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I use the Fragile Families data to examine how a diverse group of men can be classified into multiple forms of masculinity. I identify three ideal categorizations of masculinity: the traditional, contemporary, and hyper-masculine models. Cluster analysis results confirm that these categories differentiate forms of masculinity among fathers to create three distinct categories of masculinity. I find a contemporary masculinity category that displays the most socio-economic advantages and “positive” qualities of masculinity. Contemporary masculinity is characteristic of fathers who are egalitarian, emotionally available to the baby’s mother, more likely to be married and educated, and the least likely to have ever been incarcerated. Alternatively, the hyper-masculine fathers have the most abusive behaviors, least emotional availability, and are the least likely to be married and educated, while being the most likely to have ever been incarcerated. The last group of fathers is the traditionally masculine fathers who essentially fall in between the contemporary and hyper-masculine fathers. My final two research questions examine if masculinities influence men’s intimate and fathering relationships. Using multinomial regression models, I address if masculinity predicts whether fathers transition into a more or less committed relationship with their child’s mother between the birth of the child and the child’s fifth birthday. I find that intimate relationships, do indeed, differ by forms of masculinity. Contemporary fathers are the most likely and hyper-masculine fathers are the least likely to be continuously married. Hyper-masculine fathers are much more likely to transition into a less committed relationship than to either remain in the same type of relationship or transition into a more committed relationship. Lastly, I use OLS regression
models to address whether forms of masculinity are related to father involvement, specifically
distinguishing the amount of time fathers engage with their child, five years after the child’s
birth. My findings suggest that fathers within the traditional masculinity category are the least
involved with their child. Critically, hyper-masculine fathers are significantly more involved
than both traditional and contemporary fathers. My research contributes not only to the literature
on fragile families, but also to broader scholarship on gender. My research also extends previous
college-based samples on masculinity to a larger and more diverse sample to gain a better
understanding of how fathers display masculinities. Emphasizing race and institutional
participation differences allows for a more in-depth analysis of the ways in which men’s
masculinity can be classified. Finally, my research finds crucial predictors of both family
structure and fatherhood involvement; which may provide the foundation for future research on
both father well-being and child well-being.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Men’s masculinity has been developed by both social institutions and men’s socialization to cultural norms, with social institutions and cultural ideologies reciprocally influencing each other and masculinities. To a degree, traditional frameworks of masculinity (specifically Western, industrialized frameworks) were created because of the emphasis that social institutions placed on breadwinning and marriage (Connell 2005). Masculinity can also be thought of as an outward display of one’s gender identity, with culture dictating how we display gender and the repercussions for deviating from normative gender displays (Goffman 1979, cited in Nock 1998). Men are socialized to display their masculinity in a culturally idealized manner, which often stresses economic success, rationality, physical toughness, and power over women – in that men should be protectors of their wives and children. In fact, past research indicates that masculinity is demanded of all men and that men “must be sufficiently masculine to receive full rights as a member of our society (Nock 1998: 43-44).” Although masculinity is demanded of all men, the majority of men are unable and some are unwilling to achieve the idealized societal version of masculinity (Connell 2005). The question then becomes how do men construct masculinity when they are unable or unwilling to meet the ideal type version.

My dissertation attempts to understand the categorization of masculinity among different heterosexual groups of men in the United States. I will also determine how social institutions, in the form of the economy, marriage, religion, the prison system, and the military influence fathers’ masculinity. I examine how masculinity is displayed among a wide variety of heterosexual men, from those who are embedded deeply in social institutions, i.e. the married, economically stable, or those who participate in religion, to those who are possibly “constructing masculinity under pressure (Connell 2005),” i.e. those un-married, economically unstable, or
incarcerated. In addition, I also place a strong emphasis on whether race accounts for any differences in masculinity. Then, I examine how different categories of masculinity influence men’s partnering and fathering relationships, in terms of relationship transitions and father involvement.

The central focus of this dissertation determines the multiple ways in which men’s masculinity can be categorized. My research expands the work of Nock (1998) and Townsend (2002) by analyzing masculinity across a wide spectrum of men. Nock’s argument centers on the premise that entering the institution of marriage is the way men achieve their masculinity. Townsend’s argument claims that in order to achieve successful masculinity, men must obtain the “package deal” of marriage, children, home, and work. However, Townsend’s ethnographic method eliminates a wide range of men, as his sample is comprised of 77 percent White men with no Black men and consists mostly of middle- to upper- middle class men. Townsend’s focus on White men is limited by race and class, therefore his research does not depict the full range of masculinities. This dissertation relies on the gendered scholarship of Connell (1987, 2005) and argues that multiple types of masculinity are present within contemporary American society. The multiple masculinities argument is in direct comparison to Nock and Townsend’s argument that one specific, overarching, category of masculinity exists. Importantly, my dissertation looks only at masculinity. Multiple femininities are also likely to exist in contemporary American society. Addressing multiple femininities is outside of the scope of this dissertation, future research will address this topic.

I use the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study (henceforth referenced as Fragile Families) to examine multiple categories of masculinity among a diverse group of men. I identify three ideal categories of masculinity, drawn from prior theory and empirical research,
which I call traditional, contemporary, and hyper-masculine. These labels do not describe perfectly men’s masculinities, but I think they represent the overall construction of each category. I use the word traditional as a way to discuss how the mainstream family literature frames masculinity. This literature often bases masculinity on the 1950’s notion of a traditional family with a breadwinning husband and stay-at-home wife. Contemporary describes the relatively new focus on men’s emotional rather than economic capabilities. As I discuss later, hyper-masculine is based on Connell’s (2005) research on protest masculinity. The structure of protest masculinity centers on a traditional, idealized version of masculinity but is set in a context of poverty. I elected to call this group hyper-masculine because in a sense they push the barriers of certain aspects of masculinity, such as violence and control. Again, these labels are not ideal but they invoke a general idea of the characteristics that men in each category will have.

In isolating these categories, I use factors that have been associated previously with masculinity, such as emotional control, primacy of work, and violence (Brannon & Juni 1984; Eisler & Skidmore 1987; Mihalik et al. 2003; Thompson & Pleck 1986). I use cluster analysis as a means of confirming if these categories differentiate masculinity among fathers. After constructing the three ideal types of masculinity, I determine if race and institutional participation are associated with each specific category of masculinity. My final two research questions examine if masculinities influence men’s partnering and fathering relationships. I use multinomial logistic regression and logistic regression models to address whether categories of masculinity predict whether fathers make a transition into a more or less committed relationship with their child’s mother between the birth of the child and the child’s fifth birthday. Lastly, I use OLS regression models to address whether categories of masculinity are related to father involvement in their child’s fifth year.
Research Goals

The main research goal for this dissertation is to determine if urban fathers can be classified into multiple categories of masculinity. This line of research seeks to find support for one of two diverging theories on masculinity. My research examines two possible scenarios for contemporary masculinity. On one hand, there may be multiple forms of masculinity that can be differentiated clearly from one another, supporting Connell’s (2005) multiple masculinities. On the other hand, my research may support Nock’s and Townsend’s arguments of a singular form of masculinity in which men can either achieve successfully or fail to achieve. Chapter four will be largely descriptive in nature, with the first set of analyses consisting of creating the categorizations of masculinity. After constructing the masculinity models, I will provide a fuller depiction of the categories by examining race and institutional participation differences among the categories. The chapter will conclude with descriptive information that illustrates the racial and institutional participation breakdowns for each category.

Chapter five tests whether masculinity predicts transitions into more committed relationships with the child’s mother, transitions into less committed relationships, or whether the couple remains in the same type of relationship across the waves of the study. I have three objectives for this chapter. First, I describe how various types of relationship transitions vary across the multiple forms of masculinity. Second, I examine if the forms of masculinity predict transitioning into either a less committed or a more committed relationship with the baby’s mother. Third, I analyze whether race and/or participation in various social institutions act to reduce the association between the multiple forms of masculinity and relationship transitions. In chapter four, I examine how race and social institutions influence masculinity. Previous research has indicated that both race and social institutions, such as the prison system, religion, and the
military are related to transitioning into either more or less committed relationships (Carlson, McLanahan & England 2004; Harknett & McLanahan 2004; Lundquist 2004; Teachman 2007; Western & McLanahan 2000). The final goal of chapter five is to recognize that any relationship between masculinity and relationship transitions actually may be caused from either race or the institutional participation measures.

Chapter six will focus on whether masculinity predicts father involvement when the child is approximately five years old. Three goals guide this chapter. First, I will determine if one category of masculinity more so than another category is associated with greater involvement by the father. Here, I also focus on race to see if Black and White fathers within the same masculinity category have significantly different average amounts of involvement. Second, I test whether masculinity predicts fathers’ average daily involvement. Within these analyses, I address whether the inclusion of race or institutional participation eliminates the relationship between masculinity and father involvement. Third, I seek to determine if masculinity predicts father involvement among both resident and non-resident fathers. This set of analyses will help distinguish whether a consistent relationship between masculinity and father involvement exists.

As a whole, my dissertation will examine how institutional participation influences masculinity and how masculinity affects relationship commitment and father involvement. I have outlined three ideal categories of masculinity. While certain aspects of masculinity are missing from these categories, such as attitudes towards homosexuality and information on men’s bodies, these categories make the best of the available data. Although there are limitations to the masculinity measures, these constructs do provide an overview of focal characteristics of masculinity and will provide a more extensive examination of a diverse population of men.
Contributions

From a conceptual standpoint, my research expands past Fragile Families studies by providing a fuller picture of fathers. While past Fragile Families research has examined some of the same variables I use in this study, they often rely on singular, isolated measures that act as mediators or moderators to predict relationship transitions or father involvement. No research, to date, has examined how multiple measures of masculinity come together to form coherent, distinct categories of masculinity. Although many of the same focal variables have been used in prior studies, no research has studied them collectively to provide a complete portrayal of the father. Additionally, by incorporating feminist and critical gender theory and research on multiple masculinities, I am able to provide a previously unaccounted quantitative examination of masculinity.

From a methodological standpoint, my research extends prior quantitative studies on masculinity that use college-based samples by including a more diverse sample. My dissertation also expands previous research on masculinity by focusing on a broader sample of men and on a larger set of institutional factors. Also, while past research has examined paternal involvement using the mothers’ report (Carlson & McLanahan 2004; Swisher & Waller 2008; Waller & Swisher 2006), I focus only on fathers’ reports on father involvement. Although research has indicated that fathers’ reports of paternal involvement are usually higher than mothers’ reports (Mikelson 2008), I feel that fathers’ reports are better suited for the current study. Because I am trying to understand fathers as a whole and how their own masculinity shapes intimate relationships and fathering, I feel it is necessary to use their own reports of involvement.

By including a broader image of fathers that consists of breadwinning capacity, attitudes towards marriage and fatherhood, emotional rationality, and physical and mental control over
women, we gain new insights into the whole father’s identity and connections to institutions, rather than only isolated segments of the father’s life. Masculinity is a key factor in men’s relations to society (Nock 1998), and until we gain a better understanding of men’s masculinity we will be unable to have full understanding of men’s partnering and fathering relationships. Additionally, contemporary American society presents an important point of history in which femininity and masculinity are changing rapidly. Using the Fragile Families data will allow me to capture some of the movement in this process.

Furthermore, my research has the potential to provide the foundation for future studies pertaining to both father and child well-being. Previous research found that fathers, compared to non-fathers, are more socially connected to their community and family and are less likely to be unemployed (Eggebeen and Knoester 2001). Additionally, an increased commitment to fathering over time is associated positively to father’s well-being, religious participation, hours in paid labor, and improvements in the quality of the relationship with the baby’s mother (Knoester, Petts, & Eggebeen 2007). My research may provide the foundation for the next link among these relationships. Men who live with their children and are married to their baby’s mother may have higher levels of physical and mental well-being, as marriage has been associated with men’s increased well-being (Waite & Gallagher 2000). These qualities, residential fatherhood and marriage, may also be more likely to classify men into the traditional category of masculinity according to Nock’s (1998) and Townsend’s (2002) arguments, potentially implying that traditional fathers would have the highest amounts of personal well-being.

Finally, this research is also important in terms of child well-being. Past research has found significant relationships between family structure transitions and child well-being (Brown
2006) and between father involvement and child well-being (Cooksey & Fondell 1996). Specifically, father involvement is associated with children’s social, emotional, and cognitive functioning (Lamb 2004). Fathers who are in the contemporary category of masculinity may be the most likely to have supportive attitudes towards fathering (see Doucet 2006; Henwood & Procter 2003; Rotundo 1985). Supportive attitudes towards fathering may be linked to father involvement. Father involvement is associated positively with child well-being (Cooksey & Fondell 1996; Lamb 2004); therefore, contemporary masculine fathers may have children with the greatest well-being. This dissertation determines if multiple forms of masculinity act as predictors of both family structure, in terms of relationship transitions, and father involvement. Gaining a fuller understanding of the factors that influence family structure and fatherhood involvement will provide the foundation for future insights into child well-being.
CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Previous research has examined masculinity in two different manners, one that views masculinity as a universal, idealized rather ahistorical concept (Nock 1998; Townsend 2002) and one that argues for multiple masculinities that can change over time and that intersect with race and class (Connell 2005; Hamer 2001; Kimmel 2006). The majority of research done in the family literature examines masculinity from the universal perspective, often depicting men along a continuum of masculinity. This dissertation takes a different approach and examines multiple categories of masculinity rather than examining masculinity along a continuum. I focus heavily on Connell’s (1987, 2005) argument that multiple categories of masculinity co-exist in contemporary society, rather than one singular version of masculinity. Additionally, Connell (1987) presents a hierarchy of masculinity, with a dominant, idealized version of masculinity (or hegemonic masculinity) and the others as subordinate, marginalized or rebellious versions of masculinity. This dissertation examines whether Connell’s critical gendered approach to multiple masculinities can increase our understanding of men’s place in the family. Examining multiple categories of masculinity will help gain insights into men who display marginalized or counter-normative versions of masculinity, particularly low-income and minority men. Men who are unmarried, poor, institutionally precarious, or a minority racial/ethnic group may be less likely to display the dominant model of masculinity espoused by Nock (1998) and Townsend (2002). Applying Nock’s and Townsend’s singular model of masculinity would indicate that men who are unmarried, poor, or institutionally precarious have failed at achieving successful masculinity. Whereas Connell’s gendered approach helps to explore whether these men create new forms of masculinity, rather than simply achieving or failing at the dominant model of masculinity.
Hegemonic and Alternative Forms of Masculinity

Masculinity as a universal concept often focuses on what Connell (1993, 2005) terms hegemonic masculinity. Gramsci’s analysis of class relations is the basis for Connell’s use of the term hegemony, which refers to the means by which a group claims and sustains a leading position in social life (Connell 2005: 77). Extrapolating to gender relations, hegemonic masculinity is the culturally exalted category of masculinity which is often accompanied by a sense of authority. More specifically, hegemonic masculinity is the “configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees the dominant position of men and the subordination of women (Connell 2005: 77).” Furthermore, hegemonic masculinity only can be expressed in relation to women and other subordinate masculinities (Connell 1987). Although changes in masculinity can occur over time, hegemonic masculinity is the dominant, ideal masculinity that is often used as the marker of comparison. The dominant category of masculinity is often a fantasy image and does not represent the majority of men’s actual personalities (Connell 1987). Thus few, if any men, live up to the idealized notions of hegemonic masculinity, but the majority of men gain from valorizing this category of masculinity because it keeps men in the dominant position in society (Connell 2005). While hegemonic masculinity is only an ideal, it helps to create traditional templates of masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity also can structure, through institutional constraints and socialization, how men construct masculinity.

Mainstream accounts of masculinity center on the breadwinning component of hegemonic masculinity, as men are expected to be providers and protectors (Nock 1998). Townsend (2002) claims that there are four interrelated components of masculinity that combine to form the package deal: work, marriage, home and children. Townsend also argues that
“exclusion from one or more elements of the package deal is a way to exclude men from full fatherhood, full masculinity, and full personhood (2002: 31).” Without success in all four areas, men will not achieve a sufficient amount of masculinity. Following this line of reasoning, men who are incapable of achieving a full providership role are, essentially, in a subordinate position compared to sole breadwinning males because society does not fully consider them successful men, but rather as failed men.

Additional research has shown that a bifurcation in resources has occurred among many families (Furstenberg 1988; McLanahan 2004). The bifurcation can be seen as stemming from the reduction in the economic provider role or the lack of traditional masculinity. Furstenberg (1988) argues that the breakdown of the good provider role is responsible for the breakdown of fathers into “good dads and bad dads.” This breakdown creates two groups of fathers, one group that is involved closely with their child and one that is basically absent from their child’s life. McLanahan (2004) presents a similar argument in her Population Association of America Presidential address. She discusses the diverging destinies of American children. Parents with the most education have seen the most gains in resources for their children, while parents with the least education have seen the least advances (McLanahan 2004). Her argument centers on mothers, but could just as easily be describing the traditional form of masculinity among fathers. The “good dads/bad dads” and diverging destinies arguments highlight how family researchers often, but not always, frame masculinity around the hegemonic type of masculinity. Family studies typically focus on the importance of marriage and breadwinning, specifically drawing attention to the importance of residential and economically resourceful fathers. My dissertation research can show that it is not simply about the dichotomous nature of masculinity as either having hegemonic, or traditional masculinity, versus not having hegemonic masculinity.
However, research also points to alternative categories of masculinity outside of this traditional framework. In the early 1980’s, Bernard (1981, pg. 12) argued that good provider would not longer be the dominant model of men’s role in the family, but that “its legitimate successor has not yet appeared.” Additionally, Furstenberg (1988) argues that the decline of the good provider role permitted greater emotional involvement in childcare on the part of fathers. The contemporary model of masculinity, described below, may be the eventual successor of the good provider role.

The contemporary model is a way to tap into a non-dominant, emerging category of masculinity. The contemporary model focuses on men who have moved away from the traditional prominence of male breadwinning and have pushed for increased levels of emotional and material caregiving in their intimate relationships (Henwood & Procter 2003; Rotundo 1985). Henwood and Procter (2003) study fathers who are transitioning into parenthood for the first time. The new fathers in this study welcomed the idea of being present in the home, involved in their child’s life, and valued family time above work and leisure as ideal standards for fathers (Henwood & Procter 2003, pg. 343). To these fathers, good fathers were nurturing and supportive. Although, many of the fathers in their study often had difficulty enacting the nurturing caregiving ideals they expressed. Balancing paid work and childcare seemed to be a hard task for a portion of these men, but many new fathers found joy in taking care of their children and changed their notions of breadwinning because of their family (Henwood & Procter 2003). Doucet’s (2006) research on Canadian primary caregiving and single fathers also highlights a more egalitarian version of masculinity. The primary caregiving fathers actively tried to reconstruct masculinity to include the more feminine characteristics of caregiving. Doucet states, “The fathers’ narratives address the ways that men are creating new kinds of
masculinities by bringing together varied configurations of masculinities and femininities (pg. 238, emphasis in original).” These men actively attempted to create a type of masculinity that would maintain aspects of hegemonic masculinity, particularly the importance of a father’s breadwinning (although many of these men were primary caregivers, many also maintained part-time or self employment) or leaving some housework for the mother, but would also have a masculine identity that allows for feminine nurturing activities. Many of the primary-caregiving fathers in Doucet’s study believe that mothers are still more protective, nurturing, and emotionally connected to children, but these men also find value in teaching their children independence, as well as playing, having fun, and being physically active with their children. In other words, the fathers felt that nurturing and providing care was important to their lives; yet they viewed their nurturing as different from how mothers nurture their children. While these men may not display typical nurturing characteristics, the fathers’ behaviors nurture the physical and developmental needs of their children (Doucet 2006, pg. 115).

Overall, the contemporary father is emotionally available to his family and is more likely to have egalitarian gender role attitudes. The contemporary category of masculinity goes against two factors typically associated with male role norms, the toughness and antifeminity factors. The toughness factor implies that men should be mentally, emotionally, and physically tough and the antifeminity factor states that men should avoid stereotypically feminine activities and occupations (Brannon and Juni 1984; Thompson and Pleck 1986). Possibly, the contemporary masculinity category may soon be considered the new hegemonic form of masculinity. Kane’s (2006) study of parents’ attitudes towards gender conformity finds positive attitudes towards young boys’ having domestic skills, being able to nurture, and having empathy. These new attitudes towards boys’ behaviors indicate potential shifts in the ideal version of masculinity.
Alternatively, Connell’s (2005) life-history research of Australian men provides another model of masculinity: the hyper-masculine, protest masculinity. Hyper-masculinity has aspects of the factors found in hegemonic masculinity but revises them in a context of poverty (Connell 2005: 114). Connell examines young working-class unemployed men to determine how men express masculinity when they cannot achieve success at breadwinning. The unemployed young men in Connell’s study often expressed violent behavior mostly directed at other males, but occasionally against women. Connell concludes that these men are conflicted regarding sexuality, with men treating women as “disposable receptacles for semen” but concurrently feeling respect for women’s strength (Connell 2005: 108). The unemployed working class men in Connell’s study face an inherent contradiction; they welcome egalitarian households and value strength in women, but also are hyper-masculine with life histories filled with criminal acts, homophobia, and sexual exploitation of women.

Anderson (1989) also depicts hyper-masculinity in his ethnographic account of poor Black inner-city adolescents in the United States. Young Black males often engage in high rates of casual sex, in order to meet their peer group’s standards. As Anderson states (1989: 61), “the more ‘pussy’ he gets, the more esteem accrues to him.” Additionally, sexual relationships among adolescent girls and boys in this population often consist of a game for young males. The poor young Black males will often play into the young girls’ dreams of finding a boyfriend who will be able to provide for her, by hinting at their future life together by pretending to go shopping for their future home. For these poor inner-city men, masculinity is categorized by accumulating multiple sexual partners and playing a woman until he has gained control over her.

In conclusion, previous research presents three ideal models of masculinity. The first model is the traditional, hegemonic model that stresses marriage and economic breadwinning for
men. The second model is the contemporary model emphasizing emotional availability and physical caregiving. The last model is a hyper-masculine model that focuses on power, violence, and the sexual exploitation of women. Importantly, these models of masculinity indicate some overlap within each category, with a blurring of boundaries between each category. Past theoretical and empirical research hints at the hegemonic view of masculinity within each of the three categories of masculinity. The conflicting nature between breadwinning and nurturing and breadwinning and violent behavior indicates that while economic providesship may not be at the heart of each category of masculinity, providesship appears to be an orienting factor for each category of masculinity. The three models of masculinity show how providesship is an integral component for each type of masculinity. Providership is the key, focal concept for traditional masculinity. Contemporary masculinity views providesship as important, but also equally values the feminine characteristic of emotional support. Hyper-masculinity is created by men who often form counter-normative gender identities because they are unable to attain mainstream financial success. While these models are not concrete immutable versions of masculinity, they provide three identifiable, though idealized, ways to construct categories of masculinity.

*Social Institutions and Masculinity*

Social institutions help shape the normative constructs of masculinity. Masculinity can be understood only through social institutions and history (Connell 1993). Connell (2005) provides examples of the significance of social institutions in the formation of hegemonic masculinity by highlighting the historical work of Seccombe (1986) and the ethnographic research of Phillips (1984). Seccombe’s work shows male breadwinning associated with masculinity for only a brief period of time, as the male breadwinning wage was established in mid-nineteenth century Britain through the restructuring of the labor market. Governmental
institutions also helped to establish marriage as a key feature of masculinity. Historical and ethnographic accounts of New Zealand men indicate that the colonial state played a strong role in tying masculinity to marriage (Phillips 1984), by offering land settlements as a means of gaining control over men. Currently, the United States government attempts to tie masculinity to marriage and family by offering tax deductions to married couples and to those with children.

Changes in social institutions may also change the context of masculinity. Because gender relations are present within every social institution (Connell 1987), as institutions change so does the structure of gender relations. Connell (2005) argues that masculinity provides a basis for the structuring of gender relations in three ways: 1) power via dominance by men and subordination of women, 2) production via the gendered division of labor, and 3) cathexis – or emotional attachment – via sexual desires. Institutional changes in both the labor force and government have influenced the relationship between genders throughout history. Social change in the form of increased rights for women, increased rates of married women’s labor force participation, greater governmental acceptance of same-sex marriage, women’s push for sexual pleasure, and movements towards more individualized, personal forms of marriage may be creating changing categories of masculinity. Potentially, social changes may remove some of the legitimacy of patriarchal power, which might lead to more varied categories of masculinity.

Furthermore, social institutions can influence an individual in a variety of ways. Institutions, such as marriage, religion, and the military, can be a validating source of support. Other institutions, such as the penal system, can be a source of coercion and control which can limit an individual’s future opportunities. Historical accounts indicate that social institutions partially shaped traditional definitions of masculinity. Re-examining how social institutions
shape masculinity will determine if different types of institutions influence the construction of
different categories of masculinity.

Importantly, I focus only on contemporary U.S. masculinity. Connell (2005) claims that
the state is a central component in the construction of gender. This logic implies that U.S. social
policy influences masculinity and that masculinity could vary cross-culturally because of the
creation or effects of different policies. Public policies affect families either by reinforcing
gender differences or by reinforcing gender equality (Olah, Bernhardt, & Goldscheider 2002).
One type of policy supports a more specialized type of family in which the family receives
payments and allows women to stay home to help raise their children. This type of policy does
not allow for childcare subsidies or women’s job security. Policies focusing on gender equality
offer no payments, but do provide job guarantees and subsidized childcare. Overall, public
policies affecting fathers are often based on either cash, who pays for children, or who cares for
children (Hobson & Morgan 2002).

Strikingly, Orloff and Monson (2002 pg. 61) state “the most salient fact about the
treatment of fathers in U.S. social policy is the virtual absence of programs targeting them as
fathers.” U.S. policy focuses on market-based help promoting individual work rather than
providing assistance to support fathers as nurturing primary caregivers. U.S. policy makers see
men’s role as being the provider for their children, and therefore provide little financial support
to families (Orloff & Monson 2002). The basis of U.S. policy is determining paternity and
enforcement of paternal child support payments. Importantly, men can be sent to jail if they do
not pay child support but only if they are arrested for another reason. Thus, incarceration for
non-payment of child support is higher among racial/ethnic minorities because of their higher
arrests rates (Orloff & Monson 2002). Thus, the state perpetuates and protects a class- and race-stratified hegemonic, traditional version of breadwinning masculinity.

**Race, Class, and Masculinity**

In this dissertation, I only examine differences between White and Black men. While the literature on Hispanic families is burgeoning, the complication of nativity and ethnic status creates an additional level of complexity, which is beyond the scope of this study. The diversity of expected masculinities in Hispanic men is an intriguing area, but is left for future research.

In the following paragraphs, I provide an account of how race and masculinity are connected. Importantly, I do not look to explain how the differences in race come about, but rather I focus on providing a justification for why there may be differences between Black and White men’s masculinity. As Hobson and Morgan (2002, pg. 18) argue, “constructions of fatherhood, addressing poor and minority men reveal that not all men benefit from the scripted cultural ideals of masculinity that connect men’s economic power to their authority in the family.” This quote indicates that we need to examine how multiple categories of masculinity can differ across race and ethnicity. If poor and minority men do not benefit from traditional, hegemonic masculinity, their masculinity may be categorized in a completely divergent pattern than either White men or men who have more economic resources.

