Published in final edited form as:

J Fam Issues. 2010 January ; 31(1): 113–130. doi:10.1177/0192513X09341446.

Fatherhood and Men's Lives at Middle Age

David J. Eggebeen,

Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Penn State University

Jeffrey Dew, and

Department of Sociology, University of Virginia

Chris Knoester

Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University

Abstract

This paper uses data on 2,024 men who were followed through the third wave of the National Survey of Families and Households to examine the implications of fatherhood experiences for men's involvement in altruistic social activities at middle age. We find that middle-aged men (ages 45–65) who at some point in their lives become fathers are significantly more likely to have altruistically oriented social relationships and be involved in service organizations compared to men who have never become fathers. Furthermore, it appears that the defining aspect of the effect of fatherhood is the level of engagement with children while they are growing up. Neither current residential status nor whether current non-residence occurs because of nest leaving is found to distinguish men's altruistic ties.

Keywords

Fathers; Men; Middle Age

Declines in the number children born to parents, shifts in the timing and tempo of childbearing, increases in non-marital childbearing and high rates of divorce have substantially altered the practice, meaning, and significance of fatherhood in men's life course (Eggebeen, 2002). These changes have meant that a growing number of men now live out their lives with little or now interaction with children (Blankenhorn, 1995; Hofferth, Pleck, Steueve, Bianchi, & Sayer, 2002). On the other hand, the rise of the "new fatherhood" suggests that for other men, fatherhood is more than breadwinning, as they have become markedly engaged in raising and nurturing their children (Palkowitz, 2002). In the midst of these changes, attitude surveys continue to show that parenthood remains an important aspiration for young men (Thornton, 1989; Thornton & Young- DeMarco, 2001).

**Please direct all correspondence to: David Eggebeen, 103 White Building, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802. (e5x@psu.edu), Ph: 814-865-2655, Fax: 814-865-4470.

A previous version of this paper was presented at the 58th annual meeting of the Gerontological Society of America, November, 2005, Orlando, FL

Despite these transformations, we know surprisingly little about the long-term or cumulative outcomes of fathering for men. Significantly more attention has been paid to the developmental and socializing influences of marriage and divorce (Nock, 1998; Waite, 1995; Waite & Gallagher, 2000), work and careers (Schooler & Mulatu, 2004), community involvement (Voydanoff, 2004), or social networks (Antonucci, Landsford, Akiyama, Smith, Baltes, Takahashi, Fuhrer, & Dartigues, 2002) on men. Where the effects of fatherhood have been the focus, much of the attention has been on either the changes that accompany the transition to fatherhood or the effects of fatherhood where children are co-resident (Knoester, Petts, & Eggebeen, 2007; Palkovitz, 2002).

This paper examines the cumulative effects of fatherhood on men's altruistic social ties at middle age, measured in this study as ages 45 to 65. Drawing on social development and role theory, we expect to find that middle-aged men who are fathers are likely to exhibit distinct social and community ties. Specifically, we anticipate fathers to be more involved in what we call altruistic social ties--service-oriented groups and the provision of support to extended family members and friends. To test these ideas, we contrast the involvement in altruistic social relationships of men at middle age by various indicators of father status using data drawn from the newly released third wave of the National Survey of Families and Households. We focus on three questions: (1) Do men who have become fathers by middle age differ in their altruistic ties from men who have not become fathers? (2) Do men who are residential fathers differ from men who are non-residential fathers in their social altruistic relationships? Relatedly, do non-residential fathers because of nest leaving differ from other types of non-residential fathers in their altruistic social ties? And (3) do fathers' levels of engagement with their children while they are growing up predict fathers' social activities at middle age?

