Fathers' Involvement with Nonresident Children: Comparing Estimates from the American Time Use Survey and National Survey of Family Growth

Betsy Thorn
Brittany McGill
University of Maryland

PAA 2010 Submission
August 2009

Children are more likely now than a few decades ago to spend at least part of their childhood in a single-parent family, usually with their mother and apart from their father (Furstenberg 1988; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994). Our understanding of nonresident father involvement, however, is surprisingly limited. Understanding who these fathers are and what factors are associated with greater involvement is important for understanding what mechanisms link nonresident fathers to children and how policy and programmatic efforts can best assist such linkages. In particular, it is important to understand the *quality* of nonresident fathers' interactions with children, not just the quantity of interactions, as research has shown that quality has a greater influence on child wellbeing than quantity (Amato and Gilbreth 1999). As such, this paper addresses the following questions: How involved are nonresident fathers with their children? Which nonresident fathers are most involved with their children? And how well do the very different survey methodologies of the American Time Use Survey and the National Survey of Family Growth perform in analyses of nonresident father involvement? Particular attention will be paid to a broader array of activities fathers engage in with their nonresident children than is typically found in the nonresident father involvement literature.

What we know about nonresident father involvement has tended to focus on financial support and simple measures of visitation or contact with nonresident children. In comparison, we know much less about the types of activities fathers engage in with their nonresident children or the degree to which different fathers participate in those activities. It is these more detailed measures that may tap the *quality* of fathers' interactions with nonresident children, rather than just quantity of interaction (Argys, Peters et al. 2007). Further, due to issues such as attrition and difficulty locating fathers, what we know about nonresident father involvement often relies on mothers' reports rather than fathers' own reports. Mothers' reports, however, may not be the same as fathers' reports. We know, for example, that mothers' reports of nonresident father involvement tend to be lower than those of fathers, and it has been suggested that mothers' proxy reports may be affected by factors such as conflict in the relationship with the father (Amato and Rivera 1999). Finally, there is concern about the quality of *fathers'* reports as well, in that men not living with their children may difficult to survey and may not always report having children, especially if they are not involved with those children.

This paper will address these limitations by focusing on two recent, nationally representative data sets with unique and complementary advantages. The American Time Use Survey (2003-08) and the National Survey of Family Growth (2002) each gather data directly from men about what they do with and for their children, including children who reside both within and outside of their household. The ATUS asked a representative sample of men about their time use, gathering arguably the best type of data on what fathers do with their children.

These data may be less strong, however, at getting a complete enumeration of a man's children, as no special protocols were used to get a complete reporting of men's children/fertility history, or to ascertain the biological relationship between the father and child; another drawback is the lack of retrospective data in the ATUS. The NSFG, on the other hand, expended great effort to gather complete reporting of fathers' children by asking about men's fertility in the context of their relationships with partners in an effort to aid recall. This approach is believed to have resulted in a more complete reporting of all men's children, including nonresident children, as estimates of children fathered by men in the NSFG were found comparable to estimates from vital statistics (Martinez GM, Chandra A et al. 2006). The NSFG includes measures of involvement with children as well, though they have drawbacks: questions about father involvement, for example, were not child-specific, measures of socially desirable involvement with children may be more prone to inflation, and the economic covariates included on the file are less detailed than those of the ATUS.

By comparing the estimates of the total number of men with nonresident children and the levels and demographic correlates of nonresident father involvement in these two surveys, we will be able to ascertain whether the picture of variation in nonresident father involvement that emerges from each survey is the same. For example, if the ATUS underestimates the size of the nonresident father population, would we still reach the same conclusions about which fathers are more or less involved with nonresident children as if we used the NSFG with its potentially more complete accounting of nonresident fathers? Do the global measures of involvement from the NSFG match the potentially more accurate time diary measures of involvement in the ATUS? Similarly, would we reach different conclusions about the relationship of the covariates in the NSFG with the more detailed economic covariates, such as work hours and individual earnings, found in the ATUS?

Literature Review

Research and data on nonresident fathers and their involvement with their children have been limited (Hernandez and Brandon 2002). Several data sets include measures of contact with nonresident children, although research shows limited or no effects of contact with nonresident fathers for child wellbeing (Amato and Gilbreth 1999), which is often the motivation behind policy efforts. Some research shows, however, that the quality of that contact may matter (Amato and Gilbreth 1999). Quality of contact is difficult to measure for various reasons, including disagreement over how best to conceptualize quality and the lack of data collected directly from fathers or children (Argys, Peters et al. 2007). One way to capture quality of contact may be to examine the activities in which nonresident fathers engage with their children (Argys, Peters et al. 2007). Involvement in a range of daily activities with children may be an important indicator of nonresident fathers filling "parental" roles, rather than "visitor" roles: as Lamb (2000) argues,

> "If noncustodial parents are to maintain and strengthen relationships with their children… they need to participate in a range of everyday activities that allow them to function as parents rather than simply as regular, genial visitors" (178).

If this is the case, measuring nonresident father involvement in terms of routine activities shared with the children, similar to those activities frequently used to measure coresident father involvement, may be an improvement upon measures limited to contact, visitation, and financial support.

These measures are less common in many major surveys, but this is one way in which our research will make an important contribution. The ATUS and NSFG data we use for this analysis include the same engagement measures for nonresident fathers as those commonly used for the study of coresident father involvement, including time spent in various types of parenting activities, such as sharing meals with children, helping children with homework, taking physical care of children, and reading to children. In addition, these data are collected directly from fathers, rather than from residential mothers, who are likely to be less accurate reporters of fathers' activities with children and who consistently report lower levels of father involvement than do fathers (Argys, Peters et al. 2007).

