* 88(2): 179-206.
- Wolf, Joan B. 2007. "Is Breast Really Best? Risk and Total Motherhood in Breastfeeding Awareness Campaign." *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 32(4): 595-636.
- Zuo, J. 2004. "Shifting the Breadwinning Boundary: The Role of Men's Breadwinner Status and Their Gender Ideologies." *Journal of Family Issues* 25(6): 811–832.

Curriculum Vitae:

Rachel Teresa Macfarlane
rachelraymacfarlane@gmail.com
UNIVERSITY OF LAS VEGAS NEVADA
Department of Sociology
4505 Maryland Parkway
Box 455033
Las Vegas, NV 89154-5033

EDUCATION

2018 - Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

2013 - Master of Arts in Sociology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

2010 - Previous Graduate Studies, Public Health and Sociology, University of Illinois, Chicago

2006 - Bachelor of Arts, Sociology, Weber State University, Ogden, Utah

2003 - General Studies, Southern Utah University, Cedar City, Utah

FIELDS OF INTEREST

Inequality and Stratification, Gender, Masculinity, Work, Family, Criminology, Penology, Critical and Intersectional Theories and Methods

DISSERTATION

“Fathers’ Caregiving in Fragile Families: A Longitudinal Analysis by Race and Ethnicity, Family Contexts, and Gender Ideology”

Committee: Dr Christie Batson, Dr Georgiann Davis, Dr Jennifer Keene, Davis, Dr Terry Miethe

This research uses data from families at the time of their birth in the hospital to explore the factors that shape fathers’ caregiving trajectories over the first five years of a child’s life. My analysis considers the role of household makeup, coresidency with coparents and children, ethnoracial background, and gendered attitudes about the role and importance of fatherhood and fathers’ caregiving.

COMPREHENSIVE EXAM AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

2014 - Marriage & Family

Committee: Dr Andrew Spivak, Dr Jennifer Keene, Dr Barb Brents, Dr Shannon Monnat,

Dr Anita Revilla

2013 - Criminology and Penology

Committee: Dr Andrew Spivak, Dr Jennifer Keene, Dr Barb Brents, Dr Terrie Miethe

RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. (*forthcoming*). “Fathers' Early Caregiving for Children and Parents' Gender Ideology as Predictors of Father's Later Caregiving.”

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. (*forthcoming*). “Fathers' Early Caregiving for Children as a Predictor of Fathers' Later Caregiving across Ethnoracial Groups and Family Contexts.”

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. (*forthcoming*). “Father's Early Caregiving for Children as a Predictor of Fathers' Later Caregiving across Family Contexts.”

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa, and Jennifer Reid Keene. (*forthcoming*). “Real vs. Ideal Masculinity: Men's Experiences of Providership and Family, and Attitudes about a Gendered Division of Labor.”

Baxter, Nicholas, Jennifer Stevens, Christopher Conner, **Rachel Macfarlane.** (*forthcoming*). “Drive-By-Ethnography: The Bureaucratization of Ethnographic Research Methods.”

Cook, Judith, Pam Steigman, Susan Pickett-Schenk, Sita Diehl, Anthony Fox, Patricia Shipley, **Rachel Teresa Macfarlane,** Dennis Grey, and Jane Burke-Miller. 2011. “Randomized Controlled Trial of Peer-Led Recovery Education Using Building Recovery of Individual Dreams and Goals through Education and Support (BRIDGES).” *Schizophrenia Research*. Epub Nov 28, 2011.

Cook, Judith, Mary Ellen Copeland, Jessica Jonikas, Marie Hamilton, Lisa Razzano, Denis Grey, Carol Floyd, Walter Hudson, **Rachel Teresa Macfarlane,** Tina Carter, and Sherry Boyd. 2011. “Results of a Randomized Controlled Trial of Mental Illness Self-Management Using Wellness Recovery Action Planning.” *Schizophrenia Research*. Epub March 14, 2011.