Academic research on the organization of Black families persists along two main divides, one focusing on cultural factors and the other focusing on structural and economic factors (Sarkisian & Gerstel 2004; Wilson 2009). Critically, I do not examine whether cultural or structural factors are more important in forming Black men’s masculinity. As Wilson’s (2009) research suggests, cultural and structural factors interact together to create Black men’s social
and economic position\textsuperscript{1}. In the following paragraphs, I highlight family structure and distrust as cultural factors, and the legacy of slavery, deindustrialization, discrimination, and mass incarceration as structural factors to provide a perspective on why Black men’s social and economic position may lead to different types of masculinity between Black and White fathers. Critically, while I categorize the legacy of slavery as a structural component, slavery also may have cultural influences that affect contemporary Blacks.

Researchers have argued that the historical and cultural context of African-Americans has placed them in a different position in terms of family structure and men’s capacity for breadwinning. Cultural factors include Black families’ focus on consanguinal ties over conjugal ties and a matrilineal family structure over a patrilineal structure (Sudarkasa 1998), which may support women-headed households leaving men with an ambiguous position within their families. Other theorists also argue that Black families value more extended kin ties and have greater integration among their families compared to Whites (Staples 1981; Sudarkasa 1996). Empirical research by Sarkisian (2007) found that Black men are more likely than White men to both live with extended family and to visit extended kin more often.

More recent research has examined the influence of distrust as a cultural component of Black men’s position in contemporary American society. Smith’s (2007) research shows that one cultural aspect of poor, Black neighborhoods is the lack of informal job networks. Smith shows that many Black individuals in poor neighborhoods are unlikely to refer family and friends to jobs because of a lack of trust. Black jobholders are less likely to refer individuals because they fear that they may not perform quality work and therefore might jeopardize their own employment. Lack of referrals puts many poor, Black men at a disadvantage for receiving

\textsuperscript{1} Although, Wilson (2009) does argue that structural factors trump cultural factors.
gainful employment. Distrust also influences Black and low-income men’s relationships as well. Wilson (2009) finds that both marital and non-marital Black relationships are marked with distrust and antagonism. The women in Wilson’s ethnographic Chicago study are highly distrustful of inner-city Black men and think that Black men become involved with women to get sex or money. Sexual distrust also exists among low-income unmarried parents. Using qualitative data, researchers find high levels of distrust among unmarried parents over issues of fidelity that can reduce couples’ relationship quality and stability (Edin 2000; Edin, England, & Linneberg 2003).

Although ending over 100 years ago, slavery may have had long-term structural consequences on Black families. The circumstances around slavery produced an environment in which fatherhood was not tied explicitly to residency, making for a very different structure compared to White families (Hamer 2001). While Blacks did try to reunite their families and formalize their marriages at the end of slavery (Gutman 1976; Sudarkasa 1998), slavery’s legacy may still affect the current structure of Black families. Morgan and colleagues (1993) use Census data from 1910 and find that Black households were much more likely to be extended households, more likely to be female headed than White households, and much less likely to be nuclear couple-headed households. Although research typically contrasts Black families with White non-immigrant families, Tolnay (2004) compares Blacks with immigrant families. Using IPUMS data from 1880-2000, Tolnay finds that the overarching trend over time is that Black children have an increasingly lower likelihood of residing within a two-parent family. These studies appear to provide evidence that slave society may have resulted in some, though hardly all, of the structural differences between Black and White families, with Black families being significantly more likely to be one-parent, typically female-headed, households.
Additionally, Black men’s economic history within the United States also points to why masculinity may differ by race. Black men have often been the “last hired and first fired” (Holzer 2009; Rubin 1995). Numerous manufacturing plants have moved away from the center of cities, leaving many inner-city Black men with fewer opportunities for stable employment (Holzer 2009). Changes in industrialization have made it increasingly hard for less educated Black men to have upward mobility (Wilson 1987). The decline in the number of jobs available for urban, low-skilled men is not the only economic factor affecting Black men. The shift from a manufacturing to a service economy has had dramatic implications for low-skilled, low-educated individuals. Wilson (2009) finds that employers in service industries have negative attitudes towards Black men as workers and are less likely to hire them “because they are seen as unable to sustain positive contact with the public” (pg. 77). Black, low-skilled men are often left jobless as service based industries are more likely to hire women or immigrants (Wilson 2009). Deindustrialization, in combination with racial discrimination in hiring processes (Pager and Karafin 2009), creates a tenuous breadwinning capacity for many Black men.

Lastly, I address the issue of the increase in incarceration among Black men as a structural component that can explain why different categories of masculinity may vary across race. During the late 1990’s amplification in harsh sentences and punitive policies towards drug control increased the U.S. prison population, so much so that the United States has the highest incarceration rates of any Western nation (Western & Wildeman 2009). A dramatic difference in incarceration rates for Blacks and Whites also exists. Western and Wildeman (2009, pg. 228) state that Black men are eight times more likely to be incarcerated than Whites across all age groups and education levels. Pettit and Western (2004) find that incarceration is becoming a normative life course stage among low-educated, Black men. They find that of men born
between 1965 and 1969, 60 percent of Black men with less than a high school diploma had been in prison by their thirties. Furthermore, in recent years Black fathers’ incarceration rates have far exceeded White fathers’ incarceration rates (Wildeman 2009). With higher levels of noncustodial fatherhood, lower levels of breadwinning capacity and higher incarceration rates, Black American men may be unable to fit into the idealized model of hegemonic masculinity that emphasizes men as providers and residential parenting. Importantly, I have focused on low-income rather than upper- or middle-class race differences. I do this because of the nature of the Fragile Families dataset. The Fragile Families data focuses heavily on unmarried families who are at a higher risk of living in poverty. Therefore, I have elected to focus on research examining low-income men and families.

Although Black men’s historical position creates a particularly unique situation, White working-class men also confront the challenges of the changing economic landscape. Though, White men have been able to fall back on their dominant racial position in society. As Rubin (1992: xxxi) states, “when Whites at or near the bottom of the ladder look down in this nation, they generally see Blacks and other minorities.” Economic downturns along with equal employment opportunities somewhat changed Whites economic positioning and created an environment for increased racial tension.

The contraction of the economy not only has created changes in race relations, but also has necessitated a restructuring of masculinity for many White working class men. Many White working class men have needed to transform the sex roles within their families (Weis 2006). The current majority of White working class families must have two incomes to sustain a culturally accepted standard of living, although many want to enjoy the homemaker-breadwinning family dynamic. The need for dual incomes and males’ participation in domestic
responsibilities challenges White working class masculinity (Weis 2006). The removal of the breadwinning aspect of masculinity may have a greater impact on White men than on Black men, because historically Black women have participated in the labor force more than White women (Coontz 2000; Rubin 1995).

In conclusion, previous theoretical and empirical research highlights three models of masculinity. While family research has often focused only on one type of masculinity (often the traditional model, but the contemporary model has been gaining interest), this dissertation attempts to show the additional value that family research can gain when analyzing multiple categories of masculinity. Critically, I argue that when we look only at the dominant model of masculinity we are missing large segments of the population. The major goal of this dissertation is to show that demographic research needs to broaden its conceptualization of what masculinity is if we want to develop a further understanding of family dynamics, such as father involvement and relationship transitions, particularly in fragile families.
CHAPTER III: DATA AND METHODS

The Fragile Families data are the most appropriate for this project. All the men in the sample are fathers and all live in an urban area. The data contain a large number of minority respondents, including 1,870 African-American fathers. Additionally, the data provide detailed information on the fathers’ relationship characteristics with the baby’s mother, activities spent with their child, and items that can tap into the construction of the multiple categories of masculinity.

The Fragile Families data was collected in 20 U.S. cities and is a representative sample of nonmarital births in U.S. urban areas with populations over 200,000 (Reichman, Teitler, Garfinkel, & McLanahan 2001). Importantly, I do not use the nationally representative sample in this study. I elected not to use the national sample in order to increase my sample size and because this is the first, exploratory look into multiple masculinities in contemporary American society. Therefore, I am more concerned with describing these men than in the generalizability of my findings.

Additionally, the design of the Fragile Families data addresses three key policy areas: non-marital childbearing, welfare reform and the role of fathers (Reichman et al. 2001). The focus on non-marital childbearing and the role of fathers makes the Fragile Families data ideally suited for my dissertation. The collectors of this data specifically refer to unmarried parents and their child as “fragile families” because they are families who are more vulnerable to relationship dissolution and poverty (Reichman et al. 2001). The emphasis on non-marital childbearing allows me to differentiate masculinity among both unmarried and married fathers. Determining the distinctions between married and unmarried fathers’ masculinity is a key factor in this dissertation. Furthermore, I will be able to tap into a much more diverse set of men than
previous studies on masculinity because this data contain a large portion of respondents who are economically vulnerable. With a focus on the role of fathers, the data includes responses from both the mother and the father. Having responses from the father is critical to my study because I want to identify how men understand their own experiences and construct their own masculinity. The diverse nature of the Fragile Families data will allow for the opportunity to examine differences across multiple categories, such as race, religiosity, and incarceration. The diversity of the data is critical because one of my main interests is in describing the multiple ways in which masculinity differ across numerous socio-demographic characteristics.

Analytic Strategy

The data analysis will consist of four components: 1) using cluster analysis to determine the masculinity categories, 2) presenting descriptive statistics on how race and institutional participation breakdown by masculinity category, 3) estimating multinomial logistic regression models and logistic regression models to examine the relationship between masculinity and relationship transitions with the baby’s mother, 4) estimating multivariate OLS regression models to study the relationship between forms of masculinity and fatherhood involvement when the child is five years old.

(1) Cluster Analysis.

The first section of my analysis is determining how fathers fit into masculinity categories. To do this, I will use a two-step cluster process using SPSS as this procedure has the capabilities of analyzing extremely large datasets. Cluster analysis is an appropriate analytical tool because previous research has yet to quantify the multiple ways in which masculinity can be classified.
(2) Descriptive Statistics

Here, I will look at the institutional participation characteristics of fathers for the entire sample and then broken down by race. This will answer the question of how fathers’ institutional participation differs by race. Then, I will examine how institutional participation and race differ across each category of masculinity.

(3) Multinomial Logistic and Logistic Models

After constructing my masculinity categories, I will use multinomial logistic regression models to explore whether masculinity influences relationship transitions. Multinomial techniques are employed because the relationship transition measure is a three-category measure of either a transition into a more committed relationship, transition into a less committed relationship, and no transition occurred from the time the child was born until the child’s fifth birthday. My analyses will examine the transition into more committed relationships versus no transition and transition into a less committed relationship versus no transition. Then, I use logistic regressions to address movement into more committed and less committed relationships by baseline relationship status.

(4) Multivariate OLS Regression Models

Lastly, I use ordinary Least Squares regression models to examine the relationship between masculinity and father involvement when the child is five years old. I use OLS regression techniques because I anticipate a linear relationship to exist between masculinity and father involvement; such that higher levels of traditional masculinity and contemporary masculinity will predict higher levels of father involvement, whereas higher levels of hyper-masculinity will predict lower levels of father involvement.
I have elected not to discuss the specific samples or measures for the analyses in this chapter. In light of the complexity of each analysis, I will discuss more fully the data, selected samples, and variable descriptions within each empirical chapter, as they apply to each specific set of analyses.
CHAPTER IV: MASCULINITY AMONG URBAN FATHERS

In chapter two, I identified three theoretical forms of masculinity. These forms of masculinity act as a guide for the empirical analysis within this chapter. The two main goals of this chapter are to examine diverging masculinities among urban fathers by using cluster analytical techniques and to determine if there are socio-demographic differences both between and within the multiple categories of masculinities.

I contribute to both broader gender research and research on fragile families in four ways. First, and most importantly, I use a methodology that groups men rather than a methodology that groups variables to describe fathers. Although previous researchers using the Fragile Families data have examined many of the same variables I use, they do so only in a piece-by-piece fashion. I take a different approach and focus on how multiple dimensions of masculinity cohere together to form distinct categories of fathers. Masculinity is a multi-dimensional concept and cannot be examined accurately by using only one item. Critically, each dimension of masculinity does not simply mediate or moderate each other. Rather, they may serve as cohering dimensions or qualities of specific categories of masculinity. Cluster analysis allows me to gain a more holistic account of fathers by coalescing multiple aspects of men’s masculinity (Matjasko, Gruden, & Ernst 2007). Because prior research has not attempted to analyze multiple categories of masculinity quantitatively, I use this exploratory technique to find hidden patterns of masculinity among urban fathers.

Second, using cluster analysis, I explore multiple categorizations of contemporary U.S. heterosexual masculinity. Here, I will be able to determine how many categories of masculinity exist among urban fathers. I also can analyze whether men coincide with one over-arching category of masculinity that would present itself as one cluster, similar to Nock’s (1998) and
Townsend’s (2002) view of masculinity. Alternatively, I can determine if multiple masculinities are present in contemporary U.S. society. Furthermore, I will be able to describe the composition of each category of masculinity. Cluster analysis allows me to determine how distant or separate each category is from one another. Increased distance indicates a more distinctive clustering of the categorizations of masculinity. I can also examine the tightness of each category of masculinity. Examining how tight the distributions are on each variable within a specific category of masculinity helps measure the variability within each category.

Third, I determine whether race and ties to social institutions are associated with one category of masculinity compared to another category. Specifically, I examine whether men’s ties to social institutions attract them to a particular masculinity category. I then examine if race differences in social institutional participation occur within each category of masculinity. Research has already established that Black men are more likely to have ever been incarcerated than White men (Pettit & Western 2004; Wildeman 2009) and that White men are more likely to be married than Black men (Carlson, McLanahan & England 2004; Harknett & McLanahan 2004; Western & McLanahan 2000). What we do not yet know is whether these race patterns will hold across multiple categories of masculinity.

Fourth and lastly, I hope to contribute to family research by establishing a new predictor of many of the outcomes that family researchers study. Ideally, I will be able to link masculinity to many of the outcomes used in family studies, such as father involvement, relationship transitions, and ultimately child and father well-being. Often masculinity is not examined directly in family research; rather many items that can tap masculinity are included only as socio-demographic controls. My study looks at the capabilities of analyzing coherent categories of masculinity, which we can then use as more specific predictor variables. Establishing a new
empirical link, with more specific, cohesive, measures of masculinity, may be able to increase the predictive nature of our analytical models.

In conclusion, the current study is largely descriptive in nature, with the first set of analyses consisting of cluster analytic techniques to categorize masculinities. I then analyze whether each category of masculinity differs by ties to social institutions. Last, I examine whether variations in race occur within each masculinity category. For example, do Blacks and Whites have significantly different percentages of incarceration within each separate category? I proceed in this manner because past research shows the importance of social institutions in the formation of masculinity and the potential for multiple masculinities to intersect with race and class (Connell 2005; Kimmell 2006; Morris 2008; Pyke 1996).

Theoretical Construction of Models

Chapter two focused on depicting the three different categories of masculinity used as models for the current study. In this chapter, I look more specifically at research that discusses the multiple dimensions of masculinity or, in other words, what makes up masculinity. While the earlier theoretical section established the three broad models of masculinity, here I focus on the dimensions associated with masculinity, providing credence for the selection of the variables used in the cluster analysis.

I then address how previous studies using the Fragile Families data examined masculinity. Specifically, I show how previous researchers addressed only a few dimensions of masculinity. In general, previous Fragile Families studies have provided only limited insight into masculinity. Importantly, no studies using the Fragile Families data have examined the multiple ways in which masculinity can be measured as coherent unique categories. Rather, previous research has been concerned with how fathers fit along a continuum of masculinity for
individual measures isolated from each other, except for their potential mediating or moderating effects. To date no research has grouped men using multiple dimensions of masculinity.

Dimensions of Masculinity

I now examine how past research has operationalized masculinity. The following section provides my rationale for the inclusion of each dimension of masculinity into the cluster analysis. Importantly, the following background research provides models for many focal aspects of masculinity that may not necessarily be the reality for many men. In this section, I want to show how the following dimensions of masculinity can break apart to distinguish between each category of masculinity. I address the following four broad dimensions of masculinity in the subsequent paragraphs: rationality and emotional suppression, gendered attitudes and behaviors, fatherhood, and violent, abusive and controlling behaviors.

Rationality and Emotional Suppression

The dominant masculinity archetype suggests that many, but not all men, value logic and reason over emotions and desires. Seidler (1989) suggests that self-control often dominates emotion, feelings, and desires in men. Research has shown that throughout the life-course, the expectations of men are to constrain their emotions and act responsibly. During childhood, parents frequently socialize their sons not to display signs of emotion. Specifically, parents talk to daughters more than sons about emotions and stop boys from expressing their emotions (Kane 2006; Maccoby 1998). Boys often are discouraged from crying or showing softness because these are signs of weakness and vulnerability (Maccoby 1998; Mosher & Tomkins 1988; Seidler 1989). Fathers, in particular, are more likely than mothers are to pressure sons to suppress their emotions and reinforce sex-stereotypical behavior (Maccoby 1998).
Schools also provide a fertile ground for socializing young boys into becoming civil, responsible members of society. Schools often propel men into rational and responsible beings. Connell (1989) finds a compliance of identifying rationality to masculine identities with adolescent aged boys. Working class adolescent boys, in this study, are directed into rational decisions about entering training programs for subordinated, low-autonomy positions in order to have long-term economic stability. Adolescent boys from privileged backgrounds often have a passive, but rational, responsibility towards their education. These boys follow in their families’ footsteps and continue through school without giving much thought to their futures, essentially because it is what they are supposed to do (Connell 1989). Similar to parents, schools socialize boys to construct a masculinity based more on rationality and the suppression of emotions and desires.

The version of masculinity that stresses rationality and emotional suppression can continue into old age. In a study of 60 widowed men, Bennett (2007) discovered that even during bereavement, most men felt uncomfortable sharing feelings publicly. Men often retold their experiences of grief and pain in tones characterized by control, rationality, responsibility, and action. These men would discuss how they successfully overcame depression and the loss of their wives, by stressing how “life goes on,” or “yeah, felt a bit sorry for myself, but I intended to get over it and that was it” (Bennett 2007, pgs. 353-354). The literature on masculinity and emotions demonstrates that throughout the life course many boys and men are directed towards a category of masculinity that emphasizes rationality and emotional suppression.

Gendered Attitudes and Behaviors

Hegemonic masculinity focuses on the demarcation between male and female. The line between male and female is best depicted when Connell (2005, pg. 68) states “‘masculinity’
cannot exist except in contrast with ‘femininity.’” Masculine gender ideologies often stress a natural gender order which places men in a position of higher power than women and legitimates the successful male career (Pyke 1996). Pyke’s (1996) analysis of class-based masculinities indicates that both higher-class and lower-class husbands shirk their household responsibility, but provide different justifications. Higher-class men excused themselves from housework because of the power that came with their careers, while lower-class men relied on an entitled, natural sex order, patriarchal justification. Regardless of class, one version of masculinity may still emphasize conservative gender role ideologies and behaviors.

Kane’s (2006) study of parents’ views of gender nonconformity among preschool-aged children provides further evidence of the contrasting expectations for masculinity and femininity. Both mothers and fathers had few issues when their daughters’ actions crossed gender lines; in fact, many daughters were encouraged to participate in typically masculine play (pg. 157). In stark contrast, Kane found mainly negative responses to sons’ gender nonconformity, such as dancing and playing with Barbie dolls, fearful that their sons would be viewed as homosexual. Interestingly, Kane found that parents responded positively towards their sons having domestic skills, being able to nurture, and having empathy. Positive feelings towards these more egalitarian, feminine behaviors may be a sign of society’s shifting definitions of appropriate masculinity.

Demographic research supports the notion of a potential shift in masculinity towards more domestic responsibility. Although men’s housework has increased in past decades, men still do not perform an equal portion of housework (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson 2000; Gupta 1999; Sayer 2005). Childcare may be one area where gender ideology may be focusing on gender equality rather than gender distinctions. Men are increasingly accepting the
responsibility of and performing more childcare than in past generations (Bianchi 2000; Johansson & Klinth 2008). Indeed, men appear to be developing a more sensitive attitude towards involvement with their children. However as Johansson and Klinth (2008) point out, being more child-oriented does not necessarily mean that men are more gender equal.

Fatherhood

The differential valuation between breadwinning and caregiving among fathers may be a significant predictor for classifying men into multiple categories of masculinity. The basis of traditional, dominant masculinity is men serving as the main provider, if not the sole provider, for the family (Kimmel 2006; Nock 1998; Townsend 2002). The identity of fatherhood in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was highly characterized by men as provider and disciplinarian for the family with very little emotional involvement (Rotundo 1985). Kimmel (2006) depicts the 1950’s as a time when manhood was tied to breadwinning and financial providership. In this time, men were also pushed to be involved in daily family life, but not overly involved (Kimmel 2006).

Since the 1970’s, society has been more open to a masculinity that is not as dependent on breadwinning. Unemployment and increases in divorce began to reshape gendered behavior and attitudes (Rotundo 1985). Because many men were unable to be sole providers, a new category of masculine fatherhood emerged, which has been called “Androgynous Fatherhood” or “New Fatherhood” (Rotundo 1985). This nascent category of masculinity calls for men to be active in the daily routines of their children and to become more emotionally expressive (LaRossa 1988; Rotundo 1985). Although this new, caring masculinity does not fully eliminate the importance of employment, as many fathers expand more traditional notions of masculinity to include both
work and childcare (Brandth & Kvande 1998; Doucet 2006). In fact, the nurturing, caring form of masculinity often is thought of as an upper- and middle-class phenomenon (Messner 1993).

The more nurturing category of masculinity may not be fully contained with the upper- and middle-class though. Some economically disadvantaged men are highly motivated and choose to share caregiving (Waller 2009). Caregiving is also a way for many low-income men to restructure the provider role when they are unable to be sole breadwinners for their families. Forste, Bartowski and Jackson (2009) find that low-income unmarried fathers’ views of involvement differ depending on whether the men were close to their own fathers. Low-income unmarried fathers who were not close to their own fathers viewed fatherhood as breadwinning. In contrast, low-income unmarried fathers who were close to their own fathers highly valued nurturing and teaching their children about morals. Unlike many men who have no role models for fatherhood (Daly 1993), these low-income fathers clearly valued the supportive, nurturing relationships that they shared with their own fathers and sought to pursue similar relationships with their own children. Other research, on low-income fathers, discusses the importance of “being there” for their children, providing stability, being a teacher or role model, and emphasizing physical and emotional interaction (Hamer 2001; Summers, Boller, Schiffman & Raikes 2006). The research on fatherhood shows how closely a man’s social class can influence what category of masculinity men may strive towards, upper and middle class men may be more capable of pushing for an expanded dominant masculinity that includes both breadwinning and nurturing, whereas working-class or low-income fathers may replace the masculine component of breadwinning with the new nurturing component.
Violent, Abusive, and Controlling Behavior

Domination, control, and violence are also key dimensions to men’s masculine identities. In fact, Messerschmidt (1993, 2000) argues that violence is a key component of masculinity, as it provides a way for men to prove their manhood to each other. Masculine violence typically is between men only, but can coincide with male violence towards women. Mullins (2006) takes an in-depth look at masculinity and violence, by using unique data collected in multiple studies of criminally involved Blacks in Saint Louis. Mullins finds that dominance over others, typically achieved through violence, is a key aspect of the street masculinity. Violence is a way for these men to gain independence and self-control. Of particular interest is how the men connected the breadwinning component of dominant masculinity to their own lives. Many of these men understood the social pressure to work a legitimate job, but they needed to revise their vision of masculinity because they did not have the available resources, such as education and gainful employment, to achieve this category of masculinity (Mullins 2006, pg. 61). Their revised masculinity centered on independence, violence, and the objectification of women. Totten (2003) finds a similar reconstruction of masculinity among his sample of thirty, mostly White, Canadian youth, who abused their girlfriends. Twenty-nine of these young males found nothing wrong with their behavior and justified their actions by claiming that their girlfriends “failed to fulfill the obligations of what many referred to as the ‘good bitch’ ” (Totten 2003, pg. 78). The youths’ violent behavior often coincided with strong patriarchal gender ideologies. Similar to the Mullins’ criminally involved sample, Totten’s abusive sample was unable to achieve material, breadwinning success and therefore reconstructed a violent category of masculinity.

Violent masculine behavior is also present in men who have economic and material success (Messerschmidt 1993). For some men, hyper-masculinity may simply be a way to enact
power and dominance. In experimental research of mostly White, undergraduate students, Parrot and Zeichner (2003) find that men with high hyper-masculine personalities were more easily provoked and showed higher levels of physical aggression towards women than low hyper-masculine students. Additionally, hyper-masculine undergraduate men were significantly more likely to have higher levels of gender mistrust.

Fragile Families Research Using Dimensions of Masculinity

The above section focused on the use of the dimensions of masculinity in prior research. In the following section, I specifically outline how past researchers using the Fragile Families data has examined masculinity in their scholarly work. I show how past Fragile Families research has examined rationality and emotional suppression; gendered expectations about attitudes and behaviors; breadwinning, caregiving and attitudes towards fathering; and violent, abusive and controlling behavior. Appendix A illustrates a list of studies addressing the dimensions of masculinity used in the current study separated by relationship and parenting literatures. I focus here on how the previous studies in this table have used the dimensions of masculinity and why they may not be the best ways to operationalize masculinity.

{Insert Appendix A Here}

From Appendix A, we can see that very little research uses the rationality and emotional suppression measures. Rationality is only as an isolated control variable in two studies. From Appendix A, one can also see that men’s connection to the economy is highly used when analyzing the Fragile Families data; providing evidence that many researchers are focused on one key dimension of masculinity, breadwinning. Additionally, the majority of researchers emphasize emotional availability to the baby’s mother, gender role attitudes, and violent behaviors. The above measures often occur together in regression models, but as separate and
isolated mediators and moderators. Closer examination of these studies also indicate that emotional availability and violent behaviors are used as indicators of relationships quality (Carlson et al. 2004; Harknett 2008; Osborne et al. 2007; Wilcox & Wolfinger 2007) and father’s risk factors for impeding healthy relationships (Waller & Swisher 2006), rather than being used as dimensions of masculinity. So even in studies that use the same masculinity measures, researchers may not be addressing masculinity. The examination of previous studies that include the dimensions of masculinity highlight two critical limitations of studies using the Fragile Families data. First, to date, no study using the Fragile Families dataset has combined all of measures of masculinity that I use in this study. In addition, very little research has examined fathers’ emotional control, supportive attitudes towards fathering, and emotional abuse. Therefore, these studies exclude key components of masculinity. Second, the few dimensions of masculinity that are examined typically are used as single item mediators and moderators. While examining single items is a common technique it provides only an incomplete picture of masculinity. By using cluster analytical techniques, I am capable of providing a more complete, holistic account of masculinity. I will be the first to analyze quantitatively whether these variables work jointly as a whole and cohere together to form multiple categories of masculinity.

I conclude this section by reiterating that while heavily used, no research has grouped the Fragile Families data to see how specific qualities cleave together to create multiple categories of masculinity.

Masculinity Hypotheses

Table 4.1 presents a graphical representation of my expectations for how I see the different dimensions combining to form the three masculinity categories and the expectations for the distributions of institutional participation across each masculinity category. The first
conceptual category contains my hypotheses for the contemporary fathers. Consistent with Henwood and Procter’s (2003) and Rotundo’s (1985) portrayal of contemporary masculinity, I expect that fathers in this category will most strongly value emotional availability to their baby’s mother and egalitarian gender role attitudes. I hypothesize that men in the contemporary masculinity category will be most likely to have an equitable distribution of family finances, with the baby’s mother’s earnings being more similar to the father’s earnings than in any of the other masculinity categories. I hypothesize that gender mistrust, number of disagreements, and abusive behavior towards women will not be associated with the “contemporary” masculinity category, because contemporary fathers should be the most egalitarian and nurturing.