Given the limitations noted in the research, what do we know about nonresident father involvement? Argys et al. (2007) examine levels of involvement from six different data sets: the National Survey of America's Families (NSAF), the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 (NLSY97), the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 child data, the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FF), and the Wisconsin Child Support Demonstration Evaluation (WCSDE). The authors find widely varying estimates of contact between nonresident fathers and their children, but that measures across surveys are inconsistent and illustrate different aspects of father-child contact (394). Others show from the 1997 PSID-CDS that more than a quarter of children under age 13 have a nonresident father and that while one-third of those children had no contact with their father in the last year, nearly half had contact with their father at least once a month (Hofferth, Stueve et al. 2002). Finally, Amato et al. (2009) find that levels of contact between nonresident fathers and children rose significantly between 1976 and 2002.

The current research, however, will focus not on whether nonresident fathers have contact with their children, but rather on the types of activities that constitute that contact in an effort to tap the quality of their involvement with their children. As discussed previously, very little is known about such engagement. According to resident mothers' reports from the 1997 PSID-CDS, 43% of nonresident fathers engaged in leisure activities with their children in the last month, 11% in religious activities, 46% in play activities, and 16% in school activities (Hofferth, Stueve et al. 2002). Descriptive analyses of the 2002 NSFG show that while about half report not engaging in shared activities with their nonresident preschool-aged children at all in the last four weeks, more than one quarter fed or ate meals with their young children several times a week or more in the last month, and similar numbers reported bathing/diapering/dressing and play activities (Martinez GM, Chandra A et al. 2006).

Various economic and demographic factors have been found to be associated with nonresident father involvement. Employment may play a critical role in keeping nonresident fathers involved with their children. While coresident fathers are expected to provide for their children financially, employment of nonresident fathers may serve as a precondition to access to children in the first place, by signaling the ability to provide for the children financially. Indeed, employment or income emerges as a critical predictor of involvement with children (Landale and Oropesa 2001; Nelson, Clampet-Lundquist et al. 2002). On the other hand, *lack* of employment may keep nonresident fathers distanced from their children, either through a maternal gatekeeping mechanism or fathers' own reluctance to engage with children they cannot support financially (Marsiglio and Cohan 2000; Landale and Oropesa 2001; Jarrett, Roy et al. 2002). Fathers' education, financial contributions to the child, and geographic proximity may also be associated with higher levels of involvement with nonresident children (Seltzer 1991; King and Heard 1999; Stewart 1999; Landale and Oropesa 2001).

Family structure appears to be important as well. Re-partnering of the mother or father has been shown to be negatively associated with nonresident contact and involvement (Seltzer and Bianchi 1988; Landale and Oropesa 2001; Hofferth, Stueve et al. 2002; Juby, Billette et al. 2007; Wang 2008), especially if the father has new children with a current coresident partner (Manning and Smock 1999; Manning and Smock 2000). Others, however, find the birth of a new child does not affect involvement with a father's nonresident children (Juby, Billette et al. 2007). Relationship quality between parents may also be associated with greater involvement between nonresident fathers and their children (Carlson and McLanahan 2002; Nelson, Clampet-Lundquist et al. 2002; Hofferth, Forry et al. 2007). Finally, parental coresidence and marital status at the time of the birth may also be associated with greater nonresident involvement or contact after separation (Seltzer 1991; Landale and Oropesa 2001; Carlson and McLanahan 2002).

Research Questions

Research on nonresident father involvement indicates that it is the quality of interaction between father and children that is beneficial to children, but quality of is difficult to determine in many surveys. The ATUS and NSFG both contain data that speak to quality of nonresident father involvement but use very different sampling strategies and questionnaires with different strengths and weaknesses. This paper asks three questions. Two are addressed in this preliminary version of the paper; the third will be analyzed as the next step in this project.

- Do the ATUS and NSFG contain data on the same types of nonresident fathers? The ATUS does not use the extensive fertility history techniques that the NSFG uses. It is possible that the nonresident fathers represented in the ATUS are a biased group; we expect that the men who are most involved with their nonresident children are the most likely to report having nonresident children.
- Is the ratio of nonresident father involvement to resident father involvement similar across surveys? We assume that the involvement of fathers with their coresident children is similar across surveys. Using resident father involvement as a baseline allows us to assess whether our sample of nonresident fathers in the ATUS is biased towards more involved men and whether our measures are tapping the same underlying types of involvement.
- What characteristics are correlated with high levels of nonresident father involvement? Based on our literature review, we expect that economic characteristics of the father will be important, in that higher levels of employment and earnings will be associated with more involvement. We also anticipate that fathers' marital status will have an impact on involvement, with unmarried fathers having the highest levels of involvement. This question will be addressed in the next draft of this paper.

Data/Methods

The American Time Use Survey

The American Time Use Survey is a nationally representative time diary survey that records each respondent's daily activities, including details on where they were and who was in their company during most activities. The ATUS sample is drawn from the outgoing rotation of the Current Population Survey, so the ATUS contains extensive information on respondents' involvement in the labor force. Parents' time use is also a central focus of the ATUS, so unlike

the CPS, the ATUS household roster includes any non-resident children of the respondent. The ATUS has been conducted by the Census Bureau for the Bureau of Labor Statistics on a continuous basis beginning in 2003.

The ATUS sample is a nationally representative sample of the non-institutionalized population age 15 and older. Blacks, Hispanics, and members of households with children under the age of 18 are over-sampled. Additionally, approximately half of the diary days are Saturdays or Sundays. Between 2003 and 2008, 19,075 men between the ages of 15 and 44 were interviewed, 51% of whom are fathers of children between the ages of 0 and 17.

In the time diary portion of the ATUS interview, the respondent is asked what they were doing at 4:00 a.m. on the preceding day. The interviewer asks how long that activity lasted and what the respondent did next. This process is followed through 4:00 a.m. on the day of the interview. Each activity is coded according to an extensive lexicon of activities. There are 21 different childcare activities. In addition to specific childcare activities, the data on who was with the respondent during the activity can be used to assess the amount of time parents spend in non-childcare activities with their children.