Background

Life span developmental theory and role theory offer two perspectives on how fatherhood might be related to involvement in altruistically oriented groups and social relationships. Developmental theorists have long asserted that the relationship between parents and children is characterized by mutual influences (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Erikson, 1963). While much attention over the years has been given to the effect parents have on children, a few scholars have recently explored the effect of children on adults, suggesting they present important developmental challenges that can lead to substantial changes in adults (Palkovitz, 1996; 2002; Snarey, 1993). In particular, it is argued, the experience of fatherhood may have a transforming effect on men (Hawkins & Dollahite, 1997; Marsiglio, 1998; Palkovitz; Snarey). Snarey (1993), building on the work of Erik Erickson (1982) emphasized the potentially generative nature of fathering activities. Men, out of strong desire to meet the needs of their children, become generative. That is, they begin to reevaluate their priorities, becoming more caring human beings, more concerned about future generations, and more active in their communities (Hawkins & Dollahite, 1997; Marsiglio; Parke, 1996; Palkovitz; Snarey). For our purposes in this paper, becoming a father leads men to, among other things, change their social relationships to include more time spent in altruistically oriented activities—helping people or being involved in service oriented or social change oriented organizations.

A sociological perspective begins with the notion that parenthood is a role or a set of roles that are more institutionalized for fathers who reside with a child of their own (Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001). Men frequently assume fathering roles after the arrival of a child because the status of father carries with it certain culturally prescribed behavioral requirements, such as providing emotional and physical care and financial support for children (Doherty, Kouneski, & Erickson, 1998). Men behave differently, then, because they perceive—or are brought to the realization by partners, parents, friends, and their communities—that there are new expectations for how they should behave. In fact, there may be sanctions for failing to live up to these expectations, as well as rewards for appropriate fathering behaviors (Blankenhorn, 1995; Fox & Bruce, 2001). When men become fathers, then, they begin to enact a variety of roles that are consistent with this status. An important part of these enactments is to shift their time to social relationships and involvement in institutions that are expected of fathers. However, this may be most likely to occur if men are resident versus nonresident fathers because of the structural barriers in place for engaged nonresident fathering and the absence of clear and consistent expectations for how fathers should be involved in the lives of their nonresident children.

The consequences of fatherhood for men's lives may be rooted in developmental changes or a product of role enactments, but it is possible that a critical intervening factor in whether and how fatherhood affects men is the level of involvement and especially engagement of fathers in the lives of their children. Father involvement is not a theoretical explanation in the same way that developmental changes or role acquisitions are possible reasons for why fatherhood might change men. Father involvement is perhaps best viewed as a possible mechanism that links fathering experiences to developmental changes and the salience of the fathering roles in men's lives. Men who spend time with their children engaged in what fathers do with children: playing, helping, correcting, nurturing, listening, monitoring, planning, etc. may be more likely to become generative and commit to altruistic social activities that are designed to benefit children (Knoester, Petts, & Eggebeen, 2007; Palkovitz, 2002). That is, men who are more involved and engaged fathers are expected to be more likely to be affected by fatherhood.

All of these perspectives would predict that fatherhood would bring about changes in men's altruistically oriented social ties. Fatherhood—by its normative obligations and because of potential changes in men's priorities, commitments, sense of caring, and involvement with children—can lead men to shift the weight of their social relationships toward family and kin. Indeed, there is consistent evidence that parenthood strengthens intergenerational ties for both men and women (Eggebeen & Hogan, 1990; Hogan, Eggebeen, & Clogg, 1993). Routine exchanges of support between adult children and their aging parents are most typical when adult children are parents. Fatherhood may also prompt men to alter other social ties. There is evidence that fathers spend less time with friends and associates and more time in social relationships linked with their children (Secombe & Ishii-Kuntz, 1994; Snarey, 1993).

Both of these theoretical perspectives also would predict that fathers have higher levels of civic engagement. Men, out of a desire to do what is best for their children or because being involved is what is expected of fathers, are more likely to invest time and energy in

organizations or community groups that have a service mission. Most typically, this involvement is in organizations that directly benefit children—scouts, sports groups such as Little League or soccer, music or theater groups, school organizations such as PTA, church related organizations or institutions such as Sunday school or youth groups, etc. Indeed, there is evidence that father's involvement in community service organizations is higher than that of non-fathers (Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001).