{Insert Table 4.1 Here}

The second category consists of my hypotheses for traditional masculinity. In accordance with Townsend’s (2002) “package deal,” traditional fathers should be associated with the highest values of supportive attitudes towards fathering and marriage. Because the dominant archetype of masculinity puts forth the expectation that men should be rational and emotionally suppressive (Seidler 1989; Jordan & Cowan 1995; Maccoby 1998), I hypothesize that traditional fathers will have the most emotional control. Furthermore, traditional fathers are hypothesized to have the least egalitarian gender role attitudes.

Hyper-masculine is the last category of masculinity. I hypothesize that fathers in this category will be more likely to display violent or controlling behaviors (Connell 2005; Messerschmidt 1993, 2000; Mullins 2006). Specifically, I predict that these fathers will be the most likely to exert controlling behavior over women, distrust women, and have the most disagreements about family and social life with their baby’s mother. I also hypothesize that this
category of fathers will have the least amount of emotional control, or in other words, will be the most impulsive category of fathers.

Institutional Participation and Race Hypotheses

I now present my hypotheses for the relationships between social institutions and the multiple categories of masculinity. Connell (2005) argues that hyper-masculine fathers reconfigure traditional masculinity in a context of poverty. Therefore, I hypothesize economic hardship will be associated most strongly with the hyper-masculine category of masculinity. Additionally, I predict that hyper-masculine fathers will also have the lowest educational attainment.

Consistent with Nock’s (1998) and Townsend’s (2002) argument that marriage is a key component of traditional masculinity, I hypothesize that marriage will be associated with the traditional category of masculinity more than the contemporary or hyper-masculine categories. Additionally, marriage will be associated more strongly with contemporary fathers than with hyper-masculine fathers.

Hyper-masculinity is associated with violent behavior (Mullins 2006; Parrot & Zeichner 2003; Totten 2003); therefore, I hypothesize the hyper-masculine category to be associated the most strongly with fathers who have ever been incarcerated. Additionally, the contemporary category of masculinity will have a lower percentage of fathers who have ever been incarcerated compared to the traditional category of masculinity.

Research finds that the military is a way for men from disadvantaged backgrounds to increase their economic position (Lundquist 2004; Teachman 2007). Therefore, I expect military participation to be associated most likely with traditional or contemporary masculinity.
Bartowski (2000) argues that religiosity is associated with competing views of masculinity. Some religious men value aggression, strength, and innate gender differences, while other religious men believe in the importance of expressing their emotions and gender egalitarianism (Bartowski 2000). Grasmick, Wilcox, and Bird’s (1990) research shows a positive association between religious fundamentalism and maintaining patriarchic households. Additional research finds that men who had a greater feminine gender orientation are more likely to participate in religion (Thompson 1991; Thompson & Remmes 2002). Masculine identities can also lessen men’s participation in religion, because men often view the church and religion as feminine domains (Lummis 2004). Therefore, I draw competing hypotheses because religion is associated with multiple views of masculinity. On one hand, fathers classified in the contemporary category of masculinity may be the most likely to be religious because of their emotional availability and gender egalitarianism. On the other hand, fathers classified in the hyper-masculine category may have the greatest religiosity because of their aggressive behavior and patriarchic attitudes.

In chapter two, I discussed the multiple reasons for why Black and White fathers may have different forms of masculinity. Briefly reviewing the literature, past research has suggested that the historical and cultural context of African-Americans has placed them in a different position in terms of family structure and men’s capacity for breadwinning. Pagnini and Morgan (1996) argue that non-marital births do not produce the same stigma among Blacks as it does to Whites. Additionally, Black families focus more on consanguinal ties over conjugal ties and emphasize matrilineal family structures over patrilineal structures (Sudarkasa 1998). Black men have often been the last hired and first fired (Holzer 2009; Rubin 1995). Black men often struggle with tenuous breadwinning capabilities partially caused by deindustrialization and racial
discrimination in hiring processes (Pager and Karafin 2009). Alternatively, Whites often do not even think of themselves as belonging to a race (Lewis 2004). Whites, men in particular, have often held a position of privilege that allows their race to be invisible (Lewis 2004). But, economic changes and an influx of Asian and Hispanic immigrant sparked the creation of a new ethnic identity, the European-American (McDermott & Samson 2005; Rubin 1992, 1995). Taking Anderson’s (1989) ethnographic report of young Black urban males and Hamer’s (2001) examination of Black nonresidential fathers into account, I hypothesize that the highest percentage of Black fathers will fall into the hyper-masculine model, followed by the new father model. The lowest percentage of Black fathers will be in the traditional masculinity category. Following Townsend (2002) and Henwood and Procter (2003), I hypothesize that the highest percentage of White fathers will be in the traditional model, followed by the new father model. The lowest percentage of White fathers will be in the hyper-masculine model.

Considering the race literature, I now present my hypotheses for whether race differences will occur within each category of masculinity among the social institution measures. Because Black men face larger barriers to gainful employment (Pager and Karafin 2009), I hypothesize that Black fathers with have greater economic disadvantage across all categories of masculinity than White fathers. I anticipate that White fathers will be more likely than Black fathers in the same masculinity category to be married at the time of their baby’s birth. I hypothesize this because of less stigma being associated with Black non-marital births than White non-marital births (Pagnini & Morgan 1996), and Blacks lower likelihood of forming marital unions (Carlson, McLanahan & England 2004; Harknett & McLanahan 2004). I hypothesize that Black fathers will be more likely than White men in the same masculinity category to have ever been incarcerated, as Pettit and Western (2004) argue that incarceration is
becoming a normative life course transition for many Black men. Participation in the military can increase Black men’s economic opportunities (Lundquist 2004). I previously hypothesized that military participation would be more likely to be associated with traditional and contemporary masculinity; therefore I hypothesize that no race differences in military participation will occur within these two forms of masculinity. Because I hypothesized that hyper-masculinity would not be associated with military participation, I also expect that no race differences will occur within hyper-masculine fathers. As discussed earlier in chapter two, hyper-masculinity is based on a masculinity constructed within poverty (Connell 2005). Therefore, I anticipate no race differences in education among hyper-masculine men. But, I hypothesize that White men will have greater education than Black men in both the contemporary and traditional categories of masculinity. Previous research shows that Blacks are more likely to participate in religion than Whites are and that religion is highly important to many Black Americans (Ellison 1993; Ellison & Sherkat 1995; Taylor et al. 1996). Therefore, I hypothesize that Blacks will be more likely to be religious regardless of masculinity category.

Data and Method

I use data from the baseline and the one-year follow-up surveys of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study for this research. Baseline interviews were conducted between 1998 and 2000 and one-year follow-up interviews took place between 1999 and 2002. The data contain reports from both the mother and the father collected as soon after the baby’s birth as possible. The majority of the baseline data was collected within three days of the child’s birth, but there are some instances of mothers’ interviews not occurring until 112 days after birth and fathers’ interviews not occurring until 381 days after birth (Bendheim-Thomas Center for
Research on Child Wellbeing, Princeton University, 2008). Parents were then re-interviewed when the child was approximately one year old.

While the Fragile Families data can be weighted to be representative of nonmarital births in U.S. urban areas with populations over 200,000 (Reichman et al. 2001), I do not use weights in this research. I have elected not to use the weighted sample because my research is more concerned with describing a population of fathers rather than with the generalizability of my results. Additionally, I have chosen to utilize all 20 cities in the study rather than using only the 16 cities that make up the national sample. I elected this option in order to maximize the numbers of fathers in my study.

The Fragile Families Study contains data on 4,989 births. I restrict my sample to include fathers with interviews from both baseline and the one-year follow-up, reducing my sample by 1,519 fathers. Furthermore, I only include Black and White fathers because my theoretical focus is interested in differences between those two races, restricting my sample to 2,139 cases. Additionally, some of the variables I use to construct the masculinity measures were asked only in 18 of the 20 cities, further reducing cases by 441. Missing information on the masculinity construct measures further reduces my sample by 109, leaving me with an effective sample size of 1,589.

I mainly use data from the father reports because my focal interest is in identifying how men understand their own experiences, but there are a few instances, such as measures that identify violence and emotional availability to the mother, in which the mother reports had to be used because fathers were not asked about their own behavior.
Measures

Masculinity Measures

Supportive attitudes toward fathering. Supportive attitudes towards fathering will be measured using three items. Higher values will indicate that fathering is an important aspect of their lives. Questions in this category are baseline measures of how strongly the father agrees with the following statements: “being a father and raising children is one of the most fulfilling experiences a man can have,” “I want people to know that I have a new child,” and “not being a part of my child's life would be one of the worst things that could happen to me.” Higher values will indicate that fathering is an important aspect of their lives. The final index ranges from 3-12 and the Cronbach’s alpha is 0.66.²

Emotional control. A six-item index will be used to measure father’s emotional control. This index derives from an abbreviated form of Dickman’s (1990) impulsivity index. At the one-year follow up survey, fathers were asked how strongly they agree with the following statements with four responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree: “I will often say whatever comes into my head without thinking first,” “often, I do not spend enough time thinking over a situation before I act,” “I often say and do things without considering the consequences,” “I often get into trouble because I don’t think before I act,” “many times, the plans I make do not work out because I haven’t gone over them carefully enough in advance,” and “I often make up my mind without taking the time to consider the situation from all angles.” These questions were only asked in 18 cities. The item responses were summed so that higher scores will reflect higher levels of emotional control. The index ranges from 6-24 and the Cronbach’s alpha is 0.84

² In earlier models, I created two indices that measured providing as the most important aspect and caregiving as the most important aspect of fathering. These measures were skewed and altered the clusters in such a way that they essentially became uninterpretable.
Emotional availability to baby’s mother: I measure father’s emotional availability with three items from the mother’s baseline survey. Mothers were asked how the baby’s father behaves towards you regarding if he is “fair and willing to compromise when you have a disagreement,” if he “expresses affection or love for you,” and if he “encourages you to do things that are important to you.” The index ranges from 3-9 and the Cronbach’s alpha is 0.56.

Egalitarian gender role attitudes: I measure egalitarian gender role attitudes using two separate items. Fathers were asked how strongly they agree with the following statements ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (4): “the important decisions in the family should be made by the man of the house” and “fathers play a more important role in raising boys than in raising girls.” Both of these items were reverse coded so that higher values would indicate greater egalitarian attitudes.

Mother’s relative earnings: The mother’s relative earnings measure represents the mother’s proportion of the father’s earnings. Both mother’s and father’s earnings are measured at the first year follow-up interview. The formula used for this measure is mother’s income/father’s income.

Gender mistrust. Gender mistrust is a summed measured of two items with four responses ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). The first item is “in a dating relationship, a woman is largely out to take advantage of a man.” The second item is “women cannot be trusted to be faithful.” The index ranges from 2-8 and has a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.66.

---

3 I also attempted to create a gender role attitudes index that would have included the following measures: the important decisions in the family should be made by the man of the house, it is much better for everyone if the man earns the main living and the woman takes care of the home and family, it is more important for a man to spend time with his family than to work as many hours as he can, and fathers play a more important role in raising boys than in raising girls, but when placed together these items only had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.33. Additionally, factor analysis indicated that these items could not be split into two constructs. Therefore, I had to include separate items to measure gender role attitudes.
Abusive behavior. Abusive behavior is a summed index of six items from the mother’s one-year follow-up interview that measures how often the father was physically and emotionally violent towards the mother. The six items are: “how often does the baby’s father slap or kick you,” “hit you with his fist or an object that could hurt you,” “tries to make you have sex or do sexual things that you do not want to do,” “tries to keep you from seeing or talking with your friends and family,” “tries to prevent you from going to work or school,” and “withholds money, makes you ask for money or takes your money”. Each item had three responses of often (1), sometimes (2), never (3). All items were reverse coded so that higher values would be indicative of greater controlling behavior\(^4\). The final index ranges from 6-17 with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.71.

Disagreements. Disagreements is a summed index of six items taken from the father’s baseline interview of how often did the father disagree with the mother about “money,” “spending time together,” “sex,” “the pregnancy,” “alcohol or drug use,” and “being faithful.” Item responses were often (1), sometimes (2), and never (3) and each item was reverse coded so that higher values would indicate more disagreements. The final index ranged from 6-18 and had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.62.

Race and Institutional Participation Measures

Father’s race: I use a dummy variable to distinguish between black non-Hispanic fathers (1) and white non-Hispanic fathers (0).

Economic hardship. Fathers were asked if in the past 12 months “did you receive free food or meals,” “did your child/children went hungry,” “did you go hungry,” “did you not pay the full amount of rent or mortgage payments,” “were you evicted from your home or apartment

\(^4\) In earlier analyses I attempted to separate physical and emotional violence, but the physical violence measure was skewed with only a few cases indicating the highest amounts of physical violence. Therefore, I elected to combine both physical violence and emotional controlling behavior.
for not paying the rent or mortgage,” “was service turned off by the gas or electric company, or did the oil company not deliver oil,” “was service was disconnected by the telephone company because payments were not made,” “did you borrow money from friends or family to help pay bills,” “did you move in with other people even for a little while because of financial problems,” “did you stay at a shelter, in an abandoned building, an automobile or any other place not meant for regular housing even for one night”, and “was there anyone in your household who needed to see a doctor or go to the hospital but couldn’t go because of cost.” The twelve items in this index are taken from the “Basic Needs – Ability to Meet Expenses” section of the Survey on Income and Program Participation (SIPP) 1996 Panel Wave 8 Adult Well-Being Topical Module Questionnaire (Survey on Income and Program Participation, 1998) and the 1997 & 1999 New York City Social Indicators Survey (SIS) (Social Indicators Survey Center, 1997 & 1999) (Bendheim-Thomas Center for Research on Child Wellbeing, Princeton University, 2005). Because eighty-eight percent of the sample did not experience any of the twelve items, economic hardship is a dummy variable indicating whether the father experienced one or more of the hardship measures (1) or experienced none of the hardship measures (0).

*Marriage.* Marriage is measured using a dummy variable whether the father is married to the baby’s mother at baseline (1) versus not being married (0).

*Prison.* I measure incarceration history as a dummy variable indicating whether the father has ever spent time in a correctional institution. I use a constructed measure from the Fragile Families data that combines responses of father and mother reports of ever being incarcerated by the one-year follow-up interview. I use this approach rather than using only the father’s report to account for the sensitivity in reporting imprisonment and to account for as many cases of incarceration as possible.
Military. Participation in the military is a dummy variable indicating that the father has ever served in the military. Unfortunately, I cannot separate current versus past participation because of too few cases of fathers currently in the military.

Education. I use four dummy variables to measure education. The responses are less than high school, high school, some college, and college or graduate school.

Religion. Religious participation is measured by how often the father goes to religious services. The responses range from never (0) to once a week or more (4).

Analytic Strategy

The two-step cluster analysis procedure was used to create categorizations of masculinity using SPSS (release 18.0). Cluster analysis is an exploratory technique designed to create homogeneous groupings of cases, which can then be used to develop typologies within complex data (Aldenderfer & Blashfield 1984). Cluster analysis is similar to other statistical techniques, but does have significant differences. Unlike discriminant analysis, which determines a subset of variables from pre-determined groups, cluster analysis starts with undifferentiated data and then creates groups based on similarities within the data (Gore 2000). Additionally, cluster analysis creates groupings of people based on variables; whereas factor analysis creates groupings of variables (Gore 2000). The most frequent use of cluster analysis is developing typologies where one does not yet exist (Gore 2000). Cluster analysis is an appropriate analytical tool because previous research has yet to assess quantitatively the multiple ways in which masculinity can be classified. Cluster analysis is also a person-centered approach to research. The person-centered approach focuses on the relationships between individuals, compared to a variable-centered approach that looks for relationships among variables (Muthén & Muthén 2000). Because cluster analysis is a person-centered approach, that classifies groupings of people rather than
groupings of variables, I will be able to take a more holistic view of fathers in this study compared to previous research using the Fragile Families data set.

The two-step procedure was selected because of its ability to handle very large datasets. The two-step process begins with a pre-cluster step that creates many small sub-clusters, and then the sub-clusters are clustered into the designated number of clusters using a hierarchical clustering method (Amato & Hohmann-Marriott, 2007; SPSS Corporation, 2001). The log-likelihood distance measure was used for each step. The cluster distance measure is the decrease in log likelihood that would occur if two clusters were combined into a single cluster (Amato & Hohmann-Marriott, 2007 pg. 627). The distance measure indicates how separate each cluster is from another cluster. Distance measures can also be thought of as how dissimilar clusters are from each other, for instance if you had two identical clusters, their distance measure would be zero (Aldenderfer & Blashfield 1984). A larger distance measure will indicate that the clusters are more different from each other than similar to each other. Because I am looking for clusters that have more differences than similarities, I want as large a distance measure as possible. The two-step cluster analysis method also calculates the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), which is used to find the most favorable number of clusters. In general, the BIC can be thought of as a model fit statistic, or a measure that can help select the best model. The optimal cluster model will have the largest increase in distance between cluster centers and will have a low BIC value. Finally, all measures of masculinity have been standardized to make sure all variables have the same weighted value when being placed into the clusters.
Results

Cluster Analysis

In the following sections I present the results for the cluster analysis as well as the descriptive results that breakdown each masculinity category by race and participation in social institutions. I first provide information on the selection of the variables and the model fit statistics for the cluster analysis to show the rationale for why the specific variables and masculinity clusters were chosen. Next, I address the differing categories of masculinity and will discuss the composition of the chosen categories. Then, I speak to how tight each distribution of variables are within each masculinity category and whether the categories are more similar or dissimilar to one another. Examining all of these aspects allows me to determine how different these categories of masculinity really are from each other. Last, I examine how each masculinity category differs by institutional participation and race, establishing if certain characteristics of fathers draw them into a specific category of masculinity. This study is the first to empirically test if masculinity can be grouped into multiple categories, therefore full descriptive information is needed about each category of masculinity in order to gain the most insight into the multiple masculinities.

Variable Selection and Model Fit

My first major research question examines whether men can be grouped into multiple categories of masculinity. Answering this question required that a cluster analysis be performed on the nine masculinity variables described earlier: supportive attitudes towards fathering, emotional control, emotional availability to baby’s mother, two egalitarian gender role attitude items, mother’s relative earnings, gender mistrust, abusive behavior, and number of disagreements. I attempted multiple models with other variables such as supportive attitudes
towards marriage, importance of providership and caregiving, and additional indicators of gender role attitudes. However, I excluded these variables because they did not improve the model fit. The exclusion of the supportive attitudes towards marriage and importance of providership and caregiving variables is important, as these were key dimensions of masculinity found in prior literature (Henwood & Procter 2003; Nock 1998; Townsend 2002). Nevertheless, among this sample of urban fathers, these qualities were not significant dimensions of their masculinities. The information presented in the results section describes the clusters that contain the lowest BIC value and highest distance measure for models with three clusters out of all the possible combinations of variables.

Table 4.2 presents the model fit information from the cluster analysis for solutions with 1 – 10 clusters. Again, the optimal number of clusters contains the largest increase in distance between cluster centers, have a large BIC change value, along with a relatively low BIC value. The two cluster model has a ratio of distance measure of 1.64, a BIC value of 7684.37 and a BIC change value of -1140.23. The three cluster model has a ratio of distance measure of 2.12, a BIC value of 7040.07 and a BIC change value of -644.299. Although the lowest BIC value is for the cluster solution with 10 clusters, SPSS selected the three cluster model because of the large change in BIC value and the high ratio of distance measure. Therefore, model fit tests indicate the most optimal number of clusters is three.

Composition of Clusters

Consistent with the prior research guiding this study, the cluster analysis established three categories of masculinity. In the following section, I describe the specific characteristics of each
masculinity category. Figure 4.1 illustrates the results of the cluster analysis, presenting the means of each masculinity measure by masculinity category.

{Insert Figure 4.1 Here}

The first set of bars in Figure 4.1 indicates a masculinity category that has the highest supportive fathering attitudes, emotional control, emotional availability, and the most egalitarian attitudes. These fathers also have the lowest relative income, abusive behavior, disagreements and gender mistrust. I classify the first cluster of fathers into the contemporary masculinity category. The contemporary category of masculinity makes up the largest portion of the sample at 49.8 percent (n=791).

My hypotheses for the first category are supported partially. The first category does show a group of fathers who most strongly value emotional availability to their baby’s mother and egalitarian gender role attitudes compared to the other clusters. I also find support for my hypothesis that these men would not be associated with gender mistrust, number of disagreements, or abusive behavior. Inconsistent with my hypothesis, the first category of fathers were not the most likely to have an equitable distribution of earnings. Also inconsistent with my hypothesis, the first category of fathers also had the highest average emotional control compared to the other two categories.

The second set of bars in Figure 4.1 indicates a masculinity category that has a mean between the other two categories on six of the nine measures. This category has the lowest value of supportive fathering attitudes, the least egalitarian attitudes about important decisions being made by the man and highest number of disagreements. I characterize this group of fathers as those with traditional masculinity. Fathers who are classified in the traditional masculinity category make up 40.1% (n=637) of the sample. I classified this group of fathers as traditional
based less on their actual characteristics, but more so in comparison with the other two categories of masculinity. The other two categories coincided more fully with my hypotheses than this category. However, I believe that the traditional label still is appropriate for this group of fathers. Traditional masculinity is associated with the dominant, socially normative version of masculinity, so it is not unreasonable that many of the measures would be less extreme than those in the other categories of masculinity.

My hypotheses for the second cluster of fathers were the least supported of all the clusters. In fact, the supportive attitudes towards marriage measure was not even included in the cluster analysis because it worsened the model fit. I find only partial support for my hypothesis that the second cluster of fathers would have traditional gender role attitudes. I had predicted this cluster to have the highest average supportive attitudes towards fathering, but the second cluster had the lowest average supportive attitudes. Additionally, these fathers did not have the highest average emotional control, but rather had an average between the other two categories. Overall, the main characteristic of this category is that the majority of the means fall between the other two categories. Fathers classified in the traditional masculinity category seem to display a more complicated pattern of masculinity in comparison to the other two masculinity categories.

The last set of bars in Figure 4.1 shows a category of masculinity that has the lowest average emotional control, emotional availability, and least egalitarian attitudes towards fathers being more important in raising boys rather than girls. This category also has the highest values of mother’s relative income, controlling behavior, and gender mistrust. I classify this group as the hyper-masculine category of masculinity. Hyper-masculine fathers account for smallest category accounting for only 10.1% (n=161) of the sample.
I find the most support for my hypotheses for the third category. As hypothesized, these fathers have the highest average abusive behavior and gender mistrust. Also validating my hypothesis, the third cluster of fathers also has the least emotional control of all the categories. Inconsistent with my hypothesis, these fathers do not have the highest number of disagreements.

Figure 4.2 presents the masculinity categories by mean masculinity measures. I show the second figure to provide a visual representation of each category’s shape and to show how the categories compare to one another. Here we can see more clearly that the contemporary fathers had positive z-scores on the first five dimensions of masculinity, whereas the traditional and hyper-masculine categories had mostly negative z-scores on these dimensions. The opposite is true for the last four measures. Contemporary fathers display negative z-scores for these measures, compared to mostly positive z-scores the traditional and hyper-masculine fathers.

{Insert Figure 4.2 Here}

Variability Within and Potential Movement into other Masculinity Categories

The above sections gave insights into the composition of the masculinity categorizations. Here, I first address how tightly distributed each masculinity dimension is across all three categorizations to determine whether there is a lot of variability within the category or whether the category is a cohesive group. Conceptually, knowing the amount of variation within the categories may provide insights into the permeability of the boundaries, or whether some fluctuation may occur within the categories. Large standard deviations across multiple dimensions may indicate less predictability within that masculinity category. Wide variation in the categories may show a lack of agreement for the placement of all fathers into a certain category of masculinity; such that some men who are classified in the traditional masculinity category would be more appropriately placed in the contemporary or hyper-masculine category.
I am unable to address analytically the potential movement between categories; all I can do at this stage is to speculate as to what the variation may mean for the accuracy of masculinity measures.

Table 4.3 presents the means and standard deviations for all masculinity measures by cluster, as well as the overall mean and standard deviations for the entire sample. The contemporary masculinity category has the smallest standard deviations on seven of the nine dimensions of masculinity. Therefore, this group of fathers is tightly bound around the average values of the masculinity measures. Additionally for each of the masculinity measures, the contemporary fathers had smaller standard deviations than the sample as a whole.

{Insert Table 4.3 Here}

While the contemporary fathers appear to be cohesive, the same is not true of the traditional or the hyper-masculine fathers. Traditional fathers have standard deviations greater than the entire sample on three of the nine measures. But, these fathers also have smaller standard deviations on four masculinity measures. The traditional masculinity cluster appears to adhere closely together on mother’s relative income, abusive behavior, and gender mistrust, but also has large variability on fathering attitudes, emotional control, and number of disagreements. Fathers who are categorized in the hyper-masculine category show the greatest variation across measures. These fathers have the largest standard deviations on eight of the nine masculinity measures, all of which are larger than the standard deviations for the entire sample.

Four main points summarize the cluster analysis results. First, urban fathers do cluster along three different categories of masculinity, which is consistent with past research. My results suggest the occurrence of multiple masculinities in modern U.S. society, rather than one ahistorical idealized model of masculinity. Second, two diverging masculinities appear in the
contemporary and hyper-masculine categories of masculinity with traditional masculinity falling in between on the majority of the masculinity dimensions. The two diverging masculinities are in opposition to one another, with contemporary fathers coalescing on many positive, or beneficial, domains of masculinity and hyper-masculine fathers combining on many negative, potentially harmful, domains. Third, contemporary fathers have the least amount of variability. The contemporary category of masculinity appears to be the group that coheres most strongly together. Fourth, traditional and hyper-masculine fathers appear to be the men who may be more likely to “spill over” into another category of masculinity because of the large variation across the measures of masculinity. Put in other words, large variation may indicate that some of the fathers in these two categories could potentially be included in another category of masculinity or may suggest that these traditional men may be more likely to change their masculine identity over the life course or in light of their changed circumstances. ANOVA tests (results not shown) indicate that similar results, or non-significant differences, are found between traditional and hyper-masculine fathers on the number of disagreements and important decisions should be made by the man of the house. No significant differences are found between contemporary and traditional fathers on mother’s relative income and abusive behavior. These results suggest that traditionally masculine men may “spill over” into either the contemporary or hyper-masculine categories, because of the similarities between traditional and contemporary men and the similarities between traditional and hyper-masculine men.

Race and Institutional Participation Breakdowns between Masculinity Categories

I now turn to the descriptive results to see if the masculinity categories differ by race and institutional participation. I first turn my attention to the race breakdowns between each cluster. Black fathers make up 65 percent of my sample. Black fathers appear to be over-represented in
both the hyper-masculine and traditional masculinity categories. I find significantly more Black fathers in the hyper-masculine (79.5%) and traditional (75.8%) categories compared to the contemporary masculinity category (52.3%); although, hyper masculine and traditional fathers do not significantly differ from each other in terms of race (results not shown).

Table 4.4 presents the descriptive characteristics of each masculinity category by social institution participation broken down by race. The categories significantly differ by economic hardship, education, marital status, and incarceration history. But, masculinity does not differ by military experience or religious participation. I first will discuss the overall demographic composition of the masculinity categories and then examine race differences within each category of masculinity.