Time diary studies have the advantage of limiting respondents to 24 hours of activities, which is understood to limit respondents' opportunities to artificially inflate their reports of time spent in socially desirable activities. Estimates of time spent in socially desirable activities, such as reading to children, tend to be smaller in time diary studies than in studies that ask global questions about the amount of time spent in those activities. The ATUS, therefore, provides one of the most accurate ways of assessing the amount of time parents spend caring for, and interacting with, their children.

The National Survey of Family Growth

The National Survey of Family Growth provides a recent, nationally representative sample of men aged 15-44 in the non-institutionalized, household population in the United States. The survey covers a wide range of topics related to fertility and family formation, including complete marital and cohabitation histories and fathers' involvement with both coresidential and non-coresidential children. The NSFG has been conducted periodically since 1973, originally intended as a survey of women to collect data on factors related to birth and pregnancy rates.

The 2002 survey was the largest of the periodic surveys and the first to collect data from a national sample of men as well as women (Martinez GM, Chandra A et al. 2006). To adapt the survey to the inclusion of men, "a wide range of consultations were made with experts in survey methods and in the topics that the NSFG covers, to determine how the questionnaire for men should be organized, and what topics should be collected (Groves, Benson et al. 2005)."[1] Estimates from the NSFG indicate that there were 61 million men aged 15-44 years old in 2002; forty-seven percent of them were fathers, including 28.6 million who were fathers of children 18 or younger (Martinez GM, Chandra A et al. 2006).

[1] This consultation with experts included establishing Professional Services Contracts with directors of national surveys including: the National Survey of Adolescent Males (Freya Sonenstein, Urban Institute); the National Survey of Men (Koray Tanfer, Battelle Memorial Institutes); the National AIDS Behavior Survey (Joseph Catania, University of California, San Francisco); the National Health and Social Life Survey (Edward Laumann and Robert Michael, University of Chicago); the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (Frank Mott, Ohio State University); and the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (J. Richard Udry, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill).

Data were collected through in-person interviews by the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, under contract with the National Center for Health Statistics (Groves, Benson et al. 2005). Interviews were conducted in English or Spanish and averaged about 60 minutes for men. The 2002 data reflect a total of 4,928 males (and 7,643 women) aged 15-44, and blacks, Hispanics, and teenagers were oversampled. In order to bolster sample sizes, we plan to pool the 2002 data with those from the next release at the end of 2009, which will include data collected between mid-2006 through the end of 2008. Based on projections and preliminary fieldwork estimates, the NSFG expect the first data release from continuous interviewing (mid-2006 through the end of 2008) to include approximately 6,000 men (Mosher 2009).

As with the ATUS, one of the advantages of the NSFG data is that the information on men's fertility and father involvement is collected directly from the men themselves, rather than through proxy reports from the mother, as is the case for several other sources of data on father involvement. A second benefit of these data is that the response rate for men in 2002 was 78%, which is very good compared to many other surveys. Finally, the NSFG may be particularly beneficial for examining nonresident father involvement. Unlike many data sources, the NSFG includes similar engagement measures for resident and nonresident fathers, in addition to traditional measures of contact, visitation, and child support. As discussed above, these engagement questions may begin to tap the quality of contact between nonresident fathers and children.

Measures

The ATUS and NSFG identify fathers in slightly different ways. First, the ATUS portion of the analysis is limited to men with children between the ages of 0-17, whereas the NSFG includes men with children between the ages of 0 and 18. The reason for the limitation on the ATUS data is that respondents were not asked about non-household children over the age of 17. The ATUS identifies biological children, adoptive children, and step-children who live in the household at least 50% of the time as household children. Non-household children are biological, adoptive, and step-children who do not live in the household at least 50% of the time. Definitions for the NSFG are similar, but not exactly the same. Coresident children are those for whom the respondent's home is their "usual residence." Nonresident children are biological or adopted children only.

Our independent variables are a series of measures of father involvement. In the ATUS, the original measures are a continuous number of minutes spent in each activity on the diary day. In the NSFG, the original measures are reports of how frequently each activity is conducted over a given period of time. For the purposes of this analysis, we have converted each outcome measure to a dichotomous variable. For ATUS data, these measures simply capture whether or not the activity was performed on the diary day. In the NSFG portion of the analysis, cut points in frequency were chosen to reflect a high degree of involvement. For most measures, the cut point identifies people who report doing the activity several times per week versus less frequently.

The measures that we use differ by the age of the children. We have made our measures as consistent as possible across the two surveys. For fathers with children from 0 to 4 years of age, we examine three measures of involvement in the ATUS (physical care, playing, and reading) and four in the NSFG (feeding, bathing/diapering/dressing, playing and reading). For fathers of older children, six measures are assessed in each survey: helping with homework,

talking to children, taking children to or from activities, sharing meals with children, attending school meetings, and attending religious services with children. For all fathers, we have included measures on spending time with children and going on an outing with children. See Appendix 1 for details on these measures.

In the ATUS, information on childcare activities is in two broad categories that cover "household children" and "non-household children" respectively. The respondent's specific relationship with the child in question is not asked, so some time included in these measures will be time spent caring for children other than the respondent's own children.

In order to compare fathers across the two surveys, we have included frequencies on a number of demographic and human capital characteristics of fathers as well as details on the sex, age, and residence of their children. We plan to draw on the detailed information in the NSFG to also provide information on fathers' relationship histories, especially the relationship between the children's parents at birth.

Methods

We begin our analysis by examining whether the two surveys seem to capture the same sample of fathers. As the NSFG went to much greater effort to identify all of men's children, we suspect that the fathers in the two surveys may differ in important ways. Our first step is to estimate the number of men in the American population with any co-resident children, only co-resident children, any non-resident children, only non-resident children, and both types of children. If the estimates are similar between surveys, then we will have some confidence that the samples of fathers are similar and the estimates of child involvement will be comparable.