These perspectives would differ, however, on what happens to men's social relationships and community ties when men become non-resident fathers. One implication of the developmental perspective is that the largest differences in behaviors should be between having and not having children—and not between the various experiences of fatherhood such as step or non-residential. In other words, once men have experienced the challenges and opportunities that fatherhood provides, they are changed men—different in ways that carry forward even after their fathering experiences have attenuated or ended. Caring for children sparks the kind of generative behavior that is reflected in other dimensions of men's lives and over their life course. If this is the case, we would expect to find that men who at some point in their lives were fathers, regardless of whether they are currently coresident fathers, would be different from men who never became fathers.

In contrast, the role occupancy perspective, when applied to family structure arrangements, suggests that fatherhood will have its most profound effect on men who live with their children. The idea is that fatherhood affects men primarily when its roles are clearly occupied. In situations where role uncertainty may exist, or there are structural challenges to embracing fathering roles—such as in step or nonresident fatherhood—the salience of fatherhood roles may be diminished. Subsequently, the experiences of fatherhood may have a smaller effect on men's lives in these situations. Non-resident fathers, then, may be indistinguishable in their social lives from non-fathers.

Not all non-resident fathers are alike, however. One important difference that may have implications for the decline in the effect of fatherhood on men's altruistic social ties is whether they become non-resident fathers because of nest leaving or because of union dissolution. Becoming an “empty-nester” because the last of his children made the transition to adulthood is a culturally prescribed event, and one that potentially connotes more of a change in fatherhood responsibilities than a release from them. This is not to say that expectations about being a father to adult children are as clear as for fathers of younger children. There is considerable variation across families in the extent to which fathers offer advice or specific advice, ask or demand, and give economic support. Whatever the nature of the fathering that goes on, however, this type of non-resident father role tends to be viewed in a positive fashion. In contrast, there can be considerably more uncertainty surrounding the role of father for those men who are not living with their children because of a failed relationship with the child's mother. Far from being honorific, as is the case of nest-leaving non-resident fathers, these types of fathers may experience less acceptance or outright rejection from others. Given these observations, we expect nest-leaving non-resident fathers to appear more similar to residential fathers in their altruistic social ties.

The level of father involvement and especially engagement in the lives of their children may be a key intervening factor. The nature of a father's interactions with his children may predict or moderate the effect of either the developmental course of fatherhood, or the role behavior, on men's lives (Knoester, Petts, & Eggebeen, 2007; Palkovitz, 2002). In other words, co-residence with children may have minimal effect on men who spend little time with their children. Conversely, the lives of non-resident fathers who are heavily engaged and invested in their children may be clearly marked by these fathering experiences. The available evidence for some of these considerations is mixed, with earlier work showing strong support for the role-occupancy perspective. For example, analysis of cross-sectional data from the National Survey of Families and Households showed significant differences between coresident fathers and other types of fathers or non-fathers in social relationships and community ties (Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001). However, analyses of longitudinal data from the two panels of the NSFH and from the Fragile Family data suggest all three processes are in play (Knoester & Eggebeen, 2006; Knoester, Petts & Eggebeen, 2007). Perhaps this is not unexpected, as it is plausible that these processes are complementary rather than distinct pathways.

The purpose of this study is to revisit these issues by examining the consequences of fatherhood for a different stage in the life course—middle age, with new data. By focusing on middle-aged men, we are able to shed light on the cumulative effects of choices surrounding fatherhood. Do the effects of becoming a father on men's altruistic social relationships remain as children, and men, age? Do they depend on a father's engagement with his children? What happens to altruistic commitments when men transition from being resident fathers to being non-resident fathers? Does it matter whether this "exit" is normative—that it happens because children leave the home as part of their transition to adulthood (e.g., nest leaving), or from some other social process (e.g., divorce)? Does the level of engagement of fathers with their children moderate the effects of residence or the type of nest leaving on men's social lives? To address these questions, we take advantage of the newly released third wave of the National Survey of Families and Households. These data allow a more careful examination of cumulative effects of fatherhood choices than has been possible in the past.