{Insert Table 4.4 Here}

As hypothesized, contemporary fathers have the lowest average economic hardship for both Black and White fathers with 9.4 and 2.7 percent experiencing economic hardship, respectively. Race differences in economic hardship were also found among traditional fathers, over 19 percent of Black traditional fathers versus 6 percent of White traditional fathers experienced hardship. No race differences in economic hardship were found among hyper-masculine fathers. I also find that contemporary fathers have the highest average education with 8.9 percent of Black contemporary fathers and 38.7 percent of White contemporary fathers completing college. These fathers are also distinguished by the lowest percentage of fathers who have ever been imprisoned. The contemporary category of masculinity also has the highest percentage of married fathers with 24 percent and 68 percent of Black and White contemporary fathers married to their baby’s mother at the time of the child’s birth. This finding is inconsistent with my hypothesis that traditional fathers would be most likely to be married.
Turning to the hyper-masculine clusters, the results indicate the polar opposite of the contemporary fathers and support all my hypotheses for hyper-masculine fathers. Hyper-masculine fathers have the greatest economic hardship with almost a quarter of Black and White fathers experiencing hardship. Alternatively, they have the least amount of education. Hyper-masculine fathers are also the least likely to be married currently. Additionally, these fathers have the largest percentage of fathers who have a history of incarceration with 50 percent of Black hyper-masculine and 70 percent of White hyper-masculine father ever being incarcerated.

I find that the traditional fathers fall between the contemporary and hyper-masculine categories of masculinity, similar to the compositional findings. Traditional fathers are in the middle on all of the institutional participation measures. However, traditional fathers are significantly different from contemporary and hyper-masculine fathers on all participation measures except having some college (they differ only from hyper-masculine on this measure), military experience, and religious participation. Although, the traditional category of masculinity lies in the middle, this group is a distinctively different category when looking at the distributions across institutional ties. Overall, the main picture indicates two diverging categories across the socio-demographic characteristics with contemporary fathers having more advantages and hyper-masculine fathers having more disadvantages.

_Race Differences within Masculinity Categories_

In order to test my hypotheses about race, my unit of analysis needs to shift from masculinity categories to fathers. Therefore, I have to examine race differences within masculinity category. As stated earlier, I find significant race differences across the masculinity clusters. My results from this analysis also point to significant race differences within the categories of masculinity. Table 4.4 presents the results for the within masculinity race analyses.
I find only partial support for my hypothesis for economic hardship. Both contemporary and traditional Black fathers are significantly more likely to experience economic hardship than White contemporary or traditional fathers are. Nine percent of contemporary Black fathers experience at least one economic hardship compared to only three percent of White contemporary fathers. Almost 20 percent of traditional Black fathers are economically disadvantaged, while only six percent of traditional White fathers are disadvantaged. Interestingly, Black and White hyper-masculine fathers do not differ, with approximately 25 percent of both races experiencing hardship.

I find partial support for my hypotheses concerning education. As hypothesized, I find no race differences for hyper-masculine fathers. Although, significantly more Black contemporary fathers had less than a high school education than White contemporary fathers, with 18 percent and eight percent, respectively. Additionally, more contemporary and traditional Black fathers had a high school education compared to contemporary and traditional White fathers. I find no significant race differences for fathers who completed some college. Among those who completed college or graduate school, there are significantly more White contemporary and traditional fathers than Black contemporary and traditional fathers. Importantly, over one-third of the contemporary White fathers completed college compared to only nine percent of contemporary Black fathers; whereas, seventeen percent of traditional White fathers versus only four percent of traditional Black fathers finished college.

My hypotheses for race differences in marriage also found only partial support as no significant differences occurred among hyper-masculine fathers. Contemporary White fathers are significantly more likely to be married than contemporary Black fathers are, with 68 percent and 24 percent married at the time of birth, respectively. Similar results hold for traditional
fathers. Almost half of White traditional fathers were married at birth, while only 16 percent of Black traditional fathers were married.

Again, I find only partial support for my hypotheses about incarceration history. Consistent with my hypotheses, contemporary and traditional Black fathers are substantially more likely to have ever been incarcerated than contemporary and traditional White fathers. Although I expected Black fathers to be more likely than White fathers to have ever been incarcerated across all three masculinity categories, I find that White hyper-masculine fathers are significantly more likely to have ever been incarcerated with almost 70 percent compared to 50 percent for Black hyper-masculine fathers.

The only significant race difference for military participation occurred within the traditional category of masculinity. Eighteen percent of traditional White fathers compared to eleven percent of traditional Black fathers were ever in the military, which is statistically significant. This provides limited evidence to support my hypothesis that there would be no race differences in military participation among any of the masculinity categories.

Finally, I find no support for my hypotheses that Black fathers would have greater religious participation. The average amount of religious participation does not differ among Blacks or Whites within any category of masculinity.

To conclude, I find many significant race differences among contemporary and traditional categories of masculinity. Among the contemporary and traditional fathers, Blacks and Whites significantly differ in economic hardship, percent married, percent ever incarcerated, and education. Contemporary and traditional Black fathers are much more likely to experience economic hardship, incarceration, lower education and non-marriage than contemporary and traditional White fathers are. Critically, only one significant race difference occurs within the
hyper-masculine category; with *White* fathers more likely to have ever been incarcerated than Black fathers. These results suggest that hyper-masculine White fathers may be more similar to hyper-masculine Black fathers than to other White fathers.

**Conclusions and Discussion**

Overall, the cluster analysis presents a portrayal of urban fathers who fall into three categories of masculinity. On the one hand, the results point to a group of fathers characterized by what may be considered “positive” aspects of masculinity, i.e. those that are emotionally available to their baby’s mothers, have supportive attitudes towards fathering, have few disagreements with their baby’s mother, have little controlling behavior, and are not distrustful of women. On the other hand, the results show a group of fathers distinguished by what some may consider “negative” aspects of masculinity, i.e. those who exert controlling behavior towards women, distrust women, and show little signs of emotional control or emotional availability. I also find that fathers within the traditional masculinity category show the most complicated pattern of masculinity, with most values falling between those that typify the contemporary and hyper-masculine categories and showing great variability within those dimensions.

An unanticipated result is the high number, 49.8 percent, of fathers classified in the contemporary masculinity category. I expected that the majority of fathers would be placed in the traditional masculinity category. Because the contemporary category has limited variability within the masculinity dimensions, these results suggest that within this specific sample of urban fathers, a distinct sizeable group has a greater number of “positive” aspects of masculinity than other groups of fathers. A major contribution stemming from this chapter is that the traditional, hegemonic ideal of masculinity is currently a smaller proportion of fathers than the nascent type
of masculinity that incorporates both feminine and masculine identities. These results indicate that a new hegemonic form of masculinity may be emerging.

Alternatively, the fathers within the traditional masculinity category may be the category with the most potential for movement into other categories. The large standard deviations for traditional fathers on the attitudes towards fathering and emotional control measures suggest that some of these fathers potentially could be classified within the contemporary masculinity category. Although, the large standard deviation on the number of disagreements indicates that some of the fathers in the traditional category could be included in the hyper-masculine category. The fathers in the hyper-masculine category make up the smallest percentage of the sample at only 10 percent and have the largest standard deviations on eight of the nine masculinity measures. Before making conclusive statements about this category of fathers, it would be beneficial to gain a larger sample of men that meet the cluster criteria for this category of masculinity. Although it does appear that a small, but separate group of fathers exists that contain characteristics of masculinity that may be deemed “negative.” These results highlight the importance of recognizing the multi-dimensional nature of masculinity.

After examining the race and socio-demographic differences, the results also indicate two opposing categories with one depicted by “positive” socio-demographic characteristics and one represented by “negative” socio-demographic characteristics. Contemporary fathers not only have the “positive” dimensions of masculinity, they also have the lowest economic hardship, the lowest percentage of fathers with a history of incarceration, are the most likely to be married, and have the highest average education. In contrast, hyper-masculine fathers not only have the “negative” dimensions of masculinity, but they also have the highest economic hardship, are the
least likely to be married, have the most fathers who have histories of incarceration, and have the lowest average education.

My research also finds race differences within each category of masculinity. Importantly, Black fathers who are in the traditional or contemporary masculinity categories are much more likely to lack resources and experience economic oppression than White fathers in those categories are. Black men have a substantively harder time achieving traditional and contemporary masculinity than White men. Significant race gaps in marriage also occur across two of the three categories of masculinities. Consistent with previous research on race differences in marital status (Carlson, McLanahan & England 2004; Harknett & McLanahan 2004; Western & McLanahan 2000), my results find that Blacks are less likely to be married at the baby’s birth. However, my results also show that race does not tell the whole story. Masculinity does matter. White hyper-masculine fathers are no more likely to be married than are Black hyper-masculine fathers.

From a methodological standpoint, one of the most interesting contributions of the current study regards the attitudes towards fathering measures. One of the key premises for performing this study was to argue that there is more to masculinity than Townsend’s (2002) package deal framework, and that not all men see financial providership as the key tenant to being a successfully masculine father. The items available in the Fragile Families data to measure attitudes towards fathering do not appear to be quality indicators. I tried to include measures that focused more directly on whether men feel that financial providership or physical caregiving are more important to fathering, but unfortunately the available items did not sufficiently separate fathers. Approximately 90 percent of fathers within the sample had the highest possible value on both caregiving and providing, thinking that both aspects are very
important to fathering. Researchers must place a greater emphasis on creating more reliable items that can tap into the intricacies of attitudes concerning fatherhood.

Although I have theoretically sound findings, my study does have limitations. I do find multiple categorizations of masculinity, but caution must be taken with these results because of the exploratory nature of cluster analytical techniques. While I have taken every precaution to make these clusters as reliable as possible, future research will need to replicate these findings and continue to develop new ways in which to quantify masculinity.

Another limitation of this study includes potential non-response bias. Although the design of the Fragile Families study intended to gain as much information from as many fathers as possible, not all fathers are captured with this data. Fathers who would be the most likely to fit into the hyper-masculine category may be the least likely to agree to be interviewed or to remain in the study. Furthermore, I may have an over-representation of fathers that fall into the contemporary masculinity category because these men may be the most willing to participate. Coinciding with this, fathers that I have classified as belonging to the traditional masculinity category may be different from traditional men in the entire United States. Because the Fragile Families data set focuses on gaining insight into families with a non-marital birth and those who have greater economic disadvantage, I may be capturing a unique category of men who do not necessarily correspond with a similar notion of “traditional” masculinity in a broader sample. With a more nationally representative sample of men, I might be able to find a more straightforward group of men who more accurately show the hegemonic, idealized, model of masculinity. The key to determining whether this difference exists is to replicate this study across multiple data sets that provide insights into different populations of men.
Table 4.1. Factors Associated with each Conceptual Category of Masculinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Categories of Masculinity</th>
<th>New Father</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Hyper-Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforming to the Package Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive attitudes towards marriage</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive attitudes towards fathering</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of financial providing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional control</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional availability to baby's mother</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian gender role attitudes</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of caregiving</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender mistrust</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence towards women</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of women</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Although these factors could apply to each category of masculinity, categories listed with an asterisk are the most likely to have this factor.*
Table 4.2. Model Fit Information for Cluster Solutions 1 through 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Clusters</th>
<th>Schwarz's Bayesian Criterion (BIC)</th>
<th>BIC Change$^a$</th>
<th>Ratio of Distance Measures$^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8824.593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7684.368</td>
<td>-1140.225</td>
<td>1.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7040.069</td>
<td>-644.299</td>
<td>2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6806.335</td>
<td>-233.734</td>
<td>1.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6626.078</td>
<td>-180.257</td>
<td>1.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6471.457</td>
<td>-154.622</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6329.099</td>
<td>-142.358</td>
<td>1.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6196.557</td>
<td>-132.542</td>
<td>1.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6143.177</td>
<td>-53.379</td>
<td>1.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6106.277</td>
<td>-36.900</td>
<td>1.129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The changes are from the previous number of clusters in the table.

b. The ratios of distance measures are based on the current number of clusters against the previous number of clusters.

High values indicate well separated clusters.
Figure 4.1. Means of Masculinity Measures by Masculinity Categories
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Figure 4.2. Masculinity Categories by Mean Masculinity Measures
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sample Mean</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathering Attitudes</td>
<td>0.12 (0.89)</td>
<td>0.53 (0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Control</td>
<td>0.07 (0.98)</td>
<td>0.47 (0.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Relative Income</td>
<td>0.07 (1.16)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling Behavior</td>
<td>-0.07 (0.92)</td>
<td>-0.32 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Availability</td>
<td>0.24 (0.77)</td>
<td>0.52 (0.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Disagreements</td>
<td>0.01 (0.96)</td>
<td>-0.41 (0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Mistrust</td>
<td>-0.12 (1.00)</td>
<td>-0.52 (0.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagrees that Decisions Should be Made by Man</td>
<td>0.05 (0.98)</td>
<td>0.39 (0.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagrees that Fathers are More Important in Raising Boys than Girls</td>
<td>0.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>0.27 (0.95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Source - Fragile Families and Child-Well Being Data Baseline and First-Year Follow-Up
Table 4.4. Descriptive Characteristics of Institutional Participation by Masculinity Categories and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculinity Categories</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Contemporary (N=791, 48.9%)</th>
<th>Traditional (N=637, 40.1%)</th>
<th>Hyper (N=161, 10.1%)</th>
<th>Significance Test for Difference Between Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Experiencing Economic Hardship</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>9.42 ***</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>19.25 ***</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Married</td>
<td>33.79</td>
<td>23.91 ***</td>
<td>68.17</td>
<td>16.36 ***</td>
<td>50.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Ever Incarcerated</td>
<td>28.19</td>
<td>24.64 ***</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>37.68 **</td>
<td>24.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Ever in the Military</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>10.56 *</td>
<td>17.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Less than High School</td>
<td>23.16</td>
<td>18.36 ***</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>32.09</td>
<td>24.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% High School Graduation</td>
<td>36.94</td>
<td>43.24 ***</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>43.27 **</td>
<td>29.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Some College</td>
<td>25.42</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>28.91</td>
<td>21.12</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% College Graduate</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>8.94 ***</td>
<td>38.73</td>
<td>3.52 ***</td>
<td>16.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Religious Participation</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N's</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

Source - Fragile Families Data Set Baseline and First Year Follow Up

Overall, 64.5% of the sample is Black.

* Significant difference between Black and White fathers within each category at p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

a Significant difference between Contemporary and Traditional Fathers p<0.05
b Significant difference between Contemporary and Hyper-Masculine Fathers p<0.05
c Significant difference between Traditional and Hyper-Masculine Fathers p<0.05
CHAPTER V: MASCULINITY AND RELATIONSHIP TRANSITIONS

Past research on relationship transitions has often focused on socio-demographic factors, such as race, education, age, and previous relationship histories to help explain relationship instability. Studies using the Fragile Families data have expanded these factors to include parents’ attitudes and relationship quality; although, no research has examined directly the correlation between multiple forms of masculinity and relationship stability and transitions. This chapter further extends past research and examines the relationship between masculinity and both relationship stability and relationship transitions. Typically, past research has concentrated on how the masculine ideal of men’s breadwinning is associated with union formation (Goldscheider, Hogan, & Turcotte 2006; Oppenheimer 2003; Oppenheimer, Kalmijn, & Lim 1997; Sassler & Goldscheider 2004), but increased attention has been brought to the emergent, contemporary masculine ideal of emotional supportiveness (Carlson & McLanahan 2004; Hohmann-Marriott 2009). These authors find that both men’s income and emotional supportiveness propel men into marital and cohabiting unions and increases the stability of the union. In this chapter, I specifically examine whether multiple categories of masculinity are related to relationship stability by remaining in the same type of relationship or to transitions into either a more committed or less committed relationship.

This chapter uses a gendered framework to analyze relationship transitions among parents, with a particular emphasis on fathers’ masculinity. I have three objectives for this chapter. First, I describe how relationship transitions vary by masculinity category. Specifically, I examine if multiple forms of masculinity, either contemporary, traditional, or hyper-masculine, are associated significantly to relationship stability or relationship transitions. Second, I examine if masculinity predicts transitioning into either a less committed or a more committed
relationship. Results from chapter four indicate that hyper-masculine fathers are less educated, more likely to have ever been incarcerated, and are more economically disadvantaged. The results also show that contemporary fathers are more educated, are more financially secure and have very low percentages of incarceration. The characteristics of hyper-masculine men may increase their likelihood of transitioning into a less committed relationship with their baby’s mother. In contrast, the characteristics of contemporary fathers may increase both their relationship stability and likelihood of transitioning into a greater committed relationship.

Additionally, I examine if the relationship between masculinity and transitions is consistent across each baseline relationship status. Couples who were married at baseline may be more likely to remain in a stable, committed relationship compared to couples who were either cohabiting or in visiting or non-romantic relationships at the time of the birth. Alternatively, couples who were in visiting or non-romantic relationships may be at the most risk to dissolve their unions completely. This chapter analyzes if these patterns hold across multiple forms of masculinity. Third, and lastly, I test whether race and participation in various social institutions reduce the effects of masculinity on relationship transitions. Race and institutional participation are focal interests in describing the masculinity clusters, as seen in chapter four. This chapter will continue to look at the effects of race and institutional participation on masculinity. If masculinity is associated significantly with relationship transitions, will the effect of being a Black father (who may be less likely to transition into a more committed relationship) remove the significant effect of masculinity. Looking at participation in social institutions, similar patterns may hold for fathers who have a history of incarceration or economic hardship. Previous research finds strong negative relationships between transitioning into more committed relationships and incarceration and economic hardship. Here I determine if the effects of
masculinity will maintain significance after including race and institutional participation in the regression models.

The first set of analyses for this chapter consists of detailed descriptive information. This is the first exploratory look at how relationship statuses vary across categories of masculinity. Multinomial regressions will help gauge the relative stability of couples across multiple forms of masculinity; whereas, logistic regressions will provide a more intricate look into specific types of transitions either into more or less committed relationships. I will contribute to the fragile families’ literature by using a new measure, masculinity, to predict relationship transitions. Prior studies have neglected this line of inquiry. Additionally, there has been a lack of focus on married couples within the fragile families’ studies. I include married couples in my sample, which will help reveal a more detailed account of relationship stability and dissolution. I now turn to a brief description of demographic changes in intimate relationships. Here I show how relationships have changed over time and how relationships are marked increasingly by instability.

Demographic Changes in Intimate Relationships

The composition of the American family has changed drastically since the 1940’s. Marriage rates have declined substantially. Additionally, cohabitation continues to expand in the United States. Data from the 2000 Census indicates that more than three million couples were cohabiting together and forty-one percent of cohabiting households contain a child under the age of 18 (Fields & Casper 2001). Research using the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG) finds the percentage of women who have ever-cohabited also continues to rise, with a change from 45 percent of women who have ever-cohabited in 1995 to 54 percent in 2002 (Kennedy & Bumpass 2008). Using a slightly younger sample with the National Longitudinal Study of
Adolescent Health data, Schoen and colleagues (2007) find a higher estimate of 59 percent of women who have cohabited prior to marriage. Furthermore, an increasing number of births also occur within cohabiting unions. During the 1990’s around 40-50 percent of non-marital births were to cohabiting couples (Bumpass & Lu 2000; Carlson, McLanahan, & England 2004). The percentage of non-marital births to cohabiting couples appears to have remained steady into the 2000’s. Using the 2002 NSFG, Martinez and colleagues (2005) found that 40 percent of non-marital births occurred within a cohabiting union among women aged 15-44.

Along with the increase in non-marital unions, intimate relationships appear to be more tenuous than in the past. Using data from the 1990 Current Population Survey and the 1995 NSFG, Raley and Bumpass (2003) analyze trends in union instability. They find that 20 percent of first marriages dissolve after five years and that over half of all first marriages will end in either divorce or separation after 30 years, indicating that the divorce rate has remained stable since 1980. However, the stability of the divorce rate might be caused from the increased instability of cohabiting unions, particularly among Blacks and less educated women (Raley & Bumpass 2003). Cohabiting unions are particularly short lived with about half of couples remaining cohabiting after a year and only a tenth of cohabiting unions lasting five or more years, but many of these disruptions end in marriage, albeit divorce afterwards (Bumpass & Lu 2000; Lichter, Qian, & Mellot 2006). Furthermore, cohabiting unions are more likely to end by dissolution rather than marriage, particularly among poor women (Lichter, Qian, & Mellot 2006).

In fact, irrespective of race or ethnicity, children born to cohabiting parents are much more likely to see their parents’ relationship end than children born to married parents (Manning, Smock, & Majumdar 2004). Race differences in instability do occur when looking at cohabiting
parents who marry after the birth. White children’s parents are less likely to dissolve their relationship if they marry, but marriage after the birth does not provide increased stability for Black children (Manning, Smock, & Majumdar 2004). Among unmarried parents, couples who cohabited at birth are more likely to marry one year later than are visiting or non-romantic couples at the time of the birth; while couples who did not live together at the time of the birth are more likely to dissolve their relationship compared to couples who cohabited at birth (Carlson, McLanahan, & England 2004).

Previous Research on Union Formation and Dissolution

The following section highlights the past research on union formation and dissolution. I use both formation and dissolution literatures to gain an understanding of what variables may be associated with changes in relationship status. I first address how previous research uses isolated dimensions of masculinity to examine relationship transitions. I then focus on the influences of race and institutional participation, as they relate directly to the comparisons I make concerning masculinity. I also include information on relationship status at birth and the quality of the parental relationship. I include these factors because research using the Fragile Families data finds that they influence the likelihood of a transition in relationship status. Therefore, the status and quality of the parents’ relationship may further reduce the association between masculinity and relationship transitions.

Previous Studies using Masculinity

The relationship formation and dissolution literatures using masculinity can broadly be divided into two components; one focusing on men’s breadwinning and one focusing on men’s emotional supportiveness. Overall, the research focusing on breadwinning points to increased stability and transitions into more committed relationships by those who have greater economic
security. Osborne (2005) finds that higher levels of economic status increase the likelihood that cohabiting couples will marry rather than remain cohabiting after the birth of a child. Higher levels of economic status also reduce the likelihood of separating (Osborne, Manning, & Smock 2007). Additionally, father’s breadwinning capacity is associated with the transition to marriage (Carlson, McLanahan, & England 2004; Harknett & McLanahan 2004; Gibson-Davis 2009). Many unmarried low-income women will not marry a man who is not financially stable. In fact, Edin (2000: 120) finds that low-income mothers expect marriage “to pull them up the class ladder.” Movement into a more committed relationship appears to require a firm economic base among couples (Edin 2000; Edin, Kefalas, & Reed 2004; Smock, Manning, & Porter 2005).

The emergent, contemporary masculine ideal of emotional supportiveness has recently received attention from researchers. Fathers’ emotional supportiveness is associated positively with unmarried couples’ transition to marriage (Carlson, McLanahan, & England 2004). Hohmann-Marriott (2009) uses both married and unmarried couples reports of interdependent emotional supportiveness to predict relationship transitions. She finds that interdependent emotional supportiveness, compared to supportiveness by either partner or neither partner, acts as a protective barrier to dissolving unions among both married and unmarried couples and acts as a push into marriage for unmarried couples.

Clearly, the research that does incorporate masculinity, however indirectly, finds that masculinity is associated with transitions. Importantly, none of these studies incorporate multiple dimensions of masculinity that cohere together to create different categories of masculinity. Chapter four of this dissertation indicated that focusing on multiple categories of masculinity is a valid approach to analyzing masculinity. A more complete picture of how masculinity is associated with relationship transitions may be gained by analyzing multiple forms
of masculinity, rather than measuring masculinity as a continuum. My focal hypothesis is that fathers in the contemporary and traditional categories of masculinity will have more stable co-residing relationships with their baby’s mothers than fathers in the hyper-masculine category of masculinity. Additionally, traditional fathers may be more likely to transition into marriage (Nock 1998; Townsend 2002). Fathers who exhibit the hyper-masculine model will be the least likely to either remain in or form a stable, committed relationship with their baby’s mothers.

Additional Factors Influencing Relationship Transitions

Race

Prior studies have found that Blacks are less likely to marry than Whites are (Carlson, McLanahan & England 2004; Harknett & McLanahan 2004; Western & McLanahan 2000). Additionally, research has demonstrated consistently that marriage is less stable for Blacks (Phillips & Sweeney 2005; Teachman 2002; Osborne, Manning, & Smock 2007). One possible explanation for the racial gap in marriage rates is that social norms against nonmarital childbirth and divorce are not as strong within the Black community as in the White community (Pagnini & Morgan 1996). Overall, this line of research shows that Whites are more likely to marry and less likely to divorce than Blacks.

Race/ethnic differences are not limited to marital unions; differences are also in cohabiting unions. Blacks often see cohabitation as an alternative to marriage, whereas Whites view cohabitation as a stepping-stone to marriage (Manning & Landale 1996; Sweeney & Phillips 2004). Therefore, Blacks may be less likely to transition into a more formalized marital union. Since Whites are less likely to see cohabitation as an alternative to marriage, White cohabiting women may be more likely to marry in response to a birth than Black women.
(Manning 2001, 2004). Therefore, White couples who remain cohabiting after the birth of their child may be a select group who differ from White couples who marry prior to the birth.

Research using the Fragile Families data has found race/ethnic differences in relationship transitions after the birth of a child. One year after birth, Black couples are less likely than White couples to live together and are less likely to be married compared to both Whites and Hispanics, but are only less likely to transition into cohabitation compared to Hispanics (Carlson, McLanahan, & England 2004; Western & McLanahan 2000). By 30 months after birth, there are significant race differences in the number of couples who separated or married. Of parents who were romantically involved at birth, 55 percent of Black couples had broken up, compared to 35 percent for Whites, whereas only 10 percent of Blacks were married, compared to 27 percent for Whites (Harknett & McLanahan 2004). Combining the literatures on union formation and union transitions, one sees that Blacks are less likely to be married at the time of birth and less likely to transition to marriage by the child’s third birthday. Nevertheless, Blacks may be more likely to transition into a cohabiting union. Therefore, I hypothesize that Black fathers will be less likely than White fathers to transition into a more committed relationship and more likely to transition into a lower committed relationship.

_Economic Hardship_

Research on breadwinning and relationship transitions finds that fathers’ income is associated positively with moving into a more committed relationship (Oppenheimer 2003; Oppenheimer, Kalmijn, & Lim 1997; Sassler & Goldscheider 2004). Therefore, I hypothesize that fathers who have experienced economic hardship will be less likely to transition into a more committed relationship. Additionally, fathers with higher incomes will be more likely to transition into a committed relationship.
Paternal Incarceration

Incarceration is associated with the type of relationship fathers have with their children’s mothers. Incarceration reduces the chances of being married to or cohabiting with the baby’s mother by about half, and increases the likelihood of not being in a relationship with the baby’s mother at year one by about 50 percent (Western & McLanahan 2000). Waller and Swisher (2006) also find that incarceration is associated negatively with being married or cohabiting with the baby’s mother. Therefore, I expect that incarceration will be associated negatively with transitioning into a more committed relationship with the baby’s mother, but will be associated positively with transitioning into a less committed relationship.

Religion

Religious doctrine teaches that childbearing should be tied to marriage and focuses on keeping families intact; therefore, religious parents should be more likely to be in a more committed relationship than less religious parents. Previous research has found that religion has little influence on marital happiness, interaction, and conflict, but an increase in religiosity over time does decrease the likelihood of divorce slightly (Booth, Johnson, Branaman, & Sica 1995). Research using the Fragile Families data finds that higher frequencies of church attendance among mothers increase the likelihood of being married to the baby’s father at birth and one year after birth (Carlson, McLanahan, & England 2004; Wilcox & Wolfinger 2006), but the association between fathers’ religious participation and marriage is not as clear. Carlson and colleagues (2004) find no significant relationship among fathers’ church attendance, but Wilcox and Wolfinger (2006) find that churchgoing fathers are more likely to marry. Religion focuses on keeping families intact, therefore, I hypothesize that religious participation will be associated
positively with transitioning into a more committed relationship with the baby’s mother and will be associated negatively with transitioning into a less committed relationship.