Our second step is to compare the demographic, human capital, and child characteristics of each type of father. Again working on the assumption that the different techniques of the ATUS and the NSFG may produce samples that differ in important ways, we want to compare the ways in which men are distributed across these characteristics in the two surveys to assess the degree to which bias may be present in our analyses of father involvement. We use weighted means and frequencies to compare types of fathers between surveys.

The final step of our initial analysis looks at the measures of involvement. The measures of father involvement in the two surveys are exactly comparable, even when recalculated as dichotomous variables. Therefore, we analyze ratios of father involvement. These ratios compare the degree to which fathers with any non-resident children interact with their non-resident children to the amount of involvement that fathers with any resident children have with those resident children. These ratios provide an estimate of non-resident father involvement that is standardized within the survey in order to facilitate comparisons across surveys.

Future steps include a multivariate analysis that allows us to examine the ways in which non-resident father involvement varies across the demographic, human capital, and child characteristics outlined above.

Preliminary Results

Our initial results suggest that the ATUS does in fact underestimate the number of fathers in the population (Table 1). While the NSFG estimates that 49% of men aged 15-44 are fathers of children under the age of 19, the ATUS estimates that only 39% of men aged 15-44 are fathers of children under the age of 18. Estimates of fathers with household children are more similar, although the ATUS is still substantially lower. However, the most striking difference is between

the estimates of fathers with non-household children. The ATUS estimates that 3% of men have a nonresident child while the NSFG estimates that 12% of men have a nonresident child.

Table 2 displays the distribution of demographic, human capital, and child characteristics for different types of fathers across surveys. In general, the two surveys are fairly similar in the patterns of differences between co-resident and nonresident fathers. Both find that co-resident fathers are much more likely to be married, much more likely to be white, more highly educated, and more likely to work than are nonresident fathers. The distribution of age and sex of resident and nonresident children seems similar across surveys. However, there are some differences between the two surveys. Nonresident fathers are more likely to be married in NSFG than in ATUS, but resident fathers are more likely to be married in the ATUS. While the racial/ethnic distribution of co-resident fathers is similar across surveys, nonresident fathers are more likely to be Hispanic in the NSFG than the ATUS. In the ATUS, nonresident fathers are younger than co-resident fathers, but the opposite is true of the NSFG. In the ATUS, all sorts of fathers are more highly educated than in the NSFG. The human capital data available in the ATUS but not the NSFG suggests that fathers with resident children have substantially higher wages, work more hours per week, and are much more likely to be employed in management or the professions.

Together, Tables 1 and 2 suggest that while the ATUS is apparently missing some fathers – nonresident fathers in particular – the characteristics that we can compare across surveys are not especially different in the two surveys. This suggests that comparing nonresident father involvement across the two surveys will also be possible.

In Table 3, we begin to look at the levels of father involvement in the two surveys. For the ATUS, this table displays the proportion of fathers with co-resident children doing a variety of activities with those co-resident children on the diary day; the proportion of fathers with nonresident children doing the activities with those nonresident children on the diary day, and the ratio between those two groups. For the NSFG, the time frame is not the diary day, but varies by the activity. For most activities, the reported figure is the proportion of fathers who do the activity at least several times per week.

In most cases, the ratio of father involvement with nonresident children to involvement with co-resident children is lower in the ATUS than the NSFG. There are two exceptions: reading to children age 0-4 years old and going on outings with children of all ages. Reading to children is a highly socially desirable activity and subject to inflating in global activity estimates. We suspect that the reason the ratio is lower in the NSFG is because *resident* fathers overestimate how much they read to their children by a very wide margin. 56% of fathers with co-resident preschoolers say they read to those children several times per week, but the ATUS data finds that only about 9% of those fathers read to their children on any given day. The "outings" measure is perhaps a shaky indicator, as it is poorly defined in the NSFG questionnaire. However, it does not seem unlikely that nonresident fathers might spend a relatively high percentage of their time with their children going on some sort of outing.

Our original assumption about the ATUS data is that the relatively low numbers of nonresident fathers in the sample might indicate that the fathers included are biased towards those who are most likely to be highly involved with their children. However, our findings in Table 3 suggests that this concern is unfounded. In general, the ratio of nonresident to resident father involvement is higher in the NSFG.

Next Steps

There are several additions that we would like to make to this project before PAA. The first and most important is a multivariate analysis that compares the correlates of intensive nonresident father involvement across surveys. This will allow us to answer our third research question. We anticipate estimating logistic regression models with the involvement measures as the dependent variables. The demographic, human capital, and child characteristics described above will be the independent variables.

Another planned addition is the inclusion of the 2006-2008 NSFG data, which are scheduled to be released in 2009. Incorporating these data will provide a larger sample size and more power for our analyses. Furthermore, we would like to draw upon the rich relationship history in the NSFG to offer more insight into how parental relationships affect father involvement.

References

Amato, P. and F. Rivera (1999). "Paternal involvement and children's behavior problems." Journal of Marriage and the Family **61**(2): 375-384.

Amato, P. R. and J. G. Gilbreth (1999). "Nonresident Fathers and Children's Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis." Journal of Marriage & Family **61**(3): 557-573.

Argys, L., E. Peters, et al. (2007). Measuring Contact Between Children and Nonresident Fathers. Handbook of Measurement Issues in Family Research. S. Hofferth and L. Casper. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers**:** 375-398.

Carlson, M. J. and S. S. McLanahan (2002). Fragile Families, Father Involvement, and Public Policy. Handbook of Father Involvement: Multidisciplinary Perspectives. C. S. Tamis-Lemonda and N. Cabrera. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers**:** 461-488.