Analytic Strategy and Hypotheses

To consider the usefulness of theoretical perspectives that emphasize distinctions between being a father versus not being a father, being a resident versus a nonresident father, and being an engaged versus a less engaged father, we perform three sets of ordinary least-squares regression analyses that are designed to address our research questions. First, we focus on whether or not being a father predicts the altruistic social activities that men are involved in. A developmental perspective on fatherhood suggests that fatherhood transforms men's lives such that they are more likely to be involved in altruistic social ties than men who are not fathers.

Second, we shift our analysis to men who are fathers and examine whether being a resident father versus a nonresident father predicts men's altruistic social activities. We also consider whether father engagement predicts men's altruistic social ties and whether it moderates the

association between resident status and altruistic social activities. A role occupancy perspective that focuses on family structure suggests that resident fathers are more likely to be involved in altruistic social activities than are nonresident fathers. A developmental perspective that emphasizes the importance of father engagement predicts that fathers who are more engaged with their children while they are growing up are more likely to participate in altruistic social activities and have altruistically oriented social ties than fathers who are less involved. Because father engagement may condition the relationship between resident status and altruistic social activities, we also explore whether father engagement is more likely to lead men to be more involved in altruistic social activities if they are a resident or nonresident father.

Finally, we restrict our analysis to nonresident middle-age fathers and consider whether being a nonresident father because of nest leaving versus because of other reasons is associated with participation in altruistic social activities and relationships. In this analysis, we also maintain our focus on father engagement. A role occupancy perspective that focuses on family structure suggests that becoming a nonresident father because of nest-leaving, because it is a culturally prescribed event and is less likely to be associated with diminished or absent parenting responsibilities, is more likely to lead fathers to participate in altruistically oriented social activities and relationships than when they become a nonresident father for other reasons. A developmental perspective that focuses on father engagement suggests that nonresident fathers who were more engaged with their children while growing up are more likely to be involved in altruistic social activities and relationships. Because father engagement may condition the relationship between reasons for nonresident status and social activities, we also explore whether father engagement is more likely to lead men to be more involved in altruistic social activities if they are a nonresident father because of nest-leaving or a nonresident father because of other reasons.

Data and Methods

Data

The third wave of the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), collected in 2001–2003, is a subset of the original main respondents from wave 1. Wave 1 consists of interviews with 13,007 main respondents from a random national sample of households. The wave 3 sample consists of wave 1 main respondents who had a focal child eligible for an NSFH3 interview in addition to those original main respondents who were ages 45 and older by January 1, 2001.

The overall response rate of eligible wave 1 main respondents was 63%, leaving a sample of 8,990 main respondents at wave 3 (Wright, 2003). From this file, we drew out all men aged 45–65 that, after a small number of deletions because of missing data, left us with an analytical sample of 2,024 respondents. Missingness varied from 0 – 6.7%. Most variables have no missing data or less than 1% missing. Missing data was imputed using maximum likelihood estimation. Fatherhood status variables are not imputed.

Independent variables

The key independent variables are the measures of fatherhood status and father engagement. We focus on three indicators of fatherhood status: 1) Whether a man ever reported becoming a father (either biological, adoptive or step); 2) whether men who are fathers are currently coresident with at least one of their children of any age; and 3) whether men are only non-resident fathers. We further distinguish between two types of non-resident fatherhood. Nest leaving fathers are those fathers with no resident children and whose non-resident children all moved out of the home because they were transitioning into adulthood (e.g., attending college, moving into their own living arrangements, etc.). All other non-resident fathers have at least one child living elsewhere because of divorce or non-marital childbearing.

Figure one contains a graphical illustration of the paths to each indicator of father status, along with the sample sizes of each state. Clearly, at middle age, the overwhelming experience of men is having become a father. However, it is also the case that by middle age most of these men are non-residential fathers, with the majority of those having experienced nest-leaving.