Military

I only focus on the literature about the all-volunteer force, because the relationship between military participation and relationship transitions may differ for men who served under the draft system and those that serve in the all-volunteer force. The all-volunteer nature of the military has created the need for more supportive family policies on the part of the military, which allows soldiers to be committed to both the military and their families (Bourg & Segal 1999). With the increase of supportive family policies, participation in the military may increase the formation of stable unions. Enlisting in the armed forces provides an established means of employment and indicates that an individual is able to sustain a commitment (Lundquist 2004), both of which may be attractive to potential romantic partners. Research using the 1979 National Longitudinal Study of Youth find that military service increases the likelihood of being married (Lundquist 2004; Teachman 2007). Additionally, the military may reduce the race gap in marriage rates among Blacks and Whites (Lundquist 2004). Notably, Black enlistees are more likely to marry than Black civilians are and Black enlistees do not differ in the likelihood of being married compared to White enlistees (Lundquist 2004). Additionally using the Fragile Families data, Usdansky, London, and Wilmoth (2009) find that couples who had a non-marital birth with Black veteran fathers were more likely to marry than couples with Black nonveteran fathers are. Extending Lundquist’s research, Teachman (2007) finds that the probability of marriage among Blacks is closest to Whites when serving on active duty, with the positive effect of military participation on marriage removed once Blacks leave active duty. The military also offers more equal opportunities, in terms of pay and promotion, and creates more opportunities
for low educated individuals than many other industries (Lundquist 2004). Participation in the military may increase Black men’s economic opportunities (Lundquist 2004); which may increase their movement into more committed relationships.

Current research has also examined the relationship between military participation and race differences in marital dissolution. Lundquist (2006) finds that while Black civilians are more likely to divorce than White civilians are, Black enlistees are less likely to divorce than are White enlistees. Teachman and Tedrow (2008) find that military participation decreases marital dissolution among Black Army members only, but find no significant effect for Whites. Teachman and Tedrow (2008: 1042) contribute this result to a chain of three factors: 1) the percentage of Black active duty Army members is higher than any other branch of the military, 2) the high number of Black Army enlistees provides Blacks with role models and the potential for promotion, 3) which reduces race discrimination which can then increase marital quality. I hypothesize that fathers who have participated in the military will be more likely to transition into a committed relationship with the baby’s mother than fathers who have never been in the military.

In conclusion, institutional participation does appear to influence relationship transitions. Supportive institutions, such as religion and the military, do seem to increase the chances of transitioning into a more committed relationship. In contrast, coercive and controlling institutions, such as the prison system, enhance the odds of transitioning out of a relationship.

Past Research on Control Variables

*Relationship Status at Birth*

One key factor associated with parents’ relationship status after birth is their relationship status at the time of birth. Children born to married parents have greater parental stability than
children born to cohabiting parents, as children born to cohabiting parents have more than five
times the risk of experiencing their parents’ separation compared to children born to married
parents (Osborne, Manning, & Smock 2007). Osborne and McLanahan (2007) also find that
children born to married mothers are less likely to experience a partnership transition than are
children born to unmarried mothers. They find that 87 percent of mothers married at the time of
birth did not experience a transition in partners, whereas 20 percent of children born to visiting
mothers and 30 percent of children born to single mothers experience three or more partnership
transitions by the child’s third birthday (Osborne & McLanahan 2007). However, parents who
have a child within a cohabiting union are much more likely to transition into a marital union
than women who are single at the time of birth (Kennedy & Bumpass 2008). Research does
indicate that young children act as a stabilizing factor for their parents’ marriage (Waite &
Lillard 1991). Children born into cohabiting unions do not appear to provide the same stability
as in a marital union, but they do not increase levels of instability in their parents’ cohabiting
union (Manning 2004). While married parents may have the highest levels of stability,
cohabiting and visiting parents are more likely to be married one year after the child’s birth than
parents who were in a nonromantic relationship at birth (Carlson, McLanahan, & England 2004).

Potential explanations for married couples’ relative stability are that being married at the
time of the child’s birth provides greater institutional support (Cherlin 1978, 2004) and married
couples often have higher quality relationships than cohabiting couples (Brown & Booth 1996;
Nock 1995). The additional support and quality that married couples have may place them at a
lower risk of separating than cohabiting and visiting couples.

Additionally, the association between relationship status at birth and relationship
transitions appears to differ by race and ethnic status. Research using the Fragile Families data
indicates that Black children are the most likely to witness their parents’ separation and to experience a partnership change (Osborne, Manning, & Smock 2007; Osborne & McLanahan 2007). Although greater stability is found in married couples, Black marital dissolution rates are higher than dissolution rates for Black cohabiters (Osborne, Manning, & Smock 2007). Cohabiting at the time of the child’s birth increases the likelihood of separation for all parents, but is detrimental particularly for White parents (Osborne, Manning, & Smock 2007). White cohabiting parents have 10 times the risk of separating by the child’s third birthday compared to White married parents, whereas the risk is only about 2.7 times higher for Black cohabiting parents relative to Black married parents (Osborne, Manning, & Smock 2007).

Overall, being married at the time of the child’s birth appears to provide the most stability. While cohabiting at birth is more stable than being in a visiting relationship, White cohabiters may be at a particular disadvantage for dissolving their union. I expect that parents who were married at the time of the child’s birth will be the least likely to transition into a lesser committed relationship, followed by those who were cohabiting at birth, and visiting or non-romantic fathers will be at the greatest risk for transitioning into a lower committed relationship at the five year follow-up.

**Parental Relationship Quality**

The quality of the parents’ relationship in fragile families also predicts whether the couple will transition into a more committed relationship or dissolve the union. Higher levels of emotional support can be a protective factor in relationships, as both fathers’ reports of mothers’ support and mothers’ reports of fathers’ support are associated positively with being in both cohabiting and marital unions at the child’s first birthday (Carlson, McLanahan, & England 2004). Parents in higher quality relationships also are less likely to separate (Carlson,
McLanahan, & England 2004; Osborne, Manning, & Smock 2007) and are more likely to transition into a more committed relationship (Carlson, McLanahan, & England 2004). Relationship quality is a stronger predictor of cohabiting couples separation (Osborne, Manning, & Smock 2007), consistent with Nock’s (1995) argument that marital unions necessitate a stronger commitment than cohabitating unions.

While high levels of supportiveness increase commitment among parents, high levels of distrust and conflict decrease the likelihood of being in a committed relationship. Mother’s gender distrust is associated with lower rates of marriage and cohabitation at the child’s first birthday, whereas father’s gender distrust is not related significantly to relationship status (Carlson, McLanahan & England 2004). The occurrence of physical abuse is associated with lower odds of being married, cohabiting or in romantic relationship compared to being in no relationship (Waller & Swisher 2006). Additionally, qualitative findings indicate that physical abuse is associated highly with separation as every couple in which the mother reported abuse by the father at the first interview separated by the second interview (Waller & Swisher 2006). While Osborne, Manning, and Smock (2007) find no association between physical abuse and parental separation at the child’s third birthday, higher amounts of disagreements between parents increases the risk of separation. To conclude, parental supportiveness buffers against separation while conflict, both physical and verbal, increases the risk of separation. I hypothesize that fathers who have higher quality relationships with their baby’s mothers will more likely to transition into a more committed relationship and will be less likely to transition into a lower committed relationship.
Data and Methods

Data from the baseline, first year follow-up, and fifth year follow-up interviews from the Fragile Families Study are used. The Fragile Families Study contains data on 4,989 births. I restrict my sample to include fathers who have a valid value on the masculinity measure created in the first empirical chapter, reducing my sample to 1,589 fathers. Furthermore, only fathers who completed the fifth year follow-up were included. For control variables, I have replaced all missing cases with the mean sample value. This process leaves me with an effective sample size of 1,303. I use both multinomial logistic and logistic regression to examine the relationship between masculinity and transitions in relationship status from the baby’s birth until the time the child is five years old.

Multinomial logistic regression

I first analyze the full sample of fathers using multinomial logistic regression to determine if fathers remain in the same type of relationship, transition into a more committed relationship or transition into a lower committed relationship. Unfortunately, because of zero cell sizes I was unable to use race and all of the institutional participation measures in the same multinomial logistic regression model. The small number of hyper-masculine fathers who transitioned into a more committed relationship decreased the predictive capabilities of the multinomial logistic models. To eliminate the problem of zero cell sizes, I examine the full sample using logistic regression to predict whether fathers transitioned into a lower committed relationship.

---

5 As a reminder, the criteria used to obtain the masculinity measures were restricted to fathers who have both baseline and one-year interviews reducing the sample from 4,989 to 3,479. The use of only Black and White fathers reduces the sample to 2,139. Additional cases were lost because the masculinity measures were only asked in 18 of the 20 cities, bringing the sample size down to 1,698. A further 158 respondents were eliminated because of missing information on the masculinity measures.
Logistic regression: Full sample and baseline relationship sub-samples

In the full sample analysis, I can only look at the transition to a lower committed relationship because fathers who were married at the time of birth cannot transition into a more committed relationship. My last set of analyses use logistic regression on subsamples based on the relationship status at birth. I separate the sample based on relationship status for two reasons. First, the subsample analyses will allow me to correct for some of the complications of the no transitions category. The no transitions category contains fathers who are continuously married, continuously cohabiting, and continuously visiting or non-romantic. The no transitions category includes fathers who were both at high and low spectrums of the commitment continuum. Dividing the sample allows me to look more closely at those with high commitment at the child’s birth and those who were committed tenuously. Using the separate analyses, I can see if consistent patterns of associations between relationship transitions and masculinity occur across all types of baseline relationships. Second, separating the sample by baseline relationship status also allows me to use logistic regression to predict transitioning into a more committed relationship among couples who were in cohabiting and visiting or non-romantic relationships at baseline.

Dependent Variable

Relationship Transitions with Baby’s Mother: For the multinomial regressions, I measure relationship transitions with three categories: no transition or a stable relationship status (0), a transition into a more committed relationship and a transition into a less committed relationship. I use the baseline and fifth year follow-up interview interviews to create the three categories. At baseline, fathers reported that they were either married, cohabiting, visiting or in a romantic relationship but not living together, just friends, or hardly talk to the baby’s mother. I recoded
this variable to include categories of married, cohabiting, and visiting or non-romantic. I combined visiting and non-romantic fathers because there were not enough fathers to include a separate category for non-romantic fathers. At year five, fathers could categorize their relationships as married, cohabiting, visiting or in a romantic relationship but not living together, just friends, separated or divorced, and no longer in a relationship with the baby’s mother. I had to collapse some of these categories because of small cell sizes. I combined the responses of visiting or in a romantic relationship but not living together and just friends into one category, which I called visiting/non-romantic. Then, I also combined separated or divorced and no longer in a relationship into another category, labeled no relationship. Therefore, the fifth year relationship status variable was recoded to include only the categories of married, cohabiting, visiting or non-romantic, and no relationship.

Again, the dependent variable is coded as no transition or a stable relationship status, a transition into a more committed relationship and a transition into a less committed relationship. The no transition or stable relationship status includes those married at baseline and married at year five, those cohabiting at baseline and cohabiting at year five, and those visiting or non-romantic at baseline and visiting or non-romantic at year five. A transition into a more committed relationship includes those cohabiting at baseline and married at year five and those visiting or non-romantic at baseline and either married or cohabiting at year five. A transition into a less committed relationship includes those married at baseline and either cohabiting, in a visiting or non-romantic relationship, or no longer in a relationship at year five; those cohabiting at baseline and either in a visiting or non-romantic relationship, or in no relationship at year five;

---

6 Only 36 fathers reported being just friends or hardly talk to the baby’s mother.
and those visiting or non-romantic at baseline and in no relationship at year five. A summary of the dependent variable is shown in Appendix B.

For the logistic regressions, I analyze separate models for transitions into less committed relationships and transitions into more committed relationships. Relationship transitions is a dummy variable indicating a transition into a less committed relationship (1) compared to fathers who made no transition and fathers who transitioned into a more committed relationship (0). More committed relationships is a dummy variable indicating a transition into a more committed relationship (1) compared to fathers who made no transition and fathers who transitioned into a less committed relationship (0).

Focal Independent Variables

*Masculinity:* Masculinity is measured with a three-category variable that was constructed using cluster analysis, which was described in the earlier chapter. The three categories include traditional, hyper-masculine, and the excluded category of contemporary masculinity.

*Race:* I use a dummy variable to distinguish between Black non-Hispanic fathers (1) and White non-Hispanic fathers (0).

*Prison.* I measure incarceration history as a dummy variable indicating whether the father has ever spent time in a correctional institution. I use a constructed measure from the Fragile Families data that combines responses of father and mother reports of ever being incarcerated by the one-year follow-up interview. I use this approach rather than using only the fathers’ reports to account for the sensitivity in reporting imprisonment and to account for as many cases of incarceration as possible. Using father-only reports, I have 198 fathers with histories of incarceration. The combined report gives 347 fathers with histories of incarceration.
Unfortunately for my analyses, there are too few respondents who are currently incarcerated to be able to break this measure down further into past or current incarceration.

**Military.** Participation in the military is a dummy variable indicating that the father has ever served in the military. I use a measure of ever participating in the military, because there are too few fathers who are currently in the military to distinguish between current and past participation.

**Religious Participation.** Religious participation is measured at the first year follow-up by how often the father goes to religious services. The responses range from never (0) to once a week or more (4).

**Economic hardship.** Fathers were asked if in the past 12 months “did you receive free food or meals,” “did your child/children went hungry,” “did you go hungry,” “did you not pay the full amount of rent or mortgage payments,” “were you evicted from your home or apartment for not paying the rent or mortgage,” “was service turned off by the gas or electric company, or did the oil company not deliver oil,” “was service was disconnected by the telephone company because payments were not made,” “did you borrow money from friends or family to help pay bills,” “did you move in with other people even for a little while because of financial problems,” “did you stay at a shelter, in an abandoned building, an automobile or any other place not meant for regular housing even for one night”, and “was there anyone in your household who needed to see a doctor or go to the hospital but couldn’t go because of cost.” Because eighty-eight percent of the sample did not experience any of the twelve items, economic hardship is a dummy variable indicating whether the father experienced one or more of the hardship measures (1) or experienced none of the hardship measures (0).
Education. I use four dummy variables to measure education. The responses are less than high school, high school or GED, some college or technical training, and at least a college graduate.

Control Variables

Relationship quality: Father’s evaluation of the quality of the relationship with the baby’s mother is measured using one question at the first year follow-up, “In general, would you say that your relationship with her is excellent (5), very good (4), good (3), fair (2), or poor (1)”? Additionally, fathers who stated that they “never see her” were coded as 0.

Relationship status at birth: The father’s relationship status with the baby’s mother is measured with a set of dummy variables with married as the excluded category in comparison to cohabiting, and a visiting or non-romantic relationship.

Age: Age is measured in years at the baseline interview.

Income: I use fathers’ self-reports of job earnings at the year one follow-up to measure income. Fathers’ earnings for the year ranged from $624-$800,000, because of the wide range I collapsed this continuous variable into categories which were then recoded to the midpoint of the category range. The final measure consists of seven midpoint incomes: (1) $5,000, (2) $15,000, (3) $25,000, (4) $35,000, (5) $45,000, (6) $55,000, and (7) $60,000.

Results

Descriptive Results

Baseline and Year Five Relationship Statuses by Categories of Masculinity

Here I describe the fathers’ relationship with the baby’s mother at the time of birth and at the year five follow-up by categories of masculinity. Figure 5.1 presents the baseline and year five relationship statuses by masculinity category. I first discuss the overall sample
characteristics and then I will look specifically at each category of masculinity. At baseline, 35 percent of fathers were married, 40 percent were cohabiting, and 25 percent were in a visiting or non-romantic relationship. My sample has a higher percentage of unmarried couples that were cohabiting at birth (61%) and a larger percentage of unmarried parents that are romantically involved (98%), compared to the Fragile Families baseline national sample of 51 percent cohabiting and 82 percent romantically involved (McLanahan et al. 2003). The difference most likely occurs because I include only those fathers who have both baseline and fifth year follow-up interviews. Men who are in serious, romantic relationships may be more likely to remain in the study (McLanahan et al. 2003). At year five, 44 percent of fathers are married, 16 percent are cohabiting, 23 percent are in visiting or non-romantic relationships and about 18 percent are no longer in a relationship.

Results from the first empirical chapter indicated that marital status at that baby’s birth significantly differed across the categories of masculinity. Therefore, I expect to find differences in relationship status at year five as well. Contemporary fathers are more likely than both traditional and hyper-masculine fathers are to be married to the baby’s mother at both baseline and the fifth year follow-up. Almost 60 percent of contemporary fathers are married at year five, compared to 35 percent and 14 percent for traditional and hyper-masculine fathers, respectively. Cohabitation does not vary as dramatically as marriage. Traditional fathers are the most likely to be cohabiting at year five, while contemporary fathers are the least likely to be cohabiting. I find that 19 percent of traditional fathers, 16 percent of hyper-masculine, and 14 percent of contemporary fathers are cohabiting with the baby’s mother when the child is five years old. Very few fathers were visiting or in non-romantic relationships at year five. Traditional fathers
were the most likely to be visiting with seven percent, whereas five percent of hyper-masculine fathers, and only three percent of contemporary fathers were visiting at year five. Additionally, contemporary fathers also had the lowest percentage of fathers who were no longer in relationships with their baby’s mother at year five. Only twelve percent of contemporary fathers were no longer in a relationship by year five, versus nineteen percent for traditional fathers and almost forty percent for hyper-masculine fathers. Hyper-masculine fathers are more than twice as likely as the overall sample to have ended their relationship with the baby’s mother at year five.

*Relationships Transitions*

I now examine the amount of relationship stability within these urban fathers. First, I provide the overall distribution of the dependent variable for all fathers and then broken down by masculinity category. Then, I provide a more in-depth account of transitions. Previous research has emphasized a more expansive operationalization of relationship status (Rinelli 2009). Rinelli used nine categories of transitions: continuously married, continuously cohabiting, continuously visiting or continuously non-romantic, cohabiting to married, cohabiting to not cohabiting, married to not married, visiting or non-romantic to married, visiting or non-romantic to cohabiting, and between visiting and non-romantic, to measure union status and transitions. I am unable to use a more extensive measure of relationship statuses in the multivariate analyses because only a few (16) of the hyper-masculine fathers transitioned into a more committed relationship. Although I cannot perform multivariate analysis with the more complex measure of transitions, I can provide a detailed account of how the statuses differ across masculinity categories at the bivariate level.
The overall distribution of the dependent variable shows that almost half of fathers had no change in their relationship status with the baby’s mother, 18 percent transitioned into a more committed relationship, and 37 percent transitioned into a lesser committed relationship (results not shown). Looking at transitions across masculinity, fifty-six percent of contemporary fathers made no transition, 17 percent transitioned into a more committed relationship, and 28 percent transitioned into a less committed relationship. Traditional fathers experienced more movement in relationships than contemporary fathers, moving into both more committed and less committed relationships. Thirty-nine percent of traditional fathers remained in the same relationship type at both baseline and year five, 20 percent moved into a relationship with greater commitment, and 41 percent moved into a relationship with lesser commitment. Only 20 percent of hyper-masculine fathers experienced no transition in relationship status, 13 percent moved into a more committed relationship, and 68 percent transitioned into a lesser committed relationship. Furthermore, approximately 40 percent of hyper-masculine fathers were no longer in an intimate relationship with their baby’s mother by the time the child is five years old. These results indicate that contemporary fathers are the least likely to transition into a lower committed relationship, traditional fathers were the most likely to transition into a more committed relationship, and hyper-masculine fathers are the most likely to transition into a less committed relationship as well as no longer being in any type of relationship with the baby’s mother.

I break the relationship transition measure out by baseline relationship status, because the no transition category contains fathers who were continuously married, continuously cohabiting and continuously visiting or non-romantic. The following section will examine if father’s baseline relationship status influenced the no transitions category. Figure 5.2 presents a chart of relationship transitions by masculinity category and baseline relationship status. The results in
the figure suggest that 90 percent of contemporary fathers, 85 percent of traditional fathers, and about 50 percent of hyper-masculine fathers who were married at the birth remain married after five years. Therefore, the majority of the fathers who did not transition are fathers who are married at both baseline and year five. Across each of the multiple categories of masculinity, the men in the no transition category mostly were married at baseline. Therefore, they cannot transition into a more committed relationship.

{Insert Figure 5.2 Here}

Additionally, contemporary fathers who were either married or cohabiting at baseline were less likely to transition to a less committed relationship compared to traditional and hyper-masculine fathers. Contemporary fathers who were in visiting or non-romantic relationships are less likely than hyper-masculine fathers are, but are slightly more likely than traditional fathers to transition into a less committed relationship. Hyper-masculine fathers were the most likely to transition into a less committed relationship, regardless of baseline relationship status.

Contemporary fathers who cohabited at baseline were more likely to transition into a more committed relationship than are traditional or hyper-masculine cohabiting fathers. Visiting or non-romantic contemporary fathers were more likely to transition into a more committed relationship than hyper-masculine fathers, but did not differ significantly from traditional fathers who were in visiting or non-romantic baseline relationships. Hyper-masculine fathers were the least likely to transition into a more committed relationship among both fathers who cohabited or were in visiting or non-romantic relationships at baseline.

*Types of Relationship Transitions by Masculinity*

In this section, I further analyze the different types of relationship transitions among these fathers. I examine how an expanded measure of relationship transitions varies across each of the
three masculinity categories. As discussed in the earlier section, I only use a three-category measure of relationship transitions for the multivariate analysis, which looks at no transitions, more committed transitions, and less committed transitions. Here, I further break down the transitions variable to gain insights into more specific types of transitions, such as married to cohabiting or cohabiting to no relationship. Table 5.1 presents the various types of relationships fathers could be in from baseline to the fifth year follow-up. Overall, 42 percent of the fathers were continuously co-residing with their baby’s mother. Consistent with past research the results also point to the fragility of cohabiting unions (Bumpass & Lu 2000; Lichter, Qian, & Mellon 2006), as 18 percent of the fathers transitioned from a cohabiting union into a lesser committed relationship. Furthermore, the percentage of fathers who transitioned from cohabitation to a more committed relationship (9.9%) was greater than fathers who transitioned into a more committed relationship from a visiting or non-romantic relationship at baseline (7.7%).

I now look at how the specific types of relationships differ by masculinity. Differences begin to emerge when breaking the types of relationships out by categories of masculinity. The most dramatic difference is among the continuously married. I find support for my hypothesis that contemporary fathers will have high relationship stability. Contemporary fathers are much more likely to be continuously married than either traditional or hyper-masculine fathers, as 43 percent of contemporary fathers, 21 percent of traditional, and about seven percent of hyper-masculine fathers were married at both baseline and year five. Inconsistent with my hypothesis that traditional fathers would be more likely to transition from cohabitation to marriage, contemporary fathers are more likely to transition from a cohabiting union to a marital union than either traditional or hyper-masculine fathers. Conversely, hyper-masculine fathers are the
most likely to transition into a less committed relationship regardless of baseline relationship; which also lends support to my hypotheses. Specifically, seven percent of the transitions among hyper-masculine fathers were from marriage into a lesser committed relationship compared to about four percent of both contemporary and traditional fathers. Additionally, 28 percent of hyper-masculine fathers were cohabiting at baseline but then transitioned into a lesser committed relationship while only 22 percent and 14 percent of traditional and contemporary fathers followed this relationship pattern. Similar results occur for fathers who dissolved their visiting or non-romantic relationships. Hyper-masculine fathers were the most likely to dissolve their visiting or non-romantic relationships with 20 percent of their transitions marked as visiting to lesser committed, compared to only 8 percent and 4 percent of traditional and contemporary fathers’ relationships, respectively.

Overall, the most common pattern for contemporary men was to remain continuously married, traditional men were most often continuously married or moved from a cohabitating union to a lesser committed relationship, and hyper-masculine men most often moved from a cohabitating union to a lesser committed relationship. Summarizing the descriptive results in more detail, I find that contemporary fathers are the most likely to be married at both baseline and at the fifth year follow-up and were the least likely to be separated, divorced or no longer in a relationship. Although, traditional fathers were less likely than contemporary fathers to be married at the child’s birth, they were more likely than contemporary fathers to be cohabiting at the birth. Hyper-masculine fathers are the most likely to be in a visiting or non-romantic relationship at baseline and were the most likely to be separated, divorced, or no longer in a relationship at year five. Relationship transitions also differ across masculinity. Contemporary fathers are the most likely to be continuously married at baseline and year five and are the most
likely to transition from cohabitation into marriage. About 1/3 of traditional fathers are co-residing continuously with their baby’s mother, but an additional third transition into lesser committed relationships. Very few hyper-masculine fathers remain married or transition from cohabitation to marriage. Additionally, hyper-masculine fathers are the most likely to transition into a lower committed relationship with over half of these men downgrading their relationships.

Multivariate Results

Multinomial logistic regression

As a reminder, the multinomial logistic dependent variable has an excluded category that consists of continuously married, continuously cohabiting, and continuously visiting or non-romantic fathers, and two separate categories representing transitions into lower committed relationships, and transitions into more committed relationships (see Appendix B for a summary of the dependent variable). I created dummy variables for the institutional participation measures to ensure that no zero cells occurred within the model, because I have such a small sample of hyper-masculine men who have transitions into a more committed relationship (n=16). The dummy variable for religion is the father attends religious services at least weekly and for education is completion of at least some college. No models with military participation could be included because zero cell sizes occurred when both masculinity and military participation were included. Additionally because of zero cell sizes, the largest predicted model includes only masculinity, race, and education. I present the multinomial logistic results in Appendix C. Because of the issue with zero cell sizes, I briefly discuss the multinomial logistic models. The multinomial findings are cautionary since I cannot add control variables into the model because of the small sample size. Therefore, I cannot account fully for omitted variable bias within these
models. I provide a more in-depth depiction of the logistic regression models later in this chapter, which contain theoretically relevant control variables.

Model 1 estimates the log-odds of transitioning into a lesser committed relationship as compared to making no union transition. Model 1 indicates that, as compared to contemporary fathers, both hyper-masculine and traditional fathers have greater odds of transitioning into a lower committed relationship rather than remaining in the same relationship status. These effects are substantial, such that hyper-masculine fathers have almost seven times the odds and traditional fathers have twice the odds compared to contemporary fathers of transitioning into a lower committed relationship as compared to remaining in the same type of relationship status. Model 2 shows that Black fathers are more likely than White fathers are to downgrade their relationships. Note that while race has a strong influence on relationship transitions, the effects of masculinity remain significant.

In Models 3 through 6, I test whether the institutional participation measures eliminate the relationship between relationship status and masculinity. These models show dampened effects of masculinity, but not eliminated effects. I find support for my hypotheses regarding social institutional participation and relationship transitions. Incarceration history and economic hardship are associated with greater odds of transitioning into less committed relationships. Attendance at religious services at least weekly and attainment of at least some college education predict lower odds of moving into a relationship with lower commitment.

In model 6a, I show the full model that contains no zero cell statistical weaknesses. This model shows that by including both race and education in the model, the effect of traditional
masculinity is reduced and becomes non-significant. The hyper-masculinity coefficient has decreased, but still predicts significantly transitions into less committed relationships.

I now turn my attention to the models predicting a transition into a more committed relationship compared to making no transition. In Model 1, I find that both traditional and hyper-masculine fathers compared to contemporary fathers are more likely to transition into a more committed relationship. This finding is not unexpected because almost half of the contemporary fathers were married at baseline and could not transition into a more committed relationship. Models 2-6 show similar findings to the transition into less committed relationships for the institutional participation measures. Unlike the less committed transition models, I find that the relationship between masculinity and transitions into more committed relationships is eliminated by race and education as neither traditional nor hyper-masculinity is significant statistically in the final model.