Furstenberg, F. F. (1988). Good Dads-Bad Dads: The Two Faces of Fatherhood. The Changing American Family and Public Policy. A. J. Cherlin. Washington, DC, The Urban Institute.

Groves, R. M., G. Benson, et al. (2005). Plan and Operation of Cycle 6 of the National Survey of Family Growth. Vital and Health Statistics 1(42). Hyattsville, MD, National Center for Health Statistics. **1**.

Hernandez, D. J. and P. D. Brandon (2002). Who are the fathers of today? Handbook of Father Involvement: Multidisciplinary Perspectives. C. S. Tamis-Lemonda and N. Cabrera. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers**:** 33-62.

Hofferth, S. L., N. Forry, et al. (2007). Child support, father-child contact, and preteens' involvement with nonresident fathers: Racial/ethnic differences. Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, New York, NY.

Hofferth, S. L., J. L. Stueve, et al. (2002). The Demography of Fathers: What Fathers Do. Handbook of Father Involvement: Multidisciplinary Perspectives. C. S. Tamis-Lemonda and N. Cabrera. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers**:** 63-90.

Jarrett, R. L., K. M. Roy, et al. (2002). Fathers in the "Hood": Insights from Qualitative Research on Low-Income African-American Men. Handbook of Father Involvement: Multidisciplinary Perspectives. C. S. Tamis-Lemonda and N. Cabrera. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers**:** 211-248.

Juby, H., J.-M. Billette, et al. (2007). "Nonresident Fathers and Children: Parents' New Unions and Frequency of Contact." Journal of Family Issues **28**(9): 1220-1245.

King, V. and H. E. Heard (1999). "Nonresident Father Visitation, Parental Conflict, and Mother's Satisfaction: What's Best for Child Well-Being?" Journal of Marriage & Family **61**(2): 385-396.

Lamb (2000). The History of Research on Father Involvement: An Overview. Fatherhood: Research, Interventions, and Policies. H. E. P. a. R. D. Day, Haworth Press**:** 23-42.

Landale, N. S. and R. S. Oropesa (2001). "Father Involvement in the Lives of Mainland Puerto Rican Children: Contributions of Nonresident, Cohabiting and Married Fathers." Social Forces **79**(3): 945-968.

Manning, W. D. and P. J. Smock (1999). "New Families and Nonresident Father-Child Visitation." Social Forces **78**(1): 87-117.

Manning, W. D. and P. J. Smock (2000). ""Swapping" families: Serial parenting and economic support for children." Journal of Marriage and the Family **62**(1): 111-122.

Marsiglio, W. and M. Cohan (2000). "Contextualizing Father Involvement and Paternal Influence: Sociological and Qualitative Themes." Marriage & Family Review **29**(2/3): 75.

Martinez GM, Chandra A, et al. (2006). Fertility, contraception, and fatherhood: Data on men and women from Cycle 6 (2002) of the National Survey of Family Growth. Vital Health Stat 23(26), National Center for Health Statistics.

McLanahan, S. and G. Sandefur (1994). Growing Up in a Single Parent Family. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Mosher, W. D. (2009). Supporting Statement B for Request for Clearance: The Continuous National Survey of Family Growth, 2009-2012., Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics**:** http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewDocument?ref_nbr=200904-0920-005.

Nelson, T. J., S. Clampet-Lundquist, et al. (2002). Sustaining fragile fatherhood: Father involvement among low-income, noncustodial African-American fathers in Philadelphia. Handbook of Father Involvement: Multidisciplinary Perspectives. C. S. Tamis-Lemonda and N. Cabrera. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers**:** 525-553.

Paul R. Amato, C. E. M. R. E. E. (2009). "Changes in Nonresident Father-Child Contact From 1976 to 2002." Family Relations **58**(1): 41-53.

Seltzer, J. A. (1991). "Relationships between Fathers and Children Who Live Apart: The Father's Role after Separation." Journal of Marriage & Family **53**(1): 79-101.

Seltzer, J. A. and S. M. Bianchi (1988). "Children's Contact with Absent Parents." Journal of Marriage & Family **50**(3): 663-677.

Stewart, S. D. (1999). "Disneyland Dads, Disneyland Moms?: How Nonresident Parents Spend Time With Absent Children." Journal of Family Issues 20(4): 539-556.

Wang, R. (2008). What Makes a Good Dad? Contexts, Measures, and Covariates of Paternal Care, University of Maryland.

Men, age 15-44
unweighted

	ATUS (2003-2008)			NSFG (2002)		
		% of men	% of fathers		% of men	% of fathers
Total men	19075			4928		
Fathers	9685	51%	100%	1764	36%	100%
Fathers w/hh kids	9387	49%	97%	1338	27%	76%
Fathers w/non-hh kids	487	3%	5%	629	13%	36%
Fathers with only HH kids	9198	48%	95%	1135	23%	64%
Fathers with only non-HH kids	298	2%	3%	426	9%	24%
Fathers with both HH and non-HH kids	189	1%	2%	203	4%	12%
				1764		

Men, age 15-44
weighted

Total men	61488			61147		
Fathers	23832	39%	100%	29869	49%	100%
Fathers w/hh kids	22777	37%	96%	25904	42%	87%
Fathers w/non-hh kids	1538	3%	6%	7405	12%	25%
Fathers with only HH kids	22293	36%	94%	22464	37%	75%
Fathers with only non-HH kids	1055	2%	4%	3965	6%	13%
Fathers with both HH and non-HH kids	483	1%	2%	3440	6%	12%
				29869		
	(Weighted N is in thousands and is nat'l estimate)			(Weighted N is in thousands and is nat'l estimate)		

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics
Age 15-44
Unweighted N's, Weighted Percents