Table one displays the demographic characteristics of the four groups of men. Residential fathers tend to be the youngest, while fathers of grown children are the oldest. There are large differences among the four groups in the proportion currently married. Less than half of the non-fathers are married, compared to 90 percent of the residential fathers. Nearly three quarters of the residential fathers are working full time, while the remaining three groups of men are roughly similar at 54 to 59 percent. This pattern of employment is reflected in the median household incomes of each group. Residential fathers have significantly higher household income than the remaining three groups, which are not significantly different from each other.

One concern is that fatherhood is selective on characteristics that are associated with men's social lives. It is possible, in other words, that men who become fathers are better adjusted or are better at negotiating relationships and these factors, rather than any experiences with raising children, may account for group differences in social activities. To test these ideas we looked at self esteem and marital satisfaction of these men at Wave one when they were approximately 31–51 years of age. We found no significant differences among the groups on self esteem at wave 1. We did find statistically significant differences in marital satisfaction among those men married at wave one—but not in the direction we would have anticipated by a selection argument. Men who remained non-fathers at wave 3 rated their marriages at wave one as more satisfying than the men in the other three groups. These findings suggest that men who become fathers may not be as selectively different from men who never become fathers in their self-esteem and ability at nurturing quality relationships as one might expect.

Our measure of father engagement is drawn from a series of questions that asks fathers about the frequency that they spend time with their all their children (not just the NSFH focal child) engaged in certain activities. These activities include recreational activities, helping with homework, and working on a project together. These variables were summed together (Chronbach's $\alpha = .71$ for residential fathers, $.65$ for nonresidential fathers). This

measure was taken from Wave 1 of the NSFH unless men were not fathers at Wave 1. In cases where the transition to fatherhood occurred between Waves 1 and 2, the father engagement data was taken from Wave 2.

It must be acknowledged that our measurement of fatherhood does not fully capture the complexity of father involvement and father residency with children. By focusing on a “snapshot” of father statuses at middle age or father engagement at an earlier time point, we miss the dynamic, unfolding nature of fathering experiences. Our measures of father engagement fails to capture the multidimensional and changing nature of fathering as men move into and out of relationships, as additional children may or may not arrive, and as children themselves develop and change. This attempt, then, represents a first approximation at assessing the relevance of fatherhood status and engagement for men’s altruistic social activities at middle age.

Respondent age (45–66), race (White, Black, Hispanic, other), level of education (Years of completed education, mean=14.14), total household income (median=\$73,700), current marital status (Married, not currently married), and number of times married are also included in our models as controls.

Dependent variables

Two variables measure men’s involvement in altruistically oriented social activities. Service Group Involvement is the amount of time the respondent spends with groups that have a service mission (e.g., service clubs, fraternal orders, church-related organizations, political or interest groups). This scale has a range of 0–8, mean of 1.47, standard deviation: 1.55. A second variable measures supportive ties between the respondent and extended family and friends. Assistance Given is composed of a series of questions asking respondents whether in the past month they gave help with household chores, transportation, or babysitting; or gave social and emotional support to their parents, siblings, other relatives, or friends. This scale has a range of 0–13, with a sample mean of 3.14 and a standard deviation of 2.31

Results

Fathers versus non-fathers

Table 2 contains OLS estimates of the association between father status and the two indicators of altruistic ties. There is clear evidence that father status matters for altruistic social ties as they are significantly more likely than non-fathers to be involved in service oriented groups and are much more likely to give assistance to others. However, it should also be noted that the overall explanatory power of these models is modest. This is also true of the models estimated in tables 3 and 4. Nevertheless, fatherhood, relative to other demographic characteristics, does make an independent contribution to the likelihood of participating in altruistic social activities. It is positively associated with involvement in both service groups ($b = .41, p < .01$) and giving assistance to extended family and friends ($b = .35, p < .001$).

Residential fathers versus non-residential fathers

The results displayed in Table 3 are from our analysis that is limited to men who have become fathers at some point in their lives. In these models, we consider the effects of current residential versus non-residential fatherhood on altruistic social ties. Included in these models is a measure of father engagement drawn from wave 1. We also estimate models that contain an interaction term of father engagement multiplied by residential status.