In summary, the multinomial regression results suggest that hyper-masculine fathers are more likely to transition into a lower committed relationship compared to contemporary fathers. Alternatively, there is no significant difference between traditional fathers and contemporary fathers as this relationship becomes non-significant when both race and education are included in the model. I found different results for the transition into more committed relationships. Neither hyper-masculinity nor traditional masculinity is associated significantly with transitioning into a more committed relationship once race is included in the model.

Logistic regressions

I now examine separate logistic regressions predicting less committed and more committed relationships for the whole sample and for separate subsamples based on relationship status at baseline. I analyze these regressions for two reasons. First, the multinomial models
were only able to control for a limited number of variables before zero cell sizes occurred. Second, the multinomial results had complications because the no transition category contains both fathers who are unable to transition into a more committed relationship (fathers who were married at both baseline and five years) and those who remained stably in low committed relationships (fathers who were visiting or in non-romantic relationships). Analyzing the subsamples will allow me to control for any possible differences that stem from their baseline relationship status.

Table 5.2 presents the logistic regression models for the full sample of fathers predicting transitions into less committed relationships. As a reminder, the excluded category for these analyses is fathers who have no change in their relationship status and those who transitioned into a more committed relationship. In Model 1, I examine the zero-order regression for masculinity. Models 2 through 4 show the models testing for the effects of race and the institutional participation measures.

{Insert Table 5.2 Here}

In the bivariate-regression model, both hyper-masculine and traditional fathers are more likely to transition into a less committed relationship than are contemporary fathers. In fact, hyper-masculine fathers compared to contemporary fathers have almost six times the odds of transitioning into a less committed relationship versus remaining in the same type of relationship or transitioning into a more committed relationship. Results from Model 2 show that the significant relationship between traditional masculinity and relationship transitions no longer holds after I include the control variables. Moreover, the hyper-masculinity coefficient is reduced by more than half. Relationship quality and the relationship status with the baby’s mother are strongly associated with relationship transitions, with their inclusion significantly
reducing the effects of masculinity. Nevertheless, hyper-masculinity is still an important predictor of transitions even after controlling for this influential measure.

In Model 3, I now turn to the race and institutional participation effects. This model includes both the race and institutional participation measures and the control variables. I find a significant positive relationship between experiencing economic hardship and transitioning into a less committed relationship. Additionally, fathers who completed at least some college are less likely to transition into a less committed relationship versus remaining in the same type of relationship or transitioning into a more committed relationship. The significant effect of economic hardship and education endure even after controlling for strongly influential relationship quality and relationship status measures.

The full model in Model 4 tests whether race and institutional participation eliminate the significant effects of masculinity found in the bivariate model, while also accounting for the significant control variables. Consistent with the results in Model 2 that included only the control variables, traditionally masculine fathers still are no more likely to transition into a lower committed relationship than contemporary fathers after including race and institutional participation. Significantly, hyper-masculine fathers are more likely to transition into a less committed relationship, even accounting for race and institutional participation. While hyper-masculinity is still significant in Model 4, the effect size reduced substantially from hyper-masculine fathers having odds of transitioning of 2.30 in Model 2 to 1.88 in Model 4. Model 4 indicates that economic hardship and education influence the relationship between hyper-masculinity and transitions into lower committed relationships. Looking specifically at the race and institutional participation measures, I find consistent effects in the final model as I did in Model 3 when they were included separately. Economic hardship continues to be related
positively and having at least some college remains related negatively to transitioning into a less committed relationship. Fathers with economic hardship have almost three times the odds of transitioning into a less committed relationship than fathers who are not under financial constraints. Being financially strained and having more than a high school education influence transitions, but do not override the effect of masculinity. Masculinity still matters after including the control and focal race and institutional participation measures.

I now run logistic regressions broken down by relationship status at baseline, because of the complications with the no transitions category and to determine if consistent patterns of findings hold across multiple subsamples. Tables 5.3-5.5 present the results for those who were married, cohabiting, and visiting or in a non-romantic relationship at baseline, respectively. I first look at Table 5.3, which includes only fathers who were married at baseline. For these fathers, the dependent variable is only whether they transitioned into a less committed relationship (1) versus remaining married (0). Additionally, I had to remove the economic hardship measure for this set of analyses because very few fathers who were married at baseline experienced any hardship.

{Insert Table 5.3 Here}

For married fathers, only hyper-masculinity is related positively to transitioning into a less committed relationship. Hyper-masculine fathers compared to contemporary fathers have eleven times the odds of transitioning in a less committed relationship versus remaining married. Traditional fathers are not different significantly from contemporary fathers. Hyper-masculinity’s effect on relationship transitions remains significant, but almost half of the effect is reduced once I add the control variables into the model. I find only one significant relationship
for institutional participation. Fathers who were at least college graduates were about 70 percent less likely to transition out of marriage compared to fathers who completed high school.

Model 4 shows the full model. The effect of hyper-masculinity remains consistent from Model 2 to Model 4. For married fathers, relationship quality appears to be a more significant factor than either race or institutional participation. For the control variables, I find that high quality relationships act as a barrier to transitioning out of marriage. Older fathers also have a lower likelihood of transitioning out of marriage than younger fathers. Income is also positively associated with transitioning out of marriage, but this effect is small.

Table 5.4 presents the results for fathers who were cohabiting with the baby’s mother at the time of the birth. Cohabiting hyper-masculine fathers have about a 180 percent higher likelihood and cohabiting traditional fathers have a 60 percent higher likelihood of transitioning into a less committed relationship compared to remaining cohabiting or transitioning into marriage. However, these relationships are no longer significant once the father’s relationship quality with the baby’s mother is included in the model. I turn now to the final model since relationship quality eliminated the significant effect of masculinity on cohabiting fathers’ transitions. In the full model, fathers experiencing economic hardship have more than four times the odds of transitioning into a less committed relationship. Fathers with some college are significantly less likely to transition into a less committed relationship. Every unit increase in relationship quality decreases the odds by about half of transitioning into a less committed relationship compared to remaining cohabiting or transitioning into marriage.

{Insert Table 5.4 Here}

In Table 5.5, I show the regression results for transitioning into a less committed relationship among visiting and non-romantic fathers. Among these fathers, I find a more
complex relationship between masculinity and transitions. In the bivariate regression model, only hyper-masculinity is significantly associated with transitioning into a less committed relationship. The significant relationship for hyper-masculine fathers is eliminated once relationship quality is included in Model 2. Model 3 shows no significant effects among the race and institutional participation measures. But, in the full final model traditional masculinity becomes significant. Upon further examination, economic hardship suppresses the effect between traditional masculinity and transitioning into a less committed relationship for visiting and non-romantic fathers (results not shown).

{Insert Table 5.5 Here}

Tables 5.6 and 5.7 show the logistic regression models predicting transitions into a more committed relationship for those who cohabited and were in visiting and non-romantic relationships at baseline. The dependent variable for these results is fathers who transitioned into a more committed relationship (1) versus fathers who remained in the same type of relationship and transitioned into a less committed relationship (0). I first look at the results for cohabiting fathers at baseline.

{Insert Table 5.6 Here}

Both cohabiting hyper-masculine and traditional fathers were less likely to transition into marriage in the bivariate regression models. Cohabiting hyper-masculine fathers had about 1/3 the odds of transitioning into marriage and cohabiting traditional fathers had a little more than half the odds compared to cohabiting contemporary fathers. The inclusion of relationship quality in the model reduces the effect of masculinity to non-significance. Relationship quality appears to be more influential than either race or institutional participation. I do find significant relationships among the race and the institutional participation measures though. Black
cohabiting fathers are 60 percent less likely to transition into marriage than are White cohabiting fathers. Cohabiting fathers who attend church more regularly and fathers with at least a college education are more likely to marry.

Table 5.7 shows the last logistic regression, which is for predicting more commitment among fathers who were in visiting or non-romantic relationships at baseline. At the bivariate level, visiting and non-romantic hyper-masculine fathers are 60 percent more likely to transition into a more committed relationship than are contemporary fathers. However, consistent with the cohabiting fathers this relationship is reduced to non-significance when relationship quality is included. Economic hardship is the only significant institutional participation measure. Visiting and non-romantic fathers who experienced economic hardship have about half the odds of transitioning into a more committed relationship.

Summarizing the logistic results, dramatic differences between forms of masculinity and relationship transitions occur. I find that hyper-masculine fathers are more likely than traditional and contemporary fathers to transition into a relationship marked by less commitment compared to transitioning into a more committed relationship or remaining in the same type of relationship. Consistent with my expectations, the most stably committed relationships appear to occur for contemporary men, whereas the most volatile relationships occur for hyper-masculine fathers. However, these results do not remain consistent across baseline relationship statuses. In comparison to married contemporary fathers, the few hyper-masculine fathers who were married at baseline were more likely to transition into a lower committed relationship by year five versus remaining married. Hyper-masculine fathers are those who use abusive behaviors and those with

---

7 I had to use a dummy variable for education among these fathers because models with the fuller categorical measure did not work properly because of small cell sizes.
the least amount of emotional availability. The characteristics of the contemporary and traditional fathers appear to promote relationship stability, while hyper-masculine qualities promote relationship instability. Among fathers in both cohabiting and visiting or non-romantic baseline relationships, the significant association between masculinity and transitioning into either a more committed or less committed relationship is eliminated by the relationship quality measure. The lack of differences across masculinity among fathers who were cohabiting or in visiting or non-romantic relationships at baseline could result from the tenuous nature of cohabiting and visiting relationships. Lichter, Qian & Mellott (2006) find that cohabiting unions are much more likely to dissolve than to transition into marriage. Masculinity may not have an effect on transitions among these fathers, because cohabiting and visiting or non-romantic relationships are generally more likely to dissolve compared to marriages.

Conclusions

In conclusion, my results point to three main points. First, types of relationships do differ by masculinity category. The most common relationship status for urban fathers between the baseline and year five report was continuously married with 1/3 of the sample being married to their baby’s mothers at both time points. Contemporary fathers are the most likely and hyper-masculine fathers are the least likely to be continuously married. Among contemporary fathers, over half have been continuously living together with only 22 percent transitioning into a lower commitment relationship. About 1/3 of traditional fathers continuously lived together with an additional third transitioning into a less committed relationship. A much greater disparity occurs among the hyper-masculine men. Only 16 percent of these fathers have been continuously living together, while 50 percent have transitioned into a less committed relationship.
Second, hyper-masculine fathers are much more likely to transition into a less committed relationship than to either remain in the same type of relationship or transition into a more committed relationship. However, hyper-masculine fathers do not differ significantly from contemporary fathers in transitioning into a more committed relationship, though they certainly begin at lower levels of baseline commitment.

Third, the most consistent institutional participation measures were economic hardship and education. Across the majority of the models, experiencing economic hardship dramatically reduced the likelihood of moving into a more committed relationship, while having at least some college education buffered against downgrading relationships. Furthermore, I find little support for my hypotheses that Black fathers would be significantly more likely to transition into less committed relationships and significantly less likely to transition into more committed relationships. In only one regression model was race a significant predictor. Black fathers who were cohabiting at baseline are less likely than were White cohabiting fathers to transition into marriage. Outside of the focal independent variables (masculinity, race, and institutional participation), a critical control variable in this study was relationship quality. Even after controlling for the race and institutional participation measures, relationship quality remained significant in all models. I found that in every regression model relationship quality promotes transitioning into a more committed relationship and buffers against transitioning into a less committed relationship.

Discussion

This chapter set out to examine how relationship transitions differ across multiple categories of masculinity. I found dramatic differences across masculinity. Contemporary

---

8 Race was also significant in the multinomial regression models, but because of the lack of control variables in these models, I do not have complete confidence in the accuracy of the multinomial results.
fathers are the most likely to be continuously married and the most likely to transition from cohabitation to marriage. In contrast, hyper-masculine fathers are the least likely to be continuously married and the most likely to transition into a less committed relationship. The findings in this chapter support the use of a broadened, multi-dimensional measure of masculinity. This finding does have policy implications. Currently, marriage promotion and relationship education programs have gained considerable governmental support. My findings point out that these programs should be targeting fathers in the hyper-masculine category. These fathers are at the most risk for relationship instability and may be the fathers who would see the greatest benefit from these programs.

My research shows that fathers do appear to group themselves into qualitatively different categories of masculinity that have ramifications for behaviors with their baby’s mother. Researchers miss the bigger picture by only focusing on one form of masculinity. The intricacies of masculinity are important. Prior studies examining relationship formation and dissolution often only include the masculine breadwinning ideal (Oppenheimer 2003; Sassler & Goldscheider 2004). My study shows that if we look only at income as a measure of masculine success at breadwinning, we would assume that masculinity was not associated with relationship transitions; as income was not a consistent predictor of transitions into either a less committed or more committed relationship. Rather, the multitude of regressions shows that hyper-masculine men are the most likely to exhibit low commitment initially and to dissolve the intimate relationship with their baby’s mother eventually. Yes, these men do have the most economic disadvantages, but income is not the sole factor. The results of this chapter have shown that singular notions of masculinity espoused by Nock (1998) and Townsend (2002) do not show the whole story and are not effective predictors of relationships transitions. Importantly, this study
shows that using the critical gender scholars’ concepts of multiple masculinities can improve quantitative demographic research models.

I find very little association between among relationship transitions, race, and institutional variables that were prominent in prior studies in the logistic regressions. Among the institutional participation measures, economic hardship and education appear to be the strongest predictors of relationship transitions. My research provides additional support for the idea that urban fathers need secure finances before transitioning into a more stable relationship (Edin 2000; Edin, Kefalas, & Reed 2004; Smock, Manning, & Porter 2005). Past research suggested that men who have been in the military would be more likely to remain married and men who have been incarcerated would have been more likely to dissolve or transition into a less committed relationship (Lundquist 2004; Teachman 2007; Waller & Swisher 2006; Western & McLanahan 2000). My findings are not in line with this research. Having ever participated in the military or having a history of incarceration does not influence relationship transitions in this sample of urban fathers. Importantly and inconsistent with past research (Teachman 2002), I find that race is not a reliable predictor of transitions into less committed relationships. Race is only significant in the final model for those who transitioned from cohabitation into marriage. Consistent with past research, Black fathers are less likely than are White fathers to make this transition (Carlson, McLanahan, & England 2004).

One key effect in this study was the influence of fathers’ relationship quality with their baby’s mother. Lower quality relationships significantly predicted downgrading relationships. This finding along with the high emotional availability of contemporary fathers further supports past findings that emotional support from the father provided both relationship stability and

---

9 Although I did find significant results in the multinomial logistic regressions for race and institutional participation measures, I was unable to include the control variables in these models because of cell size issues. Therefore, I am unable to ascertain if these results would have remained once relationship quality was included as a control variable.
transitions into more committed relationships (Carlson, McLanahan & England 2004; Hohmann-Marriott 2009). Future research will need to examine directly how masculinity and relationship quality are interrelated.

The differing results across baseline relationship status found in this study may stem from a few key limitations. I only have a small number of hyper-masculine fathers who transitioned into more committed relationships, which limited the extensiveness of my multinomial logistic regression analyses. Unfortunately, I did not have the numbers to break relationship transitions into more complex categories within the multivariate analyses because of the small sample of hyper-masculine fathers. To elucidate further the findings in this study, future research should see how masculinity influences specific relationship transitions such as moving from cohabitation to marriage or from marriage to divorce.

We need future research to examine how masculinity changes throughout the life course and how those changes influence men’s intimate relationships. Terry and Braun (2009) find that as men get older they move from an immature, homosocial masculinity to a mature, relationship-driven masculinity. In other words, younger men base their masculinity on what “the guys” think and how their male friends will view their relationship with women. As men grow, they begin to find that their relationships with women, particularly sexual relationships, are driven by the relationship itself rather than on what other men think. Sex is no longer a conquest, but an enjoyment within a loving, caring relationship (Terry & Braun 2009).
Figure 5.1. Baseline and Year Five Relationship Statuses by Masculinity Category

Figure 5.2. Relationship Transitions by Masculinity Cluster and Baseline Relationship Status
Table 5.1. Percentages and N's of Types of Relationships from Baseline to 5th Year Follow-Up by Masculinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Relationship</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Contemporary</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Hyper-Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuously Married</td>
<td>30.9% (403)</td>
<td>43.2% (284)</td>
<td>21.3% (111)</td>
<td>6.5% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously Cohabiting</td>
<td>11.4% (149)</td>
<td>10.8% (71)</td>
<td>12.6% (66)</td>
<td>9.8% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously Visiting or Non-Romantic</td>
<td>10.3% (134)</td>
<td>7.1% (47)</td>
<td>12.9% (67)</td>
<td>16.3% (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married to Lesser Committed</td>
<td>4.5% (58)</td>
<td>4.4% (29)</td>
<td>3.8% (20)</td>
<td>7.3% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting to Married</td>
<td>9.9% (129)</td>
<td>11.4% (75)</td>
<td>9.0% (47)</td>
<td>5.7% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting to Lesser Committed</td>
<td>18.6% (242)</td>
<td>14.1% (93)</td>
<td>22.0% (115)</td>
<td>27.6% (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting or Non-Romantic to More Committed</td>
<td>7.7% (100)</td>
<td>5.5% (36)</td>
<td>10.5% (55)</td>
<td>7.3% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting or Non-Romantic to Lesser Committed</td>
<td>6.7% (88)</td>
<td>3.5% (23)</td>
<td>7.9% (41)</td>
<td>19.5% (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (1303)</td>
<td>100% (658)</td>
<td>100% (522)</td>
<td>100% (123)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.2. Logistic Models of Lower Commitment Transitions Regressed on Father’s Masculinity and Other Covariates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>e^b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>e^b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>e^b</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>e^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper-Masculinity&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.69 ***</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>0.83 ***</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.63 **</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Masculinity</td>
<td>0.61 ***</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and Institutional Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black non-Hispanic&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Incarceration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever in Military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Hardship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09 ***</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.08 ***</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.45 **</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.46 **</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.33 ***</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-1.33 ***</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>-0.52 ***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.49 ***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-0.48 ***</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting with Mother at Birth&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.23 ***</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.89 ***</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.92 ***</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting/Non-Romantic Relationship with Mother at Birth</td>
<td>1.36 ***</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.92 ***</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.93 ***</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociodemographic Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.02 *</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.00 ***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.96 ***</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.52 ***</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.39 **</td>
<td>1.34 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Data source - Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Data Set Baseline and Fifth Year-Follow Up

<sup>1</sup> Excluded category for dependent variable is fathers who have no change in their relationship status and those who transitioned into a more committed relationship.

Excluded categories are <sup>a</sup> Contemporary Masculinity <sup>b</sup> White non-Hispanic <sup>c</sup> Less than Some College <sup>d</sup> Married at Birth

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

N=1303
Table 5.3. Logistic Models of Lower Commitment Transitions\(^1\) Regressed on Father's Masculinity and Other Covariates: Married at Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper-Masculinity(^a)</td>
<td>2.40 ***</td>
<td>1.94 ***</td>
<td>1.84 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Masculinity</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and Institutional Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black non-Hispanic(^b)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Incarceration</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever in Military</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Participation</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School(^c)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>-1.12 *</td>
<td>-1.13 *</td>
<td>-1.13 *</td>
<td>-1.13 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>-0.38 *</td>
<td>-0.42 **</td>
<td>-0.38 *</td>
<td>-0.38 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociodemographic Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.08 **</td>
<td>-0.06 *</td>
<td>-0.07 **</td>
<td>-0.07 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.00 **</td>
<td>0.00 **</td>
<td>0.00 **</td>
<td>0.00 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>-2.28 ***</td>
<td>3.30 **</td>
<td>3.04 **</td>
<td>3.07 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  \(^1\) Excluded category for dependent variable is fathers who have remained married at year 5.

Excluded categories are \(^a\) Contemporary Masculinity \(^b\) White non-Hispanic \(^c\) Less than Some College

N=461

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.
Table 5.4. Logistic Models of Lower Commitment Transitions Regressed on Father's Masculinity and Other Covariates: Cohabiting at Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>eB</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>eB</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>eB</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>eB</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>eB</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>eB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper-Masculinity&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.03***</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Masculinity</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and Institutional Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black non-Hispanic&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.48*</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Incarceration</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever in Military</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.46***</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.45***</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Hardship</td>
<td>1.46***</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.45***</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>-0.77**</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.76**</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>-0.60***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.58***</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.57***</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociodemographic Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>-0.45***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.79***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.09**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.03***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Excluded category for dependent variable is fathers who have no change in their relationship status and those who transitioned into a more committed relationship.
Excluded categories are <sup>a</sup> Contemporary Masculinity <sup>b</sup> White non-Hispanic <sup>c</sup> Less than Some College
N=520
*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.
Table 5.5. Logistic Models of Lower Commitment Transitions ¹ Regressed on Father’s Masculinity and Other Covariates: Visiting or Non-Romantic at Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>e^B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper-Masculinity²</td>
<td>0.86 *</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Masculinity</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and Institutional Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black non-Hispanic³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Incarceration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever in Military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Hardship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Least Some College³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.45 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.45 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociodemographic Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.20 ***</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ¹ Excluded category for dependent variable is fathers who have no change in their relationship status and those who transitioned into a more committed relationship. ² Excluded categories are a Contemporary Masculinity b White non-Hispanic c Less than Some College N=322 *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.
Table 5.6. Logistic Models of Greater Commitment Transitions\(^1\) Regressed on Father’s Masculinity and Other Covariates: Cohabiting at Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>e(^B)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper-Masculinity(^a)</td>
<td>-1.10 **</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Masculinity</td>
<td>-0.57 **</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and Institutional Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black non-Hispanic(^b)</td>
<td>-0.94 ***</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.92 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Incarceration</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever in Military</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Participation</td>
<td>0.19 *</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.20 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Hardship</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School(^c)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>1.21 *</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.19 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>0.56 ***</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.54 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociodemographic Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>-0.78 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.89 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: \(^1\) Excluded category for dependent variable is fathers who have no change in their relationship status and those who transitioned into a less committed relationship.

Excluded categories are \(^a\) Contemporary Masculinity \(^b\) White non-Hispanic \(^c\) Less than Some College

N=520

\(*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.\)
Table 5.7. Logistic Models of Greater Commitment Transitions Regressed on Father’s Masculinity and Other Covariates: Visiting or Non-Romantic at Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B SE B eB</td>
<td>B SE B eB</td>
<td>B SE B eB</td>
<td>B SE B eB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper-Masculinitya</td>
<td>0.92 *</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Masculinity</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and Institutional Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black non-Hispanicb</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Incarceration</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever in Military</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Hardship</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>-0.65 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Least Some Collegec</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>0.43 ***</td>
<td>0.42 ***</td>
<td>0.42 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociodemographic Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.67 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.67 ***</td>
<td>-2.56 ***</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td>-2.32 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1 Excluded category for dependent variable is fathers who have no change in their relationship status and those who transitioned into a less committed relationship.

Excluded categories are a Contemporary Masculinity b White non-Hispanic c Less than Some College

N=322
*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.
CHAPTER VI: MASCULINITY AND FATHER INVOLVEMENT

The connection between masculinity and fatherhood is intricate, from the emphasis placed on men to be breadwinners to a father’s role in developing a son’s male identity. An invisible thread of masculinity, particularly breadwinning, often is present in family research. Historical accounts of marriage and fatherhood focus on the importance of employment and being “good providers” (Bernard 1981; LaRossa & Reitzes 1993). More current research emphasizes men’s increased participation in caregiving and housework (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson 2000; Maurer & Pleck 2006). At the heart of this line of research though is how men’s notions of masculinity influence family life. Whether men conform to the dominant breadwinning model of masculinity or follow the emergent model of masculinity that stresses nurturing and caregiving may influence how men participate in family life.

Past research on masculinity and fatherhood has examined broadly how masculine gender roles influence the father role (Doucet 2004; Silverstein, Auerbach, & Levant 2002). More specific research has been done on the connection between how masculine a father is and father’s amount of childcare (McHale & Huston 1984; Russell 1978), but to date, no research has examined how different forms of masculinity affect father’s familial participation. The current chapter addresses if differing forms of masculinity are associated with father involvement when the child is five years old.

The following chapter seeks to gain further insights into men’s fathering behaviors by using multiple categories of masculinity rather than a one-dimensional measure of masculinity. The current chapter extends previous studies’ emphasis on the masculine provider role by incorporating a person-centered approach to masculinity that groups men into categories of
masculinity. Past research may be missing critical links between masculinity and father involvement by examining only one dimension of masculinity. The prior empirical chapter showed that masculinity does appear to be a multi-dimensional concept with men grouping into different categories of masculinity that have distinctive qualities that cleave together. Therefore, I use the cluster analysis results from the first empirical chapter to analyze if men conforming to the traditional, contemporary, or hyper-masculine categories of masculinity differ in the amount of involvement they have with their child.

Specifically this chapter will determine if one category of masculinity more so than another category is associated with greater involvement by the father. I also focus on race to see if Black and White fathers within the same masculinity category significantly differ in average amounts of involvement. I focus on race differences within masculinity categories because research indicates that although many Black men may not be able to provide economically for their children (therefore not living up to the hegemonic, breadwinning ideal), they want to be there for their children and in doing so make concerted efforts to spend as much time with their children as possible (Hamer 2001). Additionally in chapter four, I found that the masculinity categories differed significantly by race. The results from chapter four indicated that significant race differences emerged within the masculinity categories among the institutional participation measures; therefore, race differences also are likely to occur in father involvement.

Then, I use Ordinary Least Squares Regression to see if masculinity predicts fathers’ average daily involvement. Within these analyses, I address whether race and institutional participation reduce the association between masculinity and father involvement. Finally, I split my sample between fathers who currently reside with their children all or most of the time and
fathers who live with their child less than half of the time. Past research often indicates that non-residential fathers are less involved with their children than residential fathers are (Furstenberg & Cherlin 1991; Marsiglio, Amato & Lamb 2000; Stewart 1999). Therefore, I analyze separate but identical regression models to see if the effect of fathers’ masculinity is the same for residential versus non-residential fathers and to determine if the additional independent variables present similar patterns of findings across the separate models.

Previous Research

I break down the previous literature into three sections. First, I address how past researchers have examined the link between masculinity and father involvement. Here, I describe research examining masculinity and fatherhood, particularly focusing on studies using the Fragile Families data set. I focus on the Fragile Families data to see how one-dimensional measures of masculinity, which are used frequently as either mediators or moderators, are associated with father involvement. Second, I examine prior research on race and institutional participation and how each are related to father involvement. Third, I summarize prior research concerning the control variables I use in this study.

Masculinity and Father Involvement

The overarching view of mainstream masculinity, particularly the focus on breadwinning, is evident when we examine the literature on father involvement. For instance, Christiansen and Palkovitz (2001) argue that financial providership is an actual form of father involvement. Financial providership often is overlooked and taken for granted, but is important to men’s involvement in their families (Christiansen & Palkovitz 2001). Many men also believe that providing is a key component of being a good father (Hatter et al. 2002). However, economic
and demographic shifts have meant that achieving the role of sole provider has become much harder to achieve in contemporary American society. Women’s income and education are becoming critical factors in family formation (Sweeney 2002), with one income families becoming increasingly rare. Women’s increased labor force participation may have sparked a reconfiguring of masculine familial ideals. Men’s expectations and ideals to participate more fully in the day-to-day maintenance of family life, including childcare, have increased (Cabrera et al. 2000; Henwood & Procter 2003). Men’s behavior has also adjusted slowly to account for the increased familial demands, but have not met many expectations completely. While not fully committing to equality in housework (although men’s housework has increased in past decades) (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson 2000; Gupta 1999; Sayer 2005), men are becoming more involved in childcare (Bianchi 2000; Johansson & Klinth 2008).