	ATUS 2003-08									
	Fathers with ANY nonresident kids		Fathers with ANY resident kids		Fathers with ONLY nonresident kids		Fathers with BOTH nonresident and resident kids		Fathers with ONLY resident kids	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	487	100.0%	9387	100.0%	298	100.0%	189	100.0%	9198	100.0%
Characteristics of Fathers - Demographic										
Marital Status										
Married	171	31.6%	8389	89.7%	36	13.3%	135	71.8%	8254	90.1%
Cohabiting	54	13.1%	294	3.8%	28	11.6%	26	16.5%	268	3.5%
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	163	30.0%	508	3.7%	144	41.3%	19	5.3%	489	3.7%
Never Married	99	25.3%	196	2.8%	90	33.9%	9	6.5%	187	2.7%
Race/Ethnicity										
White	285	54.3%	6793	63.8%	168	55.2%	117	52.6%	6676	64.0%
Black	112	25.5%	567	8.7%	70	23.6%	42	29.6%	525	8.2%
Hispanic	75	16.9%	1482	22.0%	52	18.0%	23	14.4%	1459	22.2%
Other	15	3.3%	545	5.6%	8	3.2%	7	3.5%	538	5.6%
Age (mean)	34.2		35		34		36		35	
Age-categories										
15-24	29	9.4%	301	5.5%	24	12.1%	5	3.6%	296	5.5%
25-29	58	15.5%	1072	15.0%	42	17.4%	16	11.4%	1056	15.1%
30-34	121	24.3%	2133	22.4%	72	22.7%	49	27.8%	2084	22.3%
35-39	145	28.8%	2921	28.5%	79	26.9%	66	33.0%	2855	28.4%
40-44	134	21.9%	2960	28.7%	81	20.9%	53	24.2%	2907	28.8%

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics
Age 15-44
Unweighted N's, Weighted Percents

	ATUS 2003-08									
	Fathers with ANY nonresident kids		Fathers with ANY resident kids		Fathers with ONLY nonresident kids		Fathers with BOTH nonresident and resident kids		Fathers with ONLY resident kids	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Characteristics of Fathers - Human Capital										
Education										
<HS	66	16.4%	982	15.3%	45	17.5%	21	13.8%	961	15.3%
HS	218	51.8%	2530	31.3%	123	49.4%	95	57.0%	2435	30.7%
Some College	136	21.0%	2550	24.4%	82	20.6%	54	22.1%	2496	24.4%
BA+	67	10.9%	3325	29.1%	48	12.5%	19	7.2%	3306	29.6%
Employment Status 2.0										
Employed	427	86.1%	8755	92.4%	159	85.7%	168	87.0%	8587	92.5%
Fulltime	404	81.8%	8413	88.0%	247	82.5%	157	80.2%	8256	88.1%
Parttime	23	4.3%	342	4.5%	12	3.2%	11	6.8%	331	4.4%
Not employed	60	13.9%	632	7.6%	39	14.3%	21	13.0%	611	7.5%
Usual Hours Worked per Week (mean)	44.45		46		44		45		46	
Weekly Earnings (mean)	755.266		972		751		765		977	
Occupation										
Management, business, and financial occupations	61	14.8%	1688	27.1%	26	9.3%	25	19.2%	1663	25.9%
Professional and related occupations	46	11.2%	1748	28.1%	32	11.4%	14	10.7%	1734	27.1%
Service occupations	63	15.3%	875	14.0%	37	13.2%	26	19.9%	849	13.2%
Sales and related occupations	32	7.8%	831	13.3%	21	7.5%	11	8.4%	820	12.8%
Office and administrative support occupations	30	7.3%	448	7.2%	23	8.2%	7	5.4%	441	6.9%
Farming, fishing and forestry occupations	3	0.7%	86	1.4%	1	0.4%	2	1.5%	84	1.3%
Construction and extraction occupations	60	14.6%	989	15.9%	41	14.6%	19	14.6%	970	15.1%
Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations	38	9.2%	616	9.9%	20	7.1%	18	13.8%	598	9.3%
Production occupations	42	10.2%	802	12.9%	22	7.8%	20	15.3%	782	12.2%
Transportation and material moving occupations	62	15.1%	672	10.8%	36	12.8%	26	19.9%	646	10.1%

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics
Age 15-44
Unweighted N's, Weighted Percents

	ATUS 2003-08									
	Fathers with ANY nonresident kids		Fathers with ANY resident kids		Fathers with ONLY nonresident kids		Fathers with BOTH nonresident and resident kids		Fathers with ONLY resident kids	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Characteristics of Children										
Number of children										
Number of resident children (mean)	0.59		2		-		2		2	
Number of nonresident children (mean)	1.505		0		2		1		-	
Gender composition										
Any resident daughters	117	20.0%	6506	69.6%	-	-	117	63.5%	6389	69.7%
Any resident sons	131	22.7%	6659	70.8%	-	-	131	72.2%	6528	70.8%
Any nonresident daughters	283	57.8%	103	1.3%	180	56.3%	103	60.9%	-	-
Any nonresident sons	292	59.8%	107	1.1%	185	62.6%	107	53.8%	-	-
Age										
Any resident preschoolers (0-4)	97	16.6%	5085	55.3%	-	-	97	52.8%	4988	55.4%
Any resident school-aged children (5-18)	135	22.7%	6782	70.7%	-	-	135	72.4%	6650	70.6%
Any nonresident preschoolers (0-4)	101	25.3%	19	0.2%	82	32.8%	19	8.9%	-	-
Any nonresident school-aged children (5-18)	428	84.6%	180	2.0%	248	79.3%	180	96.0%	-	-

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics
Age 15-44
Unweighted N's, Weighted Percents