Cook, Judith, Mary Ellen Copeland, Marie Hamilton, Jessica Jonikas, Lisa Razzano, Carol Floyd, Walter Hudson, **Rachel Teresa Macfarlane,** Dennis Grey. 2009. “Initial Outcomes of Mental Illness Self-Management using Wellness Recovery Action Planning (WRAP).” *Psychiatric Services*, 60:246-249.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT WRITING

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2013. “Maryland Parkway Corridor.” in *Resilient Communities and Distressed Neighborhoods: The Findings of Southern Nevada Strong Ethnography Research Summer Clinic*. Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa, Joanna Woodbury, and Jane Heenan. 2012. *Gender Justice Nevada Advocate Training Manual*. LGBTQ Center of Las Vegas Resources.

Heineman, Jenny, **Rachel Teresa Macfarlane**, and Barbara G. Brents. 2012. "Sex Industry and Sex Workers in Nevada." In *The Social Health of Nevada: Leading Indicators and Quality of Life in the Silver State*, edited by Dmitri N. Shalin. Las Vegas, NV: UNLV Center for Democratic Culture, <http://cdclv.unlv.edu/mission/index.html>

TEACHING

2011 to present – Independent Teaching, Department of Sociology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

- Soc 101 Principles of Sociology (7 sections)
- Soc 403 Techniques of Social Research Lab
- Soc 404 Statistical Methods Lab (2 Sections)
- Soc 431 Crime and Criminal Behaviors
- Soc 441 Social Inequality (online – 2 sections)
- Soc 447 Marriage and Family (online – 2 sections)
- Soc 478 Women in Society
- Soc 704 Graduate Statistical Methods Lab

2010 to present - Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of Sociology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

- COLA 100 First Year Experience, "The Time Bind"
- Soc 101 Principles of Sociology
- Soc 403 Techniques of Social Research
- Soc 404 Statistical Methods (2 Sections)
- Soc 431 Crime and Criminal Behavior
- Soc 449/649 Sex and Social Arrangements
- Soc 704 Graduate Statistical Methods

2004 to 2005 - Sociology 101 Supplemental Instructor, Student Support Services, Weber State University

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Problem Gambling Treatment and Evaluation: The Nevada Problem Gambling Study (2016 to present)

Interviewed participants in state-funded gambling rehabilitation programs.

Funding Agency: State of Nevada Health and Human Services

Primary Investigator: Bo Bernhard, Executive Director of the International Gaming Institute, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Juvenile Drug Court Evaluation and Assessment Internship (Spring 2017)

Developed internal assessments of the youth diversion program for drug offenders,

analyzed data, provided research, and consultation on the program and measurements.
Eighth Judicial District Court Specialty Court Programs
Las Vegas Regional Justice Courts, Family Courts and Services Center
Hearing Master Margaret Pickard, Esq.

Graduate Research Assistantship

Department of Sociology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

- With Dr Jennifer Keene (2015)

- o Research and preliminary writing for a book chapter, *Individual Differences in the Grieving Process*, in *Leading Grief Support Groups: A Guide for Moving Forward Together* by Jason M. Holland, Ph.D., Kara L. Thompson, M.S., and Jennifer Reid Keene, Ph.D.
- o Extended into the Summer Research Position with the Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, Interdisciplinary

- With Dr Dimitri Shalin (2011)

- o Indexing articles and transcription for research “on the intersection of biography, theory, and history” on politicians and democracy.

Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children Community Study (2012 to 2014)

Recruited and interviewed participants who had traded things for sex for a national, multi-site study.

Department of Sociology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Principal Investigator: Andrew Spivak

Supported by the Center for Court Innovation, Department of Justice

Ethnographic Fieldwork: Housing Transportation and Employment (2013)

Observing, interviewing and analyzing data from communities and corridors with need/opportunity of development for city-wide study of community needs assessment.

School of Community Health Sciences and Southern Nevada Strong

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Study of Cooperative Parenting in High-Conflict Custody Battles (2012 to 2013)

Research and analysis assessing efficacy and program implementation of a program designed to reduce the frequency of returning to court by high-conflict coparents in custody battles.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

with Dr Jennifer Keene, Margaret Pickard Esq.

Partnerships for Community Health (PACT) (2011)

Interviewing residents about health and community connections in largely Hispanic communities of the Eastside of Las Vegas. Assisted visiting researchers with field coordination.

Unidos por la Salud de la Comunidad (UNIDOS)

University of California, Berkeley, School of Public Health

Health Research for Action

Coordinator of Research and Policy (2007 to 2010)

Coordinated, recruited, interviewed participants and managed data for research projects around the US, having to do with innovative programs to support individuals with mental health issues and their families.