While the above section provided a broader explanation for how masculinity may be associated with father involvement, the following section discusses the empirical research using the Fragile Families data that examine the relationship between each masculinity dimension and father involvement. The majority of studies that use single dimensions of masculinity are most often included as controls. Typically the effects of the control variables are not presented in regression tables or discussed within the text (e.g. Carlson, McLanahan, & Brooks-Gunn 2008; Edin, Tach, & Mincy 2009, Gibson-Davis 2008; Ryan, Kalil, and Ziol-Guest 2008). Unfortunately, this means that I am unable to ascertain many of the effects of each, single dimension of masculinity on father involvement.

Outside of using the dimensions as control variables, previous research found non-significant results in studies that retain a greater attention to masculinity. Fathering attitudes
were not significant in studies focusing both on the relationship between religion and father involvement as well as prenatal involvement and involvement at years one and three (Petts 2007; Ryan, Kalil, & Ziol-Guest 2008; Wildeman 2008). Additionally, traditional gender role attitudes and fathers’ physical abuse of the baby’s mother are non-significant predictors of involvement (Petts 2007; Waller & Swisher 2006). Other studies find inconsistent associations between fathers’ financial providing and involvement. Petts (2007) finds a negative relationship between income and involvement. In comparison to income, fathers’ employment status increases paternal participation (Cabrera, Fagan, & Farrie 2008; Ryan, Kalil, & Ziol-Guest 2008; Wildeman 2008).

Clearly, the relationship between masculinity and father involvement is not well defined. I seek to extend the past research on fathers’ masculinity by including a comprehensive measure of masculinity that groups men along specific cohering qualities. This chapter will be the first to address how multiple categories of masculinity are associated with father involvement, by using the categories developed in the first empirical chapter. I expect to find the following relationships between masculinity and father involvement.

During the past few decades, societal expectations have risen for increased paternal participation in their child’s life (Cabrera et al. 2000); which might have caused a potential realignment of masculine ideals in American society. Increased expectations for involvement could play out between two diverging categories of masculinity. Contemporary masculine men may see involvement as a necessary and welcomed part of their lives. As the first empirical chapter showed, contemporary fathers have high amounts of economic and social resources that may provide them with increased opportunities for participating in their child’s daily life.
Alternatively, hyper-masculine fathers who were found to have the least economic and social resources may find that involvement in daily life is the only way to accomplish fatherhood. Hyper-masculine fathers are less likely to have the economic capacity to be providers. Therefore, these men may see their role as a father as being there and interacting with the child rather than focusing on being the economic breadwinner. I hypothesize that fathers in the contemporary masculinity category will be the most involved in day-to-day activities, followed by the hyper-masculine, and traditional masculinity categories.

Additional Factors Influencing Father Involvement

Race and Institutional Participation

Race

Past studies have indicated that father involvement may vary depending on race and institutional participation. Although, the research on race differences in father involvement tends to be inconsistent and often depends on the type of involvement being analyzed. Carlson and McLanahan (2004) find a complex relationship between race and early father involvement among unmarried fathers. They find no race differences between those who gave money to the mother during pregnancy and those who did not give money. However, White fathers are more likely to visit mothers in the hospital and have their name on the birth certificate than Black fathers are. Mott (1990) finds that Black nonresidential fathers are more likely to have contact with their children, but other research shows no White-Black differences in contact (King, Harris, & Heard 2004). Among residential fathers, no significant race differences occur in the total time fathers are available to their children on weekdays, but Black fathers spend less time
than Whites fathers do with their children on weekends (Yeung, Sandberg, Davis-Kean, & Hofferth 2001).

Race differences in father involvement are dependent upon multiple factors and show no consistent pattern (Carlson & McLanahan 2004; Mott 1990; King, Harris, & Heard 2004; Yeung et al. 2001). Because of the inconclusive findings in previous research, I draw competing hypotheses for how race will be associated with father involvement. On one hand, Black fathers may be less likely to be involved with their child than White fathers are (Carlson & McLanahan 2004; Yeung et al. 2001). On the other hand, Black fathers may show no difference in involvement than White fathers. Furthermore, Black non-residential fathers will have more involvement than White non-residential fathers (Mott 1990; Hamer 2001).

Additionally, I expect to find race differences among hyper-masculine fathers. In the earlier chapter, I found that hyper-masculinity is associated with higher incarceration rates and non-marital relationships with the baby’s mother at birth. Race differences in incarceration and non-marital births may elicit differential effects among hyper-masculine fathers. I hypothesize that Black hyper-masculine fathers will show greater involvement than White hyper-masculine fathers will, because incarceration and non-marital births are more normative among Blacks than among Whites (Pagnini & Morgan 1996; Pettit & Western 2004).

Financial Hardship

As mentioned earlier, previous research indicates that fatherhood has been tied explicitly to breadwinning (Lamb 2000; Townsend 2002). Good fathers are supposed to be good providers (Bernard 1981; Cohen 1987). Men often see providing as a way to give their children “the right chance in life” (White 1994). However, participation in the labor force may decrease paternal
engagement, can sometimes justify less involvement, and can leave less free time available for activities (White 1994). Fathers who work many hours in paid employment may be too tired or stressed to engage with their children when they arrive home from work (Rubin 1995). Overall, breadwinning is still associated with paternal involvement in U.S. culture. So much so, that when men are incapable of providing for their children, they make concentrated efforts at involvement by “being there” for their children as a way to make up for not being able to provide financially (Hamer 2001).

Paternal Incarceration

A history of incarceration can affect how men identify as fathers and can also damage fathers’ relationships with their children (Dyer 2005). Research using the Fragile Families data has found that of physical abuse, substance abuse, and incarceration, incarceration is the most common risk factor among fathers with 11 percent of fathers experiencing incarceration between the child’s first and third birthdays, and 30.2 percent of fathers having past histories of incarceration before their child’s birth (Waller & Swisher 2006). For both residential and nonresidential fathers who have been in contact with their children in the past 30 days, incarceration is associated negatively with fathers’ daily activities with their children (Waller & Swisher 2006).

The relationship between incarceration and father involvement is likely to differ by race. Incarceration has become essentially part of the life course for many low-educated, young minority men (Pettit & Western 2004). Black men born between 1965 and 1969 had a 20 percent risk of being incarcerated by the time they reach their mid-thirties compared to only a 3 percent risk for White men born in the same time period (Pettit & Western 2004, pg 161). The
risk increases to 60 percent for Black men who did not finish high school. More specifically related to this paper are incarceration rates for parents. Wildeman (2009) finds that Black children born in 1978 and 1990 are significantly more likely than are White children to have a parent with a history of incarceration. In fact, Black children born in 1990 were seven times more likely than were White children to have a parent who had ever been in prison. Additionally, incarceration has a strong negative association with White nonresident fathers’ days of contact with their child, but not so for Black nonresident fathers. Swisher and Waller (2008) find that White, recently incarcerated fathers see their children 13 fewer days per month compared to non-incarcerated fathers, versus 7.2 fewer days for Black fathers who were recently incarcerated. They also find that past incarceration provides an even smaller barrier for Black fathers, as previously incarcerated Black fathers see their child only one day less per month compared to fathers who have never been incarcerated. Critically, incarceration creates a high level of distrust among mothers for Whites fathers, not for Black mothers (Swisher & Waller 2008). This finding is important because levels of mothers’ distrust have been associated with lower levels of father involvement (Waller & Swisher 2006).

Religion

Studies using the National Survey of Family and Households have examined the role of religion on both residential and nonresidential father involvement. For non-residential fathers, their face-to-face and phone contact with their children is not associated with church attendance (Cooksey & Craig 1998). Wilcox (2002) uses the NSFH to examine involvement among resident fathers and finds that church attendance is associated positively with youth-related activities such as school or sports activities. However, Wilcox (2002) also finds a negative
relationship with church attendance and one-on-one interactions such as private talks or working together on homework. Higher levels of church attendance among resident fathers seem to increase paternal supervision (Bartowski & Xu 2000). Fragile Families data also has addressed the relationship between religion and father engagement. Petts (2007) uses the Fragile Families data and finds that religious participation increases paternal engagement, with first time fathers who have high levels of religious participation having the highest amount of paternal engagement.

Some of the inconsistent findings may stem from the fact that only one component of religiosity is used. King (2003) uses the National Survey of Midlife Development in the United States to examine multiple dimensions of religion and their influence on father involvement. She finds that multiple measures of fathers’ religiousness are associated with higher quality parent-child relationships, even after controlling for traditional attitudes and relationship quality with the child’s mother. King’s more in depth measures of religiousness indicate that church attendance is associated positively with parent-child relationship quality, but is not related to any other measure of father involvement.

Military

Military participation may increase father involvement. Military fathers have proven that they can endure a major commitment and maintain stable employment (Lundquist 2004). Increased efforts by the armed forces to decrease work-family conflict may also provide the opportunity for fathers to participate more extensively in their child’s life (Bourg & Segal 1999). Military participation might also decrease father involvement. The increased likelihood that
fathers may be absent because of training or deployment and the stress surrounding the potential of deployment may affect the parent-child relationship negatively (Hanson 1985).

Past Research on Control Variables

*Relationship with Baby’s Mother*

The status of the parents’ relationship and the quality of the relationship are important predictors of father involvement. Being married and being in a good marriage can increase father involvement (Hofferth & Anderson 2003; King 2003). Among unmarried fathers, cohabiting fathers are significantly more likely to be involved during infancy than are fathers who are in visiting relationships, just friends, or not in a relationship with the baby’s mother. Cohabiting fathers are more likely to provide material support during the pregnancy, visit the baby’s mother in the hospital, have their name on the birth certificates, and to have the child take their last names compared to other unmarried fathers (Carlson & McLanahan 2004). Although cohabiting fathers are supportive at the time of the birth, they may become less involved as the child ages. Cohabiting relationships are often more egalitarian and have less formalized norms for parenting practices (DeMaris & McDonald 2003), therefore cohabiting fathers may be more likely to be involved with their child than married fathers. However, cohabiting couples often are less committed and more likely to separate compared to married couples. Therefore, cohabiting fathers possibly may be less involved than married fathers are by the time the child is five years old.

The relationship status at birth is not the only important relationship. Father involvement often declines once fathers are no longer involved with their baby’s mother intimately. In general, non-residential fathers are less involved than residential fathers are (Furstenberg &
Cherlin 1991; Marsiglio, Amato, & Lamb 2000; Stewart 1999). Fathers’ repartnering can have drastic changes in father involvement. Frequently, non-resident fathers remove themselves even further from their child’s life when they have children with new partners (Furstenberg 1995; Manning & Smock 1999; Manning & Smock 2000). This finding comes as no surprise because many researchers have suggested that marriage and fathering combine into one package, as father involvement declines when the father’s relationship with the mother ends (Edin, Tack, & Mincy 2009; Furstenberg & Cherlin 1991). Importantly, nonresidential fathers also become less involved when either they or the baby’s mother have a new partner in their lives (Edin, Tach, & Mincy 2009; Tach, Mincy, & Edin 2010). However, Black fathers are more likely than White fathers are to be involved in their child’s life even after the relationship with the mother ends (Edin, Tach, & Mincy 2009; Hamer 2001; Mott 1990).

Father involvement is also higher when parents have high quality relationships (Carlson & McLanahan 2004). Maternal trust is a key dimension of relationship quality that predicts father involvement. Waller and Swisher (2006) find that among mothers who do not trust the father to take care of their child, fathers participate in fewer daily activities with their child. The importance of mother’s distrust should not be understated. In fact, the inclusion of mother’s distrust removes the significant negative effect of fathers’ perpetration of domestic violence on fathers’ daily activities with their children (Waller & Swisher 2006).

*Child Characteristics*

The child’s gender may significantly predict father involvement. Typically, sons are often thought to be the territory of husbands, while daughters are the territory of mothers (White 1994); which would indicate greater involvement by fathers to sons than to daughters. Fathers
may identify more with the same sex child and feel more social pressure to be a father to boys than girls (Russell & Saebel 1997) in order to teach them how to become men. Research using the Fragile Families data finds no difference in father involvement between sons and daughters (Carlson & McLanahan 2004), but gender differences in father involvement may not occur at young ages (Updegraff, McHale, Crouter, & Kupanoff 2001). Additionally, gender differences may depend on the type of involvement being analyzed (Lundberg, McLanahan & Rose 2007).

Data and Method

Data from the baseline, first year follow-up, and fifth year follow-up interviews from the Fragile Families Study are used. The Fragile Families Study contains data on 4,989 births. I restrict my sample to include fathers who have a valid response on the masculinity measure created in the first empirical chapter, reducing my sample to 1,589 fathers. Furthermore, only fathers who completed the fifth year follow-up and who have been in contact with their child in the past 30 days were included, further reducing my sample to 1,195 cases. Because mother’s trust is a vital indicator of father involvement, I include only cases where mothers have a completed first year interview, which excluded an additional two cases. For control variables, I have replaced all missing cases with the mean sample value. This process leaves me with an effective sample size of 1,193.

I use Ordinary Least Squares regression models to examine the relationship between masculinity and father involvement when the child is five years old. I first analyze the full sample of both residential and non-residential fathers. In order to examine the robustness of my

---

10 As a reminder, the criteria used to obtain the masculinity measures were restricted to fathers who have both baseline and one-year interviews reducing the sample from 4,989 to 3,479. The use of only Black and White fathers reduces the sample to 2,139. Additional cases were lost because the masculinity measures were only asked in 18 of the 20 cities, bringing the sample size down to 1,698. A further 158 respondents were eliminated because of missing information on the masculinity measures.
findings, I then split my sample into fathers who reside with their child most or all of the time and fathers who live with their child half of the time or less. Non-residential fathers may be unable to be as involved as residential fathers because they see their child less often than do residential fathers. The risk of exposure for resident fathers to participate in daily activities with their children is much higher than for non-residential fathers.

**Dependent Variable**

*Father involvement:* Father involvement is measured at the five year follow-up interview. The father involvement measure includes both fathers who live with their child at least half time and fathers who do not live with their child at least half time but saw their child more than once in the last 30 days. Fathers who do not live with their child at least half time and have not seen their child more than once in the last 30 days were not asked the questions regarding involvement. Respondents were asked what is the average number of days you complete each of the following activities in a typical week: “sing songs or nursery rhymes,” “read stories to child,” “tell stories to child,” “play inside with toys such as blocks or legos with child,” “tell child that you appreciated something he/she did,” “play outside in the yard, park, or playground with child,” “take child on an outing, such as shopping, or to a restaurant, church, museum, or special activity or event,” and “watch TV or a video together.” I sum each of the fathers’ responses and divide by seven; therefore, my final measure of involvement addresses the average number of days of involvement.
Focal Independent Variables

*Masculinity:* Masculinity is measured with a three-category variable that was constructed using cluster analysis, which was described in the earlier chapter. The three categories include traditional, hyper, and the excluded category of contemporary masculinity.

*Race:* I use a dummy variable to distinguish between Black non-Hispanic fathers (1) and White non-Hispanic fathers (0).

*Military.* Participation in the military is a dummy variable indicating that the father has ever served in the military. I use a measure of ever participating in the military, because there are too few cases of fathers who are currently in the military to distinguish between current and past participation.

*Prison.* I measure incarceration history as a dummy variable indicating whether the father has ever spent time in a correctional institution. I use a constructed measure from the Fragile Families data that combines responses of father and mother reports of ever being incarcerated by the one-year follow-up interview. I use this approach rather than using only the fathers’ reports to account for the sensitivity in reporting imprisonment and to account for as many cases of incarceration as possible. Using father-only reports, I have 160 fathers with histories of incarceration. The combined report gives 286 fathers with histories of incarceration. Too few respondents are currently incarcerated to be able to break this measure down further into past or current incarceration.

*Religious Participation.* Religious participation is measured by how often the father goes to religious services. The responses range from never (0) to once a week or more (4).
Economic hardship. Fathers were asked if in the past 12 months “did you receive free food or meals,” “did your child/children went hungry,” “did you go hungry,” “did you not pay the full amount of rent or mortgage payments,” “were you evicted from your home or apartment for not paying the rent or mortgage,” “was service turned off by the gas or electric company, or did the oil company not deliver oil,” “was service was disconnected by the telephone company because payments were not made,” “did you borrow money from friends or family to help pay bills,” “did you move in with other people even for a little while because of financial problems,” “did you stay at a shelter, in an abandoned building, an automobile or any other place not meant for regular housing even for one night”, and “was there anyone in your household who needed to see a doctor or go to the hospital but couldn’t go because of cost.” Because eighty-eight percent of the sample did not experience any of the twelve items, economic hardship is a dummy variable indicating whether the father experienced one or more of the hardship measures (1) or experienced none of the hardship measures (0).

Education. I use four dummy variables to measure education. The responses are less than high school, high school or GED, some college or technical training, and at least a college graduate.

Control Variables

Relationship status: The father’s relationship status with the baby’s mother is measured at the baseline interview. Married at the time of birth is the excluded category in comparison to cohabiting at birth, and romantically involved but not living together or just friends at birth.

Relationship quality: Father’s evaluation of the quality of the relationship with the baby’s mother at the first-year follow up is measured using one question, “In general, would you say
that your relationship with her is excellent (5), very good (4), good (3), fair (2), or poor (1)?”

Additionally, fathers who stated that they “never see her” were coded as 0.

Other biological children: I use a dummy variable to address whether the father has a biological child that does not live in the father’s current household (1) versus the excluded category of not having additional biological children outside of the household (0).

Parenting difficulties: At the first year follow-up interview fathers were asked “Now I’m going to read some statements about raising (child). Please tell me if you agree or disagree with each statement,” “being a parent is harder than I thought it would be,” “I feel trapped by my responsibilities as a parent,” “I find taking care of my child(ren) is much more work than pleasure,” and “I often feel tired, worn out, or exhausted from raising a family.” Responses for these questions ranged from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (4). Each item was recoded so that higher values would indicate more agreement with each statement. The final measure is the sum of the four items. The Cronbach’s alpha is 0.57.

Mother’s trust: At the first year follow-up interview, mothers were asked “If you had to go away for one week and could not take (child) with you, how much would you trust (father) to take care of your child? Would you trust him very much, somewhat, or not at all?” I created a dummy variable indicating mothers who trust the fathers very much (1) versus mothers who trust the fathers somewhat or not at all (0).

Child sex: I use a dummy variable to indicate if the child is male (1) or female (0).

Child’s health: At the first year interview fathers were asked “In general, would you say (child’s) health is excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?” I recoded this measure into a
dummy variable indicating children in excellent health (1) compared to very good, good, fair or poor health (0) because of the skew towards children in excellent health.

Health: At the first year interview fathers were asked, “In general, how is your health? Would you say it is excellent (1), very good (2), good (3), fair (4), or poor (5)?” I recoded this variable so that higher values would reflect better health.

Income: I use fathers’ self-reports of job earnings at the year one follow-up to measure income. Fathers’ earnings for the year ranged from $624-$800,000, because of the wide range I collapsed this continuous variable into categories, which were then recoded, to the midpoint of the category range. The final measure consists of seven midpoint incomes: (1) $5,000, (2) $15,000, (3) $25,000, (4) $35,000, (5) $45,000, (6) $55,000, and (7) $60,000.

Child’s current residence: I measure how often the child lives with the father at the year five follow-up interview with three dummy variables. The excluded category is child lives with father most or all of the time versus the child lives with father half or some of the time and the child lives with the father none of the time.

RESULTS

Descriptive Results

Table 6.1 presents the means and standard deviations for all the variables in the analysis. I find that the average number of days of involvement is 4.29. Approximately 75 percent of the fathers in this sample are married or cohabitating with their baby’s mother at birth. Because of the high number of co-residing parents, my sample may be more selective of fathers remaining in highly committed relationships with their baby’s mother. The average relationship quality with
the baby’s mother is 3.93, indicating that fathers have high quality relationships. The majority of fathers, 72 percent, live with their child all or most of the time.

{Insert Table 6.1 Here}

I now turn to the relationship between masculinity and father involvement. Figure 6.1 illustrates the breakdown of father involvement by masculinity and race. I find support for my hypothesis regarding masculinity and father involvement. As expected, fathers in the contemporary masculinity category are the most involved. Contemporary fathers have the highest average involvement at 4.45 days, followed by hyper-masculine fathers with an average of 4.21, and fathers in the traditional masculinity category having an average of 4.11. However, the only significant difference is between contemporary and traditional fathers.

{Insert Figure 6.1 Here}

Inconsistent with my hypotheses, the only significant race difference is between contemporary fathers. White contemporary fathers are more involved with their child than Black contemporary fathers are. Contemporary fathers participate in an average of 4.59 and 4.29 days, for Whites and Blacks respectively. No race differences occur among traditional or hyper-masculine fathers. Overall, contemporary fathers are the most involved fathers and traditional fathers are the least involved with only slight race differences across masculinity categories.

Multivariate Results

*Masculinity’s influence on father involvement*

Table 6.2 presents the nested OLS regression results of masculinity on father involvement. Turning your attention to masculinity, the focal independent variable, model 1 shows that in the zero-order regression traditional masculinity is associated with less
involvement compared to contemporary fathers. Traditionally masculine fathers participate in about 0.33 less days of involvement than contemporary masculine fathers do. Hyper-masculinity is not significantly different from contemporary masculinity in the bivariate regression. For traditional fathers, the relationship between father involvement and masculinity is reduced to non-significance by the block of variables describing the relationship with baby’s mother. Inconsistent with my expectations, hyper-masculine fathers are more involved than are contemporary fathers. With the addition of residency status to the model, hyper-masculine fathers are more involved than contemporary masculine fathers are. Hyper-masculinity is not significantly associated with father involvement in the bivariate regression models, but this effect is suppressed by father’s residency status. Model 4 shows that hyper-masculine fathers have about 0.37 more days of involvement than contemporary masculine fathers. I also changed the excluded category to be traditional fathers to examine the relationship between traditional and hyper-masculine men. I find that hyper-masculine fathers are significantly more likely to be involved than are traditional fathers in the final model ($t=2.49, p<0.05$). To conclude, after all control variables are included in the model, traditionally masculine fathers do not differ significantly from contemporary masculine fathers in father involvement. However, hyper-masculine fathers are more involved than are both contemporary and traditional fathers.

{Insert Table 6.2 Here}

Race and Institutional Participation Results

I now address the possibility that race and institutional participation may reduce the effects on the relationship between masculinity and father involvement. To test for omitted-variable bias, I first examine whether the variables significantly predict father involvement and
then I look at the attenuating effects of race and institutional participation. I drew competing hypotheses about race because of the inconsistent results found in the literature. I found support for the first hypothesis that Black fathers would be less involved than would be White fathers. Looking at Model 2 in Table 6.2, I find that Black fathers are involved an average of 0.29 days less than White fathers. I hypothesized that experiencing economic hardship would be related to less father involvement. I found support for this hypothesis. Economic hardship does decrease father involvement by 0.59 days but economic hardship is not significant once residency status is included in the model. Inconsistent with my hypotheses, military participation, religious participation, and education are not significant predictors of father involvement.

The traditional masculinity coefficient is reduced from -0.33 in Model 1 to -0.23 in Model 2, but men in the traditional masculinity category are still significantly less likely to be involved with their children. Race and institutional participation do not eliminate the association between masculinity and father involvement.

Results for control variables

Models 3 and 4 of Table 6.2 present the results for my control variables. I use these models to test whether masculinity still is related significantly to father involvement after controlling for a plethora of background characteristics. Model 3 incorporates the relationship with the baby’s mother, parenting, and father and child characteristic measures to the regression. Once these variables are included, the effect of traditional masculinity is reduced to non-significance. Taking a closer look, I find that the addition of the quality of the relationship with the baby’s mother is the key factor (results not shown). Once relationship quality is added, traditional masculinity is no longer significant.
I add child’s current residency status in Model 4. As stated earlier, the inclusion of residency status alters the relationship between masculinity and father involvement. Residency status suppresses the relationship between hyper-masculinity and father involvement. Once I account for children who do not live with their father, hyper-masculine fathers are more involved with their children than contemporary fathers.

I now report the findings for the significant control variables in the final model, which is Model 5 in Table 6.2. Fathers who were in a visiting or in a non-romantic relationship with the baby’s mother at birth have greater involvement than fathers who were married at birth. Inconsistent with my hypothesis that fathers in higher quality relationships would be more active in their child’s life, relationship quality was not significantly associated with father involvement in the final model. I find support for my hypothesis of a negative relationship between parenting difficulties and father involvement. Fathers who have increased parenting difficulties are less involved with their children. Fathers who have children with excellent health are involved in 0.30 more days than fathers who have children in poorer health. As hypothesized, fathers who do not live with their child most or all of the time are significantly less likely to be involved. Non-residential fathers partake in at least one less day of involvement compared to residential fathers. Standardized regression coefficients indicate that child’s residency status has the largest effect on father involvement (results not shown).

In conclusion, four key factors connect to father involvement in this study. First and most importantly, hyper-masculine fathers are more involved than both contemporary and traditional fathers are after accounting for child’s residency status. This finding does not fully support my hypotheses. I had expected that contemporary fathers would be the most involved
followed by hyper-masculine fathers. The results of this chapter provide tentative evidence that hyper-masculine fathers may see active participation in their child’s life as a replacement for their failure as breadwinners. Second, race and institutional participation variables do not eliminate the relationship between masculinity and father involvement. Third, fathers who see parenting as more difficult than they expected are less likely to be active participants in their children’s lives. Fourth, fathers who do not live with their children have significantly lower involvement than fathers who live with their children most of the time.

Differences between Resident and non-Resident Fathers

I now look at whether resident and non-resident fathers have the same predictors of father involvement. Here I focus on whether similar patterns exist among both resident and non-resident fathers. I split the sample because past research has found that non-resident fathers often are less involved than resident fathers (Furstenberg & Cherlin 1991). Additionally, the results for the full sample show that residency status was the greatest predictor of involvement.

Table 6.3 presents the OLS regression results for residential fathers only. Consistent with the results from the full sample, hyper-masculine residential fathers have higher amounts of father involvement than do contemporary fathers. However, this is only a marginally significant finding (p<0.10). When changing the excluded category to be traditional fathers, I find that hyper-masculine residential fathers are more likely to be involved than traditionally masculine residential fathers are (t=2.29, p<0.05). None of the race or social institution participation measures are significantly related to father involvement. Similar to the full sample, there is a negative relationship between parenting difficulties and father involvement. Residential fathers who have children in excellent health are more involved than residential fathers who have
children in poorer health. Unlike the full sample, residential fathers’ relationship quality with the baby’s mother is associated significantly with father involvement.

Table 6.4 presents the OLS regression results for non-residential fathers only. Masculinity is not associated with father involvement for non-residential fathers. No significant relationship is found if I use traditional masculinity as the excluded category either (results not shown). Non-residential fathers with some college are less involved than non-residential fathers who only graduated from high school. Both mother’s trust and self-reported health are associated positively with non-residential father involvement.

In summary, these results point to differing predictors of father involvement for resident and non-resident fathers. Initially, I expected that differential masculinity effects would have occurred among non-residential fathers more so than for residential fathers. We know that contemporary men are more emotionally supportive and have the most socio-economic advantages. Even when they do not maintain a co-residing relationship with their child, contemporary fathers would seem to be more likely to remain involved than hyper-masculine non-residential fathers. This was not the case though. Instead, masculinity is associated significantly with residential father involvement, while masculinity is not significant for non-residential fathers. However, for resident fathers, the relationship quality with the baby’s mother, parenting difficulties, and child’s health appear to influence involvement more than masculinity. Still, resident hyper-masculine fathers are more involved than resident traditional fathers. Different patterns emerge for non-residential fathers. Mothers’ trust seems to have the
most influence for non-residential father involvement. No matter what masculinity category a father falls into, greater involvement is associated with greater trust by the baby’s mother. Finally, neither race nor institutional participation predicted involvement in either of the sub-samples.