	NSFG 2002									
	Fathers with ANY nonresident kids		Fathers with ANY resident kids		Fathers with ONLY nonresident kids		Fathers with BOTH nonresident and resident kids		Fathers with ONLY resident kids	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	629	100.0%	1338	100.0%	426	100.0%	203	100.0%	1135	100.0%
Characteristics of Fathers - Demographic										
Marital Status										
Married	*192*	44.4%	*884*	76.2%	*84*	30.7%	*108*	60.2%	*776*	78.6%
Cohabiting	*80*	16.5%	*192*	12.2%	*33*	10.3%	*47*	23.5%	*145*	10.5%
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	*209*	25.2%	*118*	6.2%	*181*	37.3%	*28*	11.2%	*90*	5.5%
Never Married	*148*	14.0%	*144*	5.4%	*128*	21.7%	*20*	5.2%	*124*	5.5%
Race/Ethnicity										
White	208	44.4%	605	64.3%	148	48.1%	60	40.2%	545	68.0%
Black	205	23.8%	246	10.9%	141	21.6%	64	26.3%	182	8.5%
Hispanic	188	25.6%	429	19.2%	118	25.8%	70	25.4%	359	18.3%
Other	28	6.1%	58	5.7%	19	4.5%	9	8.0%	49	5.3%
Age (mean)	35.1		34.5		34.8		35.5		34.4	
Age-categories										
15-24	71	8.5%	169	7.7%	54	10.7%	17	5.9%	152	7.9%
25-29	91	12.5%	231	15.2%	62	14.4%	29	10.4%	202	16.0%
30-34	124	17.4%	316	23.2%	81	17.0%	43	17.9%	273	24.0%
35-39	167	29.7%	349	26.6%	102	24.8%	65	35.3%	284	25.3%
40-44	176	32.0%	273	27.3%	127	33.2%	49	30.6%	224	26.8%

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics
Age 15-44
Unweighted N's, Weighted Percents

	NSFG 2002									
	Fathers with ANY nonresident kids		Fathers with ANY resident kids		Fathers with ONLY nonresident kids		Fathers with BOTH nonresident and resident kids		Fathers with ONLY resident kids	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Characteristics of Fathers - Human Capital										
Education										
<HS	154	23.2%	297	17.5%	98	21.0%	56	25.8%	241	16.2%
HS	279	42.1%	512	38.7%	188	41.2%	91	43.1%	421	38.0%
Some College	141	23.8%	299	23.7%	97	23.2%	44	24.6%	255	23.6%
BA+	55	10.8%	230	20.1%	43	14.6%	12	6.5%	218	22.2%
Employment Status 2.0										
Employed	521	83.3%	1185	90.2%	347	80.3%	174	86.7%	1011	90.7%
Fulltime	461	73.2%	1077	81.8%	300	69.3%	161	77.7%	916	82.4%
Parttime	60	10.1%	108	8.4%	47	11.0%	13	9.0%	95	8.3%
Not employed	108	16.7%	153	9.8%	79	19.7%	29	13.3%	124	9.3%
Usual Hours Worked per Week (mean)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Weekly Earnings (mean)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Occupation										
Management, business, and financial occupations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional and related occupations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Service occupations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sales and related occupations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Office and administrative support occupations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Farming, fishing and forestry occupations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Construction and extraction occupations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Production occupations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transportation and material moving occupations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics
Age 15-44
Unweighted N's, Weighted Percents

	NSFG 2002									
	Fathers with ANY nonresident kids		Fathers with ANY resident kids		Fathers with ONLY nonresident kids		Fathers with BOTH nonresident and resident kids		Fathers with ONLY resident kids	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Characteristics of Children										
Number of children										
Number of resident children (mean)	1.0		2.0		0.0		2.1		2.0	
Number of nonresident children (mean)	1.6		0.2		1.6		1.6		0.0	
Gender composition										
Any resident daughters	132	32.4%	889	68.3%	-	-	132	69.7%	757	68.1%
Any resident sons	140	31.5%	940	73.0%	-	-	140	67.9%	800	73.8%
Any nonresident daughters	394	59.6%	129	8.3%	265	57.2%	129	62.3%	-	-
Any nonresident sons	399	65.0%	119	8.3%	280	67.1%	119	62.5%	-	-
Age										
Any resident preschoolers (0-4)	107	24.4%	754	54.0%	-	-	107	52.6%	647	54.3%
Any resident school-aged children (5-18)	152	36.0%	908	70.5%	-	-	152	77.5%	756	69.4%
Any nonresident preschoolers (0-4)	197	26.2%	49	2.4%	148	33.0%	49	18.3%	-	-
Any nonresident school-aged children (5-18)	504	84.7%	176	12.2%	328	78.5%	176	91.9%	-	-

Table 3. Within-Survey Ratios of Father Involvement
Age 15-44

	ATUS 2003-08			NSFG 2002		
	A	B	C	A	B	C
Activity	Proportion doing activity with resident kids (of dads with any resident kids in the appropriate age group)	Proportion doing activity with nonresident kids (of dads with any nonresident kids in the appropriate age group)	B / A	Proportion doing activity with resident kids (of dads with any resident kids in the appropriate age group)	Proportion doing activity with nonresident kids (of dads with any nonresident kids in the appropriate age group)	B / A
0-4 year olds						
physical care	50.45	6.45	0.13	-	-	-
feed/eat meals[1]	-	-	-	95.3	27.2	0.28
bathe/diaper/dress[1]	-	-	-	82.3	26.0	0.32
play[1]	28.65	7.47	0.26	97.7	34.0	0.35
read[1]	8.79	4.41	0.50	56.3	17.1	0.30
5-17/18 year olds						
help with homework[1]	8.88	0.24	0.03	57.6	8.2	0.14
talk to[1]	5.76	1.17	0.20	87.3	26.4	0.30
take to/from activities[1]	22.15	1.24	0.06	53.7	6.9	0.13
share meals with[1]	67.35	10.77	0.16	94.5	18.5	0.20
school meetings[2]	0.84	0.00	0.00	64.0	31.8	0.50
attend religious services[3]	3.48	0.29	0.08	29.0	4.3	0.15
all kids 0-17/18						
spend time with[4]	89.61	19.63	0.22	100.0	25.7	0.26
go on an outing[3]	2.30	2.26	0.98	35.4	12.0	0.34