University of Illinois Chicago, Department of Psychiatry
Center on Mental Health Services Research & Policy

- Illinois Wellness Recovery Action Planning Study
- Texas Self-Directed Care Study
- Ohio Wellness Recovery Action Planning Study
 - Ohio Wellness Recovery Action Planning Study Photo Elicitation
- Tennessee Building Recovery of Individual Dreams and Goals through Education and Support Study

Research Assistant (2006 to 2007)

Coded and edited market research surveys, prepared reports and presentations for clients.
Rabin Research,
Chicago, Illinois

Primary Researcher (2005 to 2006)

Recorded and analyzed qualitative interviews with men working varied shifts to understand the impact on social connections.

Air Force Air Traffic Controllers: Friends, Fathers and Community
Weber State University &
National Science Foundation Research Experience for Undergraduates

INVITED PRESENTATIONS

Falcón, Sylvanna, Haley Gentile, **Rachel Teresa Macfarlane**. 2017. “Dialogue – The United States Post Trump’s Election: An Open Discussion Facilitated by the Members of the Social Action Committee.” Invited Panel. Sociologists for Women in Society, Winter Meeting. Albuquerque, NM.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2014. “A Glimpse of Maryland Parkway Resident Concerns.” Southern Nevada Strong 2014 Summit. Southern Nevada Regional Planning Commission, Las Vegas, NV.

Spivak, Andrew L., Jennifer Whitmer, **Rachel Teresa Macfarlane**. 2012. “Overview of the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) Project.” Invited presentation, *Human Rights Symposium*, Phi Alpha Delta, Law Fraternity International, Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2013. “A Decade of Las Vegas Neighborhoods and Housing Trends.” Invited installations. COLAB Art Cooperative’s Show, In Search of Las Vegas: Sociological Investigations beyond the Neon. Las Vegas, NV.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2013. "Methodological Challenges in Gender Research." Invited Panel, Pacific Sociological Association, 84th Annual Meeting, Reno/Sparks, NV.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2005. "Impact Analysis of Shiftwork on Social Roles for Air Force Air Traffic Controllers." Circadian Disruption of Military and Law Enforcement Personnel through Shift Work. National Science Foundation Research Experience for Undergraduates, Weber State University, Ogden, UT.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2018. "Call-boys, Bad Boyfriends, and Hustlers: Gender Performance, Experiences and Identities of Young Men and Boys in the Las Vegas Sex Trade." Southern Sociological Society, New Orleans, LA.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2018. "Gender Differences in Experiences of Youth in the Sex Trade in Las Vegas." Society for Women in Sociology, Winter Meeting, Atlanta, GA.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2017. "Fathers' Early Caregiving for Children and Gender Ideology as a Predictor of Later Caregiving across Family Contexts." Society for the Study of Social Problems, Montreal, Canada.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2017. "Fathers' Early Caregiving for Children as a Predictor of Later Caregiving across Ethnoracial Groups and Family Contexts." Pacific Sociological Association, Portland, OR.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2016. "Dads Who Care: Fathers' Caregiving in Fragile Families." UNLV Graduate College Rebel Grad Slam Research Rumble, Las Vegas, NV.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2015. "Family Formation, Care and Financial Support and Gender Ideology, from a Life-Course Perspective." Society for Women in Sociology, Winter Meeting, Washington, DC.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa and Jennifer Reid Keene. 2014. "Real vs. Ideal Masculinity: Men's Experiences of Providership and Family, and Their Attitudes about a Gendered Division of Labor." Society for the Study of Social Problems. San Francisco, CA.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2013. "A Seat at the Table, a Table of Our Own: Claiming Space and Transnational Identity in the Las Vegas Filipino Community." Graduate and Professional Student Association Student Research Conference. UNLV, Las Vegas, NV.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa, Mark Ohrtman, Jessica Jonikas, Marie Hamilton, Judith Cook. 2012. "The Problems and Power of Photographs: Evaluating Method Fit." Pacific Sociological Association, San Diego, CA.