We find that residential status is not related to either of the measures of altruistic social ties in the additive models (i.e., first columns) of Table 3. Yet, father engagement is positively associated with both service group involvement ($b = .10, p < .01$) and assistance given to extended family and friends ($b = .12, p < .001$). In addition, there is a significant interaction between father engagement and residential status for assistance given. The interaction effect suggests that father engagement is much more positively associated with assistance given among nonresidential fathers than among residential fathers.

Nest-leavers versus other types of non-residential fathers

The models displayed in Table 4 are limited to non-resident fathers and address the question of whether the pathway to non-resident fatherhood predicts participation in altruistic social relationships. The coefficients indicate that nest-leavers are no different from other types of non-resident fathers when it comes to involvement in service groups and giving assistance to extended family and friends. Also, no significant interactions between nest leaving and father engagement emerged

Discussion

The patterns in these data are consistent with the idea that the reach of fatherhood extends well into middle age and alters men's altruistic social ties. Men who at some point in their lives become fathers are significantly more likely to have altruistically oriented social relationships and be involved in service organizations compared to men who have never become fathers. Furthermore, it appears that among fathers, the defining aspect of the effect of fatherhood is the level of one's engagement with his children while they are growing up. Neither current residential status nor whether non-residence occurs because of nest-leaving or other reasons are found to distinguish men's altruistic ties to any significant degree.

These findings, then, offer varying support for the theoretical perspectives outlined. There is little evidence that residential status per se is associated with altruistic social ties. The fact that the involvement of nest-leavers in altruistic activities and relationships do not differ appreciably from other types of non-resident fathers also suggests that social role explanations are not sufficient to account for the observed effects. Father engagement is important in and of itself; however, it only partially moderates the effect of residence on social relationships, and has no moderating influence on nest-leaving versus other types of non-resident fatherhood. Instead, the rather robust differences in social ties between fathers and non-fathers and between fathers because of their levels of engagement, most consistently support the developmental expectations that surround becoming a father and,

specifically, becoming an engaged father. Fatherhood can have a transforming effect that stays with men even into middle age—when most men are fathering at a distance.

Of course, there are a number of reasons to be modest about these conclusions. Two significant determinants of the effect of fathering on men have been ignored: The influence of the child's mother on men and their fathering, and the nature of the fathers' current involvement with their children. Our focus in this paper on prior father engagement and on current residential status presents, at best, crude proxies for these theoretically salient factors. Neither did this analysis take into account the length of time that has elapsed since the start of non-residential fatherhood. It is possible that the effects of fatherhood may naturally fade with time—and that some of the observed differences between non-resident fathers are because the spell of non-residence may be confounded by type of non-residence. Finally, of course, some of the observed differences between fathers and non-fathers may be due to selection. Men who avoid fatherhood may have also been less altruistic from an early age. We have reason to believe that selection effects are probably negligible, however. Although we cannot directly test for differences in altruism at earlier ages, controls for such indirect indicators as marital status and history, age, education and income probably reduce some of the selectivity. We also estimated models containing Wave 1 measures of self-esteem (not shown). The patterns of results were the same. Despite these cautions, these fairly robust findings, which are consistent with our theoretical perspectives and other empirical work on the transition to fatherhood, suggest that becoming a father changes the nature and course of men's social and community ties in ways that extend over the life course (Palkovitz, 2002; Snarey, 1993). This is especially true if men are engaged fathers.

Children benefit from positive, engaged, and involved fathers and for this reason alone we should encourage men who are fathers to take this role seriously (Blankenhorn, 1995; Marsiglio, Amato, & Day, 2000). Fathers also appear to benefit when they are more committed to fathering behaviors (Knoester et al., 2007). Our findings suggest that not only are children positively affected by exposure to engaged fathers, but that communities, families and individuals also potentially benefit, perhaps thrive, because of men who are fathers tend to invest in them. Fatherhood can exact a toll on men. Studies show that parenthood is associated with declines in marital satisfaction, increased stress, loss of freedom, financial burdens, and loss of personal time, among other things (Belsky & Pensky, 1988; Cowan & Cowan, 2000). When the positive side of fatherhood is discussed, it is often limited to a narrow fixation on the "joys" or "satisfactions" that children bring. Our work, however, suggests there is more to the fatherhood story. When men become fathers, changes may begin that end up benefiting not only their children, but their extended families and communities as well.