[1] For ATUS figures, estimates indicate the percent reporting the given activity on the diary day. For NSFG figures, estimates indicate the percent reporting the given activity several times a week or more in the past 4 weeks.
[2] For ATUS figures, estimates indicate the percent reporting the given activity on the diary day. For NSFG figures, estimates indicate the percent reporting the given activity at all in the last 12 months.
[3] For ATUS figures, estimates indicate the percent reporting the given activity on the diary day. For NSFG figures, estimates indicate the percent reporting the given activity about once a week or more in the last 12 months.
[4] For ATUS figures, estimates indicate the percent reporting the given activity on the diary day. For NSFG figures, estimates indicate the percent reporting seeing or having a visit with nonresident children several times a week or more in the last 12 months. Resident fathers are assumed to have all seen or had a visit with their resident children several times a week or more in the last 12 months.

Table 3. Within-Survey Ratios of Father Involvement
Age 15-44
N's for reference (unweighted): N (N missing)[5]

	ATUS 2003-08		NSFG 2002	
	A	B	A	B
Activity	# of dads with any resident kids	# of dads with any nonresident kids	# of dads with any resident kids	# of dads with any nonresident kids
0-4 year olds				
physical care	5085	101	-	-
feed/eat meals[1]	-	-	753 (1)	169 (28)
bathe/diaper/dress[1]	-	-	753 (1)	169 (28)
play[1]	5085	101	753 (1)	169 (28)
read[1]	5085	101	753 (1)	170 (27)
5-17/18 year olds				
help with homework[1]	6785	428	906 (2)	498 (6)
talk to[1]	6785	428	907 (1)	498 (6)
take to/from activities[1]	6785	428	907 (1)	498 (6)
share meals with[1]	6785	428	907 (1)	498 (6)
school meetings[2]	6785	428	907 (1)	385 (119)
attend religious services[3]	6785	428	906 (2)	493 (11)
all kids 0-17/18				
spend time with[4]	9387	487		626 (3)
go on an outing[3]	9387	487	1338 (0)	497 (132)

[5] The ATUS does not have missing activity data.

Appendix 1 - Father Involvement Measures

ATUS

Measure	***Description***
Fathers of 0-4 year olds	
physical care	Respondent spent at least one minute on the diary day taking physical care of household or non-household children. Children are distinguished by residence but not by age or relationship to the respondent.
play	Respondent spent at least one minute on the diary day playing with household or non-household children. Children are distinguished by residence but not by age or relationship to the respondent.
read	Respondent spent at least one minute on the diary day reading to or with household or non-household children. Children are distinguished by residence, but not by age or relationship to the respondent.
Fathers of 5-17 year olds	
help with homework	Respondent spent at least one minute on the diary day helping household or non-household children with homework. Children are distinguished by residence but not by age or relationship to the respondent.
talk to	Respondent spent at least one minute on the diary day talking to or listening to household or non-household children. Children are distinguished by residence but not by age or relationship to the respondent.
take to/from activities	household or non-household children. Children are distinguished by residence but not by age or relationship to the respondent.
share meals with	Respondent spent at least one minute on the diary day eating with household or non-household own children between the ages of 5 and 17. Children are distinguished by residence, age, and relationship to the respondent.
school meetings	Respondent spent at least one minute on the diary day attending school meetings related to a household or non-household child's education. Children are distinguished by residence but not by age or relationship to the respondent.
attend religious services	Respondent spent at least one minute on the diary day attending religious services with a household or non-household own child between the ages of 5 and 17. Children are distinguished by residence, age, and relationship to the respondent.
Fathers of kids 0-17	
spend time with	Respondent spent at least one minute on the diary day with a household or non-household own child between the ages of 0 and 17. Children are distinguished by residence, age, and relationship to the respondent.
go on an outing	Respondent spent at least one minute on the diary day going on an outing (including performing arts events, museums, zoos, movies, or watching sporting events) with a household or non-household child between the ages of 0 and 17. Children are distinguished by residence, age, and relationship to the respondent.

Appendix 1 - Father Involvement Measures

NSFG

Measure	***Description***
Fathers of 0-4 year olds	
feed/eat meals	The respondent reports feeding or eating with resident or non-resident children at least several times per week during the past four weeks.
bathe/diaper/dress	The respondent reports bathing, diapering, or dressing resident or non-resident children at least several times per week during the past four weeks.
play	The respondent reports playing with resident or non-resident children at least several times per week during the past four weeks.
read	The respondent reports reading to resident or non-resident children at least several times per week during the past four weeks.
Fathers of 5-18 year olds	
help with homework	The respondent reports helping resident or non-resident children with homework at least several times per week during the past four weeks.
talk to	The respondent reports talking to resident or non-resident children at least several times per week during the past four weeks.
take to/from activities	The respondent reports taking resident or non-resident children to or from activities at least several times per week during the past four weeks.
share meals with	The respondent reports sharing meals with resident or non-resident children to or from activities at least several times per week during the past four weeks.
school meetings	The respondent reports attending a school meeting on behalf of a resident or non-resident child at some point during the past 12 months.
attend religious services	The respondent reports attending religious services with a resident or non-resident child about once a week during the last 12 months.
Fathers of kids 0-18	
spend time with	Fathers with non-resident children report seeing or having a visit with nonresident children several times a week or more in the last 12 months. Resident fathers are assumed to have all seen or had a visit with their resident children several times a week or more in the last 12 months.
go on an outing	The respondent reports going on an outing with a resident or nonresident child about once a week during the last 12 months.