Discussion

Forms of masculinity are important predictors of father involvement. Overall and inconsistent with expectations, contemporary fathers are not the most involved with their children. Traditional fathers are the least involved, while residential hyper-masculine fathers are the most involved. Consistent with research suggesting that the traditional model of masculinity elicits non-involvement from fathers (Mihalik & Morrison 2006; Silverstein, Auerbach, & Levant 2002), my findings suggest that fathers within the traditional masculinity category are the least involved with their children. Critically, contemporary masculinity does not predict father involvement. Although, contemporary fathers could be considered the most advantaged, with strong, “positive” aspects of masculinity and secure attachments to validating forms of social institutions, these men are no more likely to be involved than traditional or hyper-masculine men. As indicated in the earlier chapter, hyper-masculine fathers experience the most financial hardship. My finding that hyper-masculine fathers are significantly more involved than traditional fathers, may lend further credence to research that emphasizes that low-income fathers value the physical interaction and emotional support they can provide to their children (Hamer 2001; Jarrett et al. 2002; Summers et al. 2006).

Fathers’ residency status is crucial in examining father involvement. Hyper-masculine residential fathers are more involved than both contemporary and traditional residential fathers
A secondary goal of this chapter was to determine if race and institutional participation reduced the effects between masculinity and father involvement. Bivariate results indicated that on average, Black fathers were less involved than were White fathers regardless of masculinity category. I found a similar pattern in the full sample multivariate results. Black fathers are involved about 0.21 average days less than are White fathers. I would argue that additional research is needed to address race differences in father involvement, because although my study finds lower involvement on the part of Black fathers previous research has found mixed results from Blacks being more involved, less involved, and no race differences (King, Harris, & Heard 2004; Mott 1990; Yeung et al. 2001). Furthermore, institutional participation had little influence on involvement among these urban fathers. Economic hardship was the only institutional variable affecting involvement. The lack of significance among the institutional participation variables is not completely unexpected. Unlike previous research on institutional participation and relationship transitions that showed clear results, research on the association between institutional participation and father involvement is murkier. One clear relationship found in
previous research is that marriage increases father involvement, but participation in other institutions shows no conclusive pattern of involvement in previous research.

A few limitations need to be addressed. Lamb and colleagues (1985) argue that father involvement is multidimensional and comprised of three components: interaction, availability, and responsibility. My study only examines one aspect of involvement, which I would categorize as interaction. One could classify the measures of father involvement I use as what fathers “do” with their children and these might be more likely to be associated with play-like behavior. Research shows that fathers are more likely to play with children than care for children (McBride & Mills 1993; Yeung et al. 2001). Masculinity possibly may have different effects on other dimensions of involvement. Contemporary masculine fathers may be more likely to be involved in the other two components, responsibility and availability, of father involvement. While, my study found that hyper-masculine fathers are more involved than both contemporary and traditional fathers this may be an artifact of the type of measurement used for father involvement.

Additionally, because of the small number of white hyper-masculine fathers I am unable to test for possible moderating effects. In future research, I would like to examine two potentially influential interaction effects between race and masculinity and mother’s trust and masculinity. My models also do not account for time-varying effects. Institutional participation at the first follow-up interview was not significant. However, changes over time may give further insights into involvement. Future research should examine how masculinity is associated with changes in father involvement. The possibility exists that contemporary fathers may have little change in involvement over the years, because of stably high involvement. Whereas hyper-
masculine fathers may have relatively high involvement at one point in time, they may be unable to maintain high involvement for a long time. Possibly, hyper-masculine men may also have different trajectories of involvement because of their increased risk of incarceration.

Future research is necessary to determine how father’s involvement will affect children in their later years. Research should examine whether hyper-masculine men pass on their gender identity to their children. Will hyper-masculine men’s more assertive actions be seen as a building block for their children’s behavior? Additionally, future studies should attempt to analyze what the mechanisms are behind hyper-masculine men’s higher levels of involvement. On one hand, hyper-masculine fathers may use involvement as a way to gain control over the child’s mother and the child. Kenney’s (2008) study using the Fragile Families data finds that when fathers are in control of the pooled household income there are lower investments towards children than when mothers control the pooled income. Children may be at a disadvantage if the basis for increased involvement is a need for control. On the other hand, hyper-masculine men may be treating their involvement as an alternative to financial providership, which may have fewer negative consequences for children. Researchers need to determine if the involvement really is a means by which these men prove their masculinity outside of successful breadwinning.
Table 6.1. Descriptive Statistics for All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father Involvement (5th yr)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Masculinity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper-Masculinity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Masculinity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White non-Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black non-Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been in military</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been in jail or prison</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious participation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced economic hardship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate or GED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or technical school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least college graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married to baby's mother at birth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting with baby's mother at birth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting or just friends with baby's mother at birth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship quality with baby's mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other biological children who do not reside in household</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other biological children who do not reside in household</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting difficulties</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's trusts father very much to care for child if gone for a week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's trusts father somewhat or not at all to care for child if gone for a week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's health is excellent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's health is very good, good, or poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child is male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child is female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self reported health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>31647.11</td>
<td>15508.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child currently resides with father half of the time or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child currently resides with father all or most of the time or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.1. Father Involvement by Masculinity Category and Race

Notes: *Significant difference between contemporary and traditional masculinity categories.

*Significant difference between White contemporary and Black contemporary fathers at p<0.05.
Table 6.2. OLS Regression Results of Masculinity on Father Involvement at 5th Year Follow-Up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Social Institutional Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been in military</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been in prison</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious participation</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced economic hardship</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school education</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated college</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Baby's Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitating at birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting or in a non-romantic relationship at birth</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship quality</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological child not living in household</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting difficulties</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother trusts father very much to care for child for one week</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child is male</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child is in excellent health</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Socio-Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's Current Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child lives with father half of the time</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child lives with father none of the time</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Statistic</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>14.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: †<0.10 *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.
N = 1193

Excluded categories are: (a) Contemporary masculinity, (b) White non-Hispanic, (c) High school or GED, (d) Married to baby's mother at child's birth, (e) Mother trusts father somewhat or not at all to care for child for one week, (f) Child is female, (g) Child is in very good, fair, or poor health, (h) Child lives with father all or most of the time.
Table 6.3. Final OLS Regression Model of Masculinity on Father Involvement at 5th Year Follow-Up for Residential Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional *</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and Social Institutional Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been in military</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been in prison</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious participation</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced economic hardship</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school education c</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated college</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with Baby's Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting at birth</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting or in a non-romantic relationship at birth</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship quality</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological child not living in household</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting difficulties</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother trusts father very much to care for child for one week e</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child is male</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child is in excellent health</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father's Socio-Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.
n = 864
Excluded categories are: (a) Contemporary masculinity, (b) White non-Hispanic, (c) High school or GED, (d) Married to baby's mother at child's birth, (e) Mother trusts father somewhat or not at all to care for child for one week, (f) Child is female, (g) Child is in very good, fair, or poor health.
Table 6.4. Final OLS Regression Model of Masculinity on Father Involvement at 5th Year Follow-Up for Non-Residential Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>2.69 **</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional a</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and Social Institutional Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black non-Hispanic b</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been in military</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been in prison</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious participation</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced economic hardship</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school education c</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>-0.52 *</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated college</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with Baby's Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting at birth d</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting or in a non-romantic relationship at birth</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship quality</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological child not living in household</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting difficulties</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother trusts father very much to care for child for one week e</td>
<td>0.51 *</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child is male e</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child is in excellent health f</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father's Socio-Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.26 *</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Statistic</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

n = 329

Excluded categories are: (a) Contemporary masculinity  (b) White non-Hispanic, (c) High school or GED (d) Married to baby's mother at child's birth, (e) Mother trusts father somewhat or not at all to care for child for one week, (f) Child is female, (g) Child is in very good, fair, or poor health.
CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSION

The overarching aim of this dissertation was to examine masculinity quantitatively. My research drew heavily on two divergent theories of masculinity, one emphasizing a universal, overarching view of masculinity and one emphasizing multiple categories of masculinity that can vary by race and class. Using cluster analysis, I examined whether multiple categories of masculinity are present among contemporary urban fathers. I then sought to determine if masculinity differentially affected relationship transitions with the baby’s mother and father involvement. I found that masculinity could, in fact, be classified into multiple categories and that masculinity does influence both partnering and parenting behaviors. In conclusion, I wish to highlight five major components of this dissertation: cluster analysis as a valid analytical technique for measuring masculinity, the vast amount of difference between the contemporary and hyper-masculine fathers, the complexity of the hyper-masculine fathers, the significance of race and institutional participation, and the potential emergence of a new hegemonic masculinity. I will also discuss the limitations and potential future research projects that may spawn out of this dissertation.

Importantly, this dissertation gained insights into new ways of measuring masculinity. I found that cluster analysis is a valid technique for creating masculinity categories. Using multiple forms of masculinity is an improvement on past quantitative measures of masculinity that typically focus on masculinity as a continuum. Prior family research analyzing masculinity often used singular, separate measures of masculinity as either moderating or mediating variables (for examples see Carlson et al. 2004; Harknett 2008; Osborne et al. 2007; Waller & Swisher 2006; Wilcox & Wolfinger 2007). The major contribution of my research is that masculinity can be measured by creating coherent groupings of men across multiple dimensions of masculinity.
My research shows that fathers can be classified into three distinct categories of masculinity. I have labeled these categories as having contemporary, traditional, and hyper-masculine masculinity. As a brief overview, the contemporary fathers appear to be the group of fathers who have the “positive” aspects of masculinity; the traditional fathers are the fathers who essentially fall in the middle of the other two categories; and the hyper-masculine fathers are those with what we might call “negative” masculinity qualities.

My finding that three categories of masculinity are present in today’s society is consistent with the theoretical models used to direct this research (Connell 2005; Henwood & Procter 2003; Nock 1998; Townsend 2002). Finding different categories of masculinity supports Connell’s (2005) argument of multiple masculinities. The results from my cluster analysis show the value of using critical gender theory and qualitative research to guide quantitative demographic research. Using Connell’s (2005) argument of multiple masculinities helped gain insights into men who can be categorized into subordinate masculinities. Indeed, I found that men who are either unmarried or belong to a minority group were less likely to fit into the dominant, universal model of masculinity depicted in Nock (1998) and Townsend (2002). If researchers only use the universal approach to masculinity, many intricacies among urban fathers would not have been found. Also by using Connell’s concept of multiple masculinities, I was able to establish whether participation in social institutions and race varied across the different categories of masculinity. Importantly, the multiple categories of masculinity do predict family behaviors. My research shows the added benefit to family research when viewing masculinity from a pluralistic approach rather than using a singular model of masculinity.

Critically, the cluster analysis results pointed to a great amount of divergence between the contemporary and hyper-masculine categories of masculinity. I found a contemporary
masculinity category that displayed the most socio-economic advantages and “positive” qualities of masculinity. Contemporary masculinity is characteristic of fathers who are egalitarian, emotionally available to the baby’s mother, more likely to be married and educated, and the least likely to have ever been incarcerated. Alternatively, the hyper-masculine fathers have the most abusive behaviors, least emotional availability, and are the least likely to be married and educated, while being the most likely to have ever been incarcerated. The second group of fathers is the traditionally masculine fathers who essentially fall in between the contemporary and hyper-masculine fathers. While I had anticipated that these fathers would be the largest group of men and most distinctive group, this was not the case. These fathers accounted for 40 percent of the sample and appear to be those in the middle of both the masculinity dimensions and the institutional participation measures. In fact, the measures that I had initially thought would be most associated with traditional fathers, such as attitudes towards marriage and the importance of breadwinning were not included in the cluster analysis because they reduced the model fit. In general, my research suggests that the traditional form of masculinity might be losing dominance in today’s society. Overall, the cluster analysis presents a broader portrait of fathers than prior research by showing groupings of fathers based on similar characteristics of masculinity. The divergent nature of the contemporary and hyper-masculine fathers indicated that there might be implications for masculinity on fathers’ partnering and parenting behaviors.

In chapter two, I discussed how previous research had thought about fathers (and mothers) in two distinctly separate groups based heavily on socio-economic resources (Furstenberg 1988; McLanahan 2004). My dissertation research shows that while I find two very contrary forms of masculinity, it is not as easy as qualifying these fathers as “good dads or bad dads” and that the “diverging destinies” argument may not be completely on point. I find
that masculinity is a significant predictor of both relationship transitions with the baby’s mother and father involvement when the child is five years old. Importantly hyper-masculine fathers are more involved in their child’s life than both contemporary and traditional fathers are. Alternatively, hyper-masculine fathers are much more likely than either contemporary or traditional fathers are to dissolve their relationship with their baby’s mother, which could have additional implications for child well-being. Furthermore, hyper-masculine fathers are also more likely to have ever been incarcerated. While hyper-masculine fathers are more involved with their children, they are also at a greater risk of being absent from their children’s lives at some point in time. Taken as a whole, the circumstances surrounding urban, hyper-masculine fathers create a much more complicated picture than the “good dads/bad dads” argument. While we may be encouraged to call the contemporary fathers “good dads,” hyper-masculine fathers cannot as easily be coined “bad dads.”

A key component of this dissertation was to determine if masculinity differed by race and institutional participation and whether these factors would reduce the association between masculinity and both relationship transitions and father involvement. The results from chapter four indicate that the masculinity categories have dramatic variation across both race and institutional participation. I found significant race differences between the hyper-masculine and contemporary fathers and between the traditional and contemporary fathers. Additionally, institutional participation differed between the masculinity categories. I find significant differences between each of the masculinity categories for economic hardship, being married to the baby’s mother at the time of the birth, incarceration, and education. No significant differences were found for military or religious participation. While I did find variation across masculinity, results from chapters five and six indicate few significant effects among both race
and institutional participation. Both economic hardship and education did reduce the relationship between masculinity and relationship transitions, eliminating the significant difference between traditional and contemporary masculinity while also reducing the effect of hyper-masculinity. For the father involvement analyses, race was a significant predictor but did not eliminate the statistically significant effect of masculinity. Importantly, incarceration, religious participation and military experience do not predict either father involvement or relationship transitions. These results are inconsistent with past research that found significant direct effects for incarceration, religion, and military participation (Bartowski & Xu 2000; Lundquist 2004; Petts 2007; Swisher & Waller 2008; Teachman 2007; Waller & Swisher 2006; Western & McLanahan 2000; Wilcox & Wolfinger 2006).

A major contribution this dissertation makes to both family research and to broader gender research is the usurping of traditional masculinity by the contemporary masculinity as the hegemonic form of masculinity. As a reminder, Connell (1987, 2005) argued that hegemonic masculinity is the dominant, ideal masculinity typically used as the marker of comparison. Connell (2005) also argued that masculinities could change over time. My dissertation provides tentative evidence that masculinity is, indeed, changing and that the dominant form of masculinity may no longer be the breadwinning model. Bernard (1981) argued that the successor of the good provider model had yet to be established, but that the good provider model was indeed losing dominance. The results from this dissertation show that the contemporary category of masculinity contains the largest percentage of urban fathers, making up almost 50 percent of my sample. Additionally, the contemporary category of masculinity has the tightest distributions across the masculinity measures indicating the least amount of variability. Therefore, I suggest that the successor to the good provider model is what I have called the
contemporary model of masculinity, characterized by both economic resources as well as egalitarian and nurturing behavior.

These results provide evidence that the shape of masculinity in contemporary American culture appears to be changing. The good provider model as the ideal hegemonic version of masculinity has been highly valued since the 1950’s, although rarely achieved in actuality (Coontz 2000). The increased participation of women in the labor force may have alleviated some of the social pressure men may face to be the sole providers for their families. Although the role of provider is less crucial for fathers today than in previous decades, fathers none-the-less still place importance on financial support. Preliminary analyses indicated that 90 percent of the respondents in my sample agreed that both breadwinning and caregiving are very important for fathering. The results of my study suggest that a version of masculinity that contains both breadwinning and caregiving may be replacing the traditional breadwinning model as the new hegemonic masculinity. Doucet’s (2006) research on primary-caregiving fathers indicates that even in a sample of fathers who perform the majority of the daily care activities emphasis is still placed on providing at least some income. Henwood and Procter’s (2003) study of fathers who were transitioning into first time fatherhood indicated that fathers have high expectations for involvement and nurturing, but also have difficulty balancing work and caregiving. Their study reflects the difficulties of connecting men’s expectations and behaviors. Additional research by Hohmann-Marriott (2009a) shows that although fathers want to be supportive and emotionally available many mothers may not find these qualities as important. This may lead to further complications as men try to construct their masculinity. Men seem to be attempting to combine both breadwinning and caregiving, but the social norms surrounding masculinity may not have caught up with men’s attitudes towards fathering; which leaves many men with little support or
guidance about how to achieve their fathering ideals. The changing nature of masculinity is vitally important. The focal group of men needs to change, if family researchers continue to use the singular, continuum based measure of masculinity. Rather than focusing extensively on the provider aspect of masculinity, researchers need to broaden their view of masculinity to include a type of masculinity that contains both nurturing qualities and breadwinning components.

I now address the limitations of my study. First, not all dimensions of masculinity are included in the Fragile Families data set. Previous research has shown that homophobia, sports, and men’s bodies are vitally important dimensions of masculinity (Connell 2005; Kimmell 1994; Messner 1992). Without the full range of masculinity dimensions, my cluster analysis results may not be completely accurate. Future research needs to replicate these findings across multiple data sets to determine their reliability. I also have additional methodological issues with my fathering measures. As mentioned above, 90 percent of respondents in my sample stated that both caregiving and breadwinning are very important to fathering, which eliminated my capabilities of using these variables in my analyses. Being able to distinguish between fathers who are more invested in caregiving than in breadwinning is a critical aspect of distinguishing between masculinity categories, particularly between contemporary and traditional fathers. I suggest that family researchers need to take a more critical approach to measuring fatherhood. More in depth questions regarding fatherhood, particularly how it relates to masculinity, are necessary in future data collection projects.

The last limitation I would like to discuss is the potential concerns about the traditional fathers. Fathers in this category of masculinity fell in between the contemporary and hyper-masculine fathers on a majority of the masculinity dimensions and institutional participation measures. While I have classified them as traditional fathers in this study, I may not be fully
tapping traditional masculinity, as it would be in a nationally representative sample of all men not just fathers. Traditional masculinity outside of fatherhood may be vastly different from traditional masculinity within the boundaries of fatherhood. Research has shown that in the United States the most educated men are not likely to become fathers, either within marriage or outside of marriage (Olah, Bernhardt, & Goldscheider 2002). Additionally, Connell (1998) has suggested another category of masculinity, which is termed “trans-national business masculinity.” These men are in the highest income brackets and are fully committed to financial success, making them dependent on being geographically mobile. The probability that I address this type of business-oriented masculinity in my study is unlikely. The full-on commitment towards financial success reduces the likelihood of men with these characteristics becoming fathers and even if they were fathers most would probably be unlikely to participate in social research. Both Olah and colleagues and Connell’s research indicates that masculinity may dramatically differ based on whether men enter fatherhood, which might constrain my results for traditional masculinity.

Finally, I would like to address the future research that could be sparked by this dissertation. First, we need additional studies to examine the traditional fathers more fully. As mentioned above, I did not find a traditional masculinity category consistent with past theoretical research, which might stem from my focus on fathers, rather than on all men. Further research needs to examine the characteristics of the men that I have classified as traditional fathers. Remember from chapter four that these fathers had large standard deviations among many of the masculinity measures, indicating a more wide-ranging group of men than the contemporary fathers. The high levels of variability within the masculinity dimensions among the traditional men might be an artifact of the changing expectations for men’s behaviors (Cabrera et al. 2000).
These men’s notion of what masculinity entails, essentially breadwinning, is eroding. Some of the traditional fathers may be on the edges of this form of masculinity. Societal circumstances might push a selection of the traditional fathers into another category of masculinity. For instance, the economic recession may push some of the traditional men into the hyper-masculine category, but improved social policies may make a more nurturing, caregiving environment that bordering men can apply to their lives. These suggestions are simply conjecture though. Since this study was a first, initial look into the multiple categorizations of masculinity, more work must be done to understand the complex make-up of traditional fathers.

One way to address the complexities among the traditional fathers would be to take a longitudinal approach and determine if masculinity changes across the life course. One possible approach is by examining change across time for all of the masculinity measures among the traditional fathers. This approach might help determine if these men could be re-categorized into another type of masculinity with the inclusion of additional information. I think this would be a crucial step in future masculinity research, as previous studies have suggested that masculinity may change across the life-course from a more immature to a more mature form of masculinity (Terry and Braun 2009).

Future research should also extend this dissertation by including more race/ethnic groups. While I had a strong theoretical justification for using only Black and White fathers, the inclusion of fathers of other races and ethnicities would bring increased insight into masculinity. Hispanic and Asian masculinity may dramatically differ from Black or White masculinity. From a statistical standpoint, the increased sample size gained from their inclusion might allow for the use of interaction effects as well as a more refined measure of relationship quality; which I was limited from performing in this research because of the small number of hyper-masculine fathers.
Outside of the formation of the masculinity categories, I would suggest that more complex sets of analysis be used to predict the dependent variables. While I have taken the first step in examining how masculinity influences men’s behavior, additional analyses should be conducted to provide additional support for my results. Examining relationship transitions using event history analysis could address more specific changes within the fathers’ partnering relationships by capturing the time-varying nature of these relationships. Furthermore, the use of growth curve analysis would be appropriate to establish if masculinity predicts changes in father involvement over time. These more complex analyses will help push masculinity research further. Additionally, this dissertation has shown that masculinity is predictive of family behavior. Therefore, a next step would be to examine whether masculinity predicts other behaviors, such as relationship quality and both child and father well-being.

Lastly, while I focus solely on the fathers in this research, the importance of mothers cannot be understated. The relationships between mothers and fathers are connected intricately, with final decisions often occurring from both partners rather than an individual. Couple-level approaches to both father involvement and relationship transitions have recently garnered attention (Hohmann-Marriott 2009a, 2009b). Therefore, masculinity should not be accounted for in isolation to femininity whenever possible. The creation of femininity categories to use in couple-level analyses that coincide with the use of the masculinity categories may increase our knowledge of family processes.

Furthermore, my research does not provide insights into the true reality of these fathers’ day-to-day interactions and relationships. As Lorber (1994) points out, human beings produce situational gendered interactions. Men and women are constantly “doing gender,” even without realizing it (West & Zimmerman 1987). Men’s masculinity may be more likely to come out in
specific situation, therefore future research should examine how daily interactions differ across each form of masculinity. For example, how does each form of masculinity influence men’s communication and conflict resolution patterns? Along these same lines, future research needs to determine how masculinity interacts with femininity. For instance, how does the female partner’s gender orientation influence men’s masculinity? This dissertation has only reached the surface of what we still need to know about masculinity and men’s behaviors. Researchers can now take the categories of masculinity developed in this dissertation to examine not only additional family behaviors, but also the gendered interactions that occur on a daily basis.
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### Appendix A. Fragile Families Research that use the Main Dissertation Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Participation</th>
<th>Fragile Families Relationship Literature</th>
<th>Fragile Families Parenting Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military</strong></td>
<td>Usdansky, London, &amp; Wilmoth (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Masculinity Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian gender role attitudes</td>
<td>Carlson, Garfinkel, McLanahan, Mincy &amp; Primus (2004); Carlson, McLanahan &amp; England (2004); Ciabattari (2005); Fitzgibbons Shafer (2006); Harknett &amp; McLanahan (2004); Osborne (2005); Teitler &amp; Reichman (2008); Waller &amp; McLanahan (2005); Petts (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender mistrust</td>
<td>Carlson, Garfinkel, McLanahan, Mincy &amp; Primus (2004); Carlson, McLanahan &amp; England (2004); Fitzgibbons Shafer (2006); Harknett &amp; McLanahan (2004); Osborne (2005); Waller (2001); Waller &amp; McLanahan (2005); Waller &amp; Swisher (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence towards women</td>
<td>Carlson, Garfinkel, McLanahan, Mincy &amp; Primus (2004); Huang, Son &amp; Wang (2010); Lopoo &amp; Carlson (2008); Osborne (2005); Osborne, Manning &amp; Smock (2007); Teitler &amp; Reichman (2008); Waller (2001); Waller &amp; Peters (2008); Wilcox &amp; Wolfinger (2006); Carlson, McLanahan &amp; Brooks-Gunns (2008); Kenney (2008); Scott, Bronte-Tinkew, Logan, Franzetta, Manlove, &amp; Steward (2010); Waller &amp; Swisher (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. Summary of Dependent Variable

No transition
M → M
C → C
V → V

Transition into more committed relationship
C → M
V → M
V → C

Transition into less committed relationship
M → C
M → V
M → N
C → V
C → N
V → N

Notes: Source - Fragile Families and Child-Well Being Studies, Baseline and Fifth Year Follow-Up Interviews
M = Married
C = Cohabiting
V = Visiting/Non-Romantic
N = No Relationship/Separated/Divorced
### Appendix C. Multinomial Models of Relationship Transitions Regressed on Father’s Masculinity, Race and Institutional Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition into less committed relationship versus no transition (^1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyper-Masculinity (^b)</td>
<td>6.94 *** 5.09 *** 5.42 *** 6.81 *** 5.41 *** 4.79 *** 3.89 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.25) (0.26) (0.25) (0.25) (0.26) (0.26) (0.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Masculinity</td>
<td>2.10 *** 1.55 ** 1.85 *** 2.08 *** 1.77 *** 1.61 *** 1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.13) (0.14) (0.14) (0.13) (0.14) (0.14) (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black non-Hispanic (^c)</td>
<td>3.80 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Been Incarcerated</td>
<td>2.44 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Religious Services at Least Weekly</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced at Least One Economic Hardship</td>
<td>8.45 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed at Least Some College</td>
<td>0.25 *** 0.31 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.14) (0.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Transition into more committed relationship versus no transition \(^1\)** |                     |
| Hyper-Masculinity \(^b\)                     | 2.19 * 1.76 1.81 2.16 * 2.06 * 1.67 1.43 |
|                                               | (0.34) (0.35) (0.35) (0.34) (0.34) (0.35) (0.35) |
| Traditional Masculinity                       | 1.64 ** 1.32 1.48 * 1.62 ** 1.56 ** 1.35 1.16 |
|                                               | (0.49) (0.17) (0.17) (0.16) (0.16) (0.19) (0.17) |
| Black non-Hispanic \(^c\)                     | 2.42 ***            |
|                                               | (0.17)              |
| Ever Been Incarcerated                        | 2.05 ***            |
|                                               | (0.19)              |
| Attends Religious Services at Least Weekly    | 0.64 *              |
|                                               | (0.20)              |
| Experienced at Least One Economic Hardship    | 2.87 *              |
|                                               | (0.34)              |
| Completed at Least Some College               | 0.39 *** 0.46 ***   |
|                                               | (0.17) (0.17)       |

\(-2\) Log Likelihood: 34.99 69.93 66.97 64.30 61.07 65.94 139.50

Notes: \(^1\) No transition category includes those who were continuously married, continuously cohabiting, and continuously visiting/non-romantic.

\(^a\) Models can only contain either race or one institutional participation measure because of zero cell sizes.

\(^b\) Excluded category is Contemporary Masculinity

\(^c\) Excluded category is White non-Hispanic

Models including military participation could not be ran because of zero cell sizes.

N=1303

\(^{*}\)p<0.05, \(^{**}\)p<0.01, \(^{***}\)p<0.001.