References

- Antonucci TC, Landsford JE, Akiyama H, Smith J, Baltes MM, Takahashi K, Fuhrer R, Dartigues J. Differences between men and women in social relations, resource deficits, and depressive symptomatology during later life in four nations. *Journal of Social Issues*. 2002; 58(4):767–783.
- Belsky J, Pensky E. Marital change across the transition to parenthood. *Marriage and Family Review*. 1988; 12:133–156.

- Blankenhorn, D. *Fatherless America: Confronting our most urgent social problem*. New York: Basic Books; 1995.
- Bronfenbrenner, E. *The ecology of human development: Experiments by design and nature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1979.
- Cowan, CP.; Cowan, CP. *When partners become parents: The big life change for couples*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2000.
- Doherty WJ, Kouneski EF, Erickson MF. Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual framework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 1998; 60:277–292.
- Eggebeen, David J. The changing course of fatherhood: Men’s experiences with children in demographic prospective. *Journal of Family Issues*. 2002; 23:486–505.
- Eggebeen DJ, Hogan DP. Giving between generations in American families. *Human Nature*. 1990; 1:211–232. [PubMed: 24222083]
- Eggebeen DJ, Knoester C. Does fatherhood matter for men? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 2001; 63:381–393.
- Erikson, E. *Childhood and society*. Toronto: W.W. Norton; 1963.
- Fox GL, Bruce C. Conditional fatherhood: Identity theory and paternal investment theory as alternative sources of explanation of fathering. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2001; 63(2):394–403.
- Hawkins, AJ.; Dollahite, DC., editors. *Generative fathering: Beyond deficit perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 1997.
- Hofferth, SL.; Pleck, JH.; Stueve, JL.; Bianchi, S.; Sayer, L. The demography of fathers: What fathers do. In: Cabrera, N.; Tamis-Lemonda, *C., editors. *The Handbook of Father Involvement*. New Jersey: Erlbaum; 2002. p. 63-90.
- Hogan DP, Eggebeen DJ, Clogg CC. The structure of intergenerational exchanges in American families. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1993; 98:1428–1458.
- Knoester C, Eggebeen DJ. The effects of transition to parenthood and subsequent children on men’s well-being and social participation. *Journal of Family Issues*. 2006; 27:1532–1560.
- Knoester C, Petts R, Eggebeen DJ. Commitments to fathering and the well being and social participation of new fathers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2007; 69:991–1004.
- Marsiglio, W. *Procreative Man*. New York: New York University Press; 1998.
- Nock, S. *Marriage in men’s lives*. New York: Oxford University Press; 1998.
- Palkovitz R. Parenting as a generator of adult development: Conceptual issues and implications. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 1996; 13:571–595.
- Palkovitz, R. *Involved fathering and men’s adult development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; 2002.
- Parke, R. *Fathers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1996.
- Schooler C, Mulatu MS. Occupational self-direction, intellectual functioning, and self-directed orientation in older workers: Findings and implications for individuals and societies. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2004; 110(1):161–197.
- Secombe K, Ishii-Kuntz M. Gender and social relationships among the never-married. *Sex Roles*. 1994; 30:585–603.
- Snarey, J. *How fathers care the next generation: A four decade study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1993.
- Stolzenberg RM, Blair-Loy M, Waite LJ. Religious participation in young adulthood: Age and family life cycle effects on church membership. *American Sociological Review*. 1995; 60:84–103.
- Thornton A. Changing attitudes towards family issues in the United States. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1989; 51:873–893.
- Thornton A, Young-Demarco L. Four decades in attitudes toward family issues in the United States: The 1960’s through the 1990’s. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2001; 63:1009–1037.
- Voydanoff P. Implications of work and community resources and demands for marital quality. *Community, Work & Family*. 2004; 7(3):311–325.
- Waite LJ. Does marriage matter? *Demography*. 1995; 32:483–508. [PubMed: 8925942]

Waite, L.J.; Gallagher, M. The case for marriage: Why married people are happier, healthier, and better off financially. New York: Broadway Books; 2000.