Razzano, L.A., Marie Hamilton, and **Rachel Teresa Macfarlane.** 2008, June. "Implementing

Health Prevention and Promotion Programs within Psychiatric Rehabilitation Settings.”
Workshop, Annual Meeting of the USPRA, Chicago, IL.

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2006. “Maintaining Family, Friendship and Community Relations in Shiftwork: A Qualitative Study of Air Force Air Traffic Controllers.” National Conference of Undergraduate Research. University of North Carolina- Asheville. (Paper published in the NCUR Proceedings)

Macfarlane, Rachel Teresa. 2006. “Masculinity and Social Roles in Shiftwork: A Qualitative Study of Air Force Air Traffic Controllers.” Art of Gender. Idaho State University. Pocatello, ID.

AWARDS, HONORS & SCHOLARSHIPS

2016 to present - Graduate Assistantship, International Gaming Institute, University of Las Vegas

2015 to present - Patricia Sastaunik Scholarship, University of Las Vegas, Nevada

2010 to 2017 - Graduate Assistantship, Department of Sociology, University of Las Vegas, Nevada

2015 - COLA Dean’s PhD Student Summer Research Stipend, University of Las Vegas, Nevada

2013 - Outstanding MA Student Award, Department of Sociology, University of Las Vegas, Nevada

2013 - GPSA Graduate Research Awards, 2nd Place, University of Las Vegas, Nevada

2012, 2015-2017 - Graduate Student Access Grant, University of Nevada Las Vegas

2006 - Outstanding Graduate, Department of Sociology & Anthropology, Weber State University

2006 - Woman of the Year Finalist, Crystal Crest Awards, Weber State University

2005 - Myers Mortuary Scholarship, Weber State University

2005 - Ogden OUTreach Social Justice Grant, Unitarian Universalist Funding Program

2004 to 2006 - Matthew Shepard Scholarship, Weber State University

2004 - Transfer Student Scholarship, Weber State University

2002 - President’s Club Scholarship, Southern Utah University

2002 - Sociology Department Scholarship, Southern Utah University

2001 - Skaggs and Braithwaite Scholarship, Southern Utah University

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Sociologists for Women in Society
Social Action Committee
Society for the Study of Social Problems
Family Division
Crime, Law and Deviance Division
American Sociological Association
Pacific Sociological Association
Alpha Kappa Delta
Nevada Chapter of the American Statistical Association

SERVICE

PROFESSIONAL

2013 to present –Sociologists for Women in Society
Social Action Committee Member, Grant and Award Reviewer
Reviewer for *Gender and Society* since 2014

2013 to present - Society for the Study of Social Problems
Session Organizer for Family Division
Reviewer for *Social Problems* since 2017

2003 to present - Alpha Kappa Delta
Volunteer
Reviewer for *Sociological Inquiry* since 2016
President, Weber State University, 2005 – 2006
Vice President, Weber State University, 2004-2005
Secretary, Weber State University, 2003-2004
Officer, Southern Utah University, 2003

UNIVERSITY

2015 to present – Department of Sociology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Graduate Representative for the Undergraduate Committee, 2016 - 2017
Graduate Representative for the Graduate Committee, 2015 – 2016
Alternate Representative for Graduate & Professional Student Association, 2014 - 2015

2014 - Interdisciplinary Studies, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Mentor, Spring 2014

COMMUNITY

2012 to present - Gender Justice Nevada Queer Anti-Violence Project Training Facilitator,
Advocate and Community Educator

2011 to 2014 Crisis Line / Care line Volunteer, Jean Nidetch Women's Center

2012 to 2014 - PAAVE Presenter (Peers Advocating Anti-Violence Education), Jean Nidetch
Women's Center

2009 to 2010 - Shelter Volunteer, 2008 to 2009 Bus Volunteer, The Night Ministry, Chicago, IL

2006 - On-call Police Escort Advocate and Shelter Volunteer, The Dove Center Domestic
Violence Shelter, St George, UT

2005 to 2006 - Social Action Committee Co-Chair, Unitarian Universalist Church of Ogden

2004 to 2006 - Committee Co-Chair Ogden OUTreach, Community Support Group for At-Risk
Youth

2003 to 2005 - Shelter Volunteer, 2004 Diversity Coordinator, Safe Harbor Domestic Violence
Shelter, Clearfield, UT