Figure 1.
Distribution of men by various father statuses.

Table 1

Characteristics of Middle Age Men by Father Status

	Non-Fathers	Residential Fathers	Non-Residential	
			Nest-Leaving	Other
Age	53.32	51.64	56.74	54.15
Proportion Married	.48	.90	.85	.65
Labor Force Participation				
Full-time	.59	.73	.58	.54
Part-time (Not retired)	.20	.18	.14	.27
Part-time (Retired)	.21	.09	.28	.19
Median Household Income	59,000	85,000	68,700	67,650
Self Esteem (Wave 1)	15.98	15.77	15.75	15.65
Marital Satisfaction (Wave 1)	6.31	6.02	5.94	5.82

Table 2

Regression of involvement in altruistic social activities on men's fatherhood status (unstandardized ordinary least squares coefficients).

Variable	Service Groups	Assistance Given
Father	0.41 **	0.35 ***
Age	0.01	-0.00
Black	0.46 ***	0.24 ***
Hispanic	-0.28	0.35 ***
Other	-0.62 *	0.05
Education	0.09 ***	0.00
Income	0.03	0.02
Marital Status	0.21 *	0.01
Times Married	-0.17 **	-0.10 **
Intercept	-0.90	1.00 ***
R Square	.06	.02

Significance:

*
.05

**
.01

.001

Reference category for race: white

Table 3

Regression of involvement in altruistic social activities on father's residential status and engagement (unstandardized ordinary least squares coefficients).

Variable	Service Groups		Assistance Given	
Residential father	−0.04	−0.04	0.08	0.09
Father Engagement	0.10**	0.10**	0.12***	0.12***
Resident Father x Father Engagement	----	−0.05	----	−0.11**
Age	0.01	0.01	−0.004	−0.004
Black	0.41***	0.41***	0.26***	0.25**
Hispanic	−0.29	−0.29	0.33**	0.32**
Other	−0.62*	−0.61*	0.01	0.03
Education	0.08***	0.08***	0.001	0.001
Income	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.02
Marital Status	0.23*	0.23*	0.01	0.01
Times Married	−0.17**	−0.17**	−0.09**	−0.09**
Number of children	0.07*	0.07*	0.05**	0.05*
Youngest Child Age	−0.01	−0.01	0.01	0.01
Intercept	−0.65	−0.65	1.22***	1.21***
R Square	.06	.06	.04	.04

Significance:

*
.05

**
.01

.001

Reference category for race: white

Table 4

Regression of involvement in altruistic social activities on reasons for being a nonresident father and father engagement (unstandardized ordinary least squares coefficients).

Variable	Service Groups		Assistance Given	
Nest-leaving	−0.04	−0.04	0.05	0.05
Father Involvement	0.13**	0.13**	0.14***	0.14***
Nest Leaving by Father Involvement	----	−0.04	----	−0.09
Age	0.02*	0.02*	−0.01	−0.01
Black	0.26	0.25	0.16	0.16
Hispanic	−0.04	−0.04	0.39*	0.38*
Other	−0.62	−0.62	−0.23	−0.23
Education	0.08***	0.08***	0.01	0.01
Income	0.02	0.02	−0.003	−0.004
Marital Status	0.19	0.19	0.13	0.13
Times Married	−0.13	−0.13	−0.05	−0.05
Number of children	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.05
Age of Youngest C.	−0.01	−0.01	−0.01	−0.01
Intercept	−0.69	−0.67	1.63***	1.66***
R Square	.05	.05	.06	.06

Significance:

*
.05

**
.01

.001

Reference category for race: white