"Exploring Townsend's 'Package Deal' among Disadvantaged Fathers: Integrating Mainstream Sociological and Critical Gender theories of Masculinity on Fatherhood"

Bart Stykes

Abstract: I use the Fragile Families data to examine multiple forms of masculinity at a key life-course event: the transition into fatherhood. My theoretical framework integrates the work of mainstream sociological scholars with critical gender theorists to develop a new typology highlighting three forms of masculinity: generative (showing children love and teaching about life in addition to providership and caregiving), traditional (favoring providership over caregiving or generativity), and marginalized (valuing caregiving over providership and generativity). I employ multinomial logistic regression techniques to compare men's socioeconomic, demographic, and attitudinal characteristics across the three forms of masculinity. I find significant differences across key variables such as relationship status, educational attainment, and personal income as well as demographic and attitudinal characteristics. I find greater differences in comparing traditional and either generative or marginalized men. The few differences between generative and marginalized men become nonsignificant after controlling for demographic characteristics (primarily Hispanic ethnicity and age).

Introduction

In this study, I explore attitudes toward masculinity among men at the birth of their child. My theoretical framework incorporates the work of two critical gender scholars, Connell and Coles, to expand a universal, exclusive representation of masculinity highlighted by mainstream sociological scholars, such as Townsend and Nock. I use attitudinal questions about the importance of multiple dimensions of fatherhood to develop three typologies of masculinity. The first form, *generative masculinity*, represents men who note that both providership and caregiving are very important, but showing the child love or teaching the child about life is the single most important dimension of fatherhood. The second form, *traditional masculinity*, represents men who favor economic providership over providing direct care or the generative form of masculinity. Finally, *marginalized masculinity* represents men who favor providing direct care over the providership or emotional forms of masculinity. I model Townsend's "package deal" by examining the effects of relationship status to the child's mother, father's personal earnings, educational attainment, and ties to home ownership as possible predictors of masculinities. In addition, I control for demographic and attitudinal characteristics of men as Connell (1987) and Coles (2009) argue that these characteristics play an active role in constructing particular forms of masculinity. My approach allows me to integrate two different schools of thought on masculinity and develop an insightful framework that incorporates the best aspects from each perspective.

My study provides three major contributions to research on masculinity. First, this study is one of the first to use the Fragile Families dataset to identify different forms of masculinity as

they may vary across socioeconomic, demographic, and attitudinal characteristics. I explore the ways socioeconomic, demographic, and attitudinal characteristics are associated with different forms of masculinity. Second, my study contributes to current research by exploring attitudes toward masculinities among married, cohabiting, nonresident-romantically involved men, and men who are not romantically involved with the child's mother. Townsend (2002) and Nock (1998) both provide very detailed analyses of what constitutes a masculine identity; however, both scholars only discuss masculinity within the context of marriage (Nock, 1998; Townsend, 2002). Third, this study provides a conceptual framework that integrates two rival theoretical camps of masculinity. The first, represented by Nock and Townsend, considers masculinity to be more static and universally defined concept with normative expectations. The second, represented primarily by Connell and Coles, considers masculinity to be a more fluid concept with the possibility of multiple, competing forms and contested normative expectations. I examine different socioeconomic, demographic, and attitudinal characteristics and explore associations that might demonstrate why some men adopt the dominant form of masculinity while others adopt alternative forms of masculinity.

I begin the literature review by defending fatherhood as a window for examining masculinities. After establishing the connection between fatherhood and masculinities, I review the mainstream and critical theories on masculinity. Next, I review the literature on different models of fatherhood. I conclude my literature review by discussing how the Fragile Families data have been used in examining fatherhood. After finishing the literature review on masculinities and fatherhood, I discuss my hypotheses and then begin the empirical section of this paper.

Fatherhood as a Window for Exploring Masculinities

Many scholars address the intricate connection between fatherhood and masculine identities (e.g. Nock, 1998; Townsend, 2002; Finn and Henwood, 2009; Jordan, 2009). Specifically, Nock (1998) considers fatherhood to be one of a man's most fulfilling experiences and an ultimate symbol of masculine prowess. Similarly, Townsend (2002) discusses fatherhood as having an exclusive character as those men who fail to meet the cultural standards associated with fatherhood (steady employment, home ownership, marriage, and status as a father) also fail at securing their manhood.

The Fragile Families data are primarily concerned with studying men's expectations for father involvement; they do not focus heavily on men's general attitudes toward masculinities. However, I consider men's responses to questions about fathering as a useful window into their attitudes toward masculinities. Fragile Families scholars conceptualize the immediate time frame following the birth of a child as a "magic moment," ripe for exploring gender identities. Thus, I consider the "magic moment" as a key life-course event well-suited for the study of attitudes toward masculinities by men of varying socioeconomic, demographic, and attitudinal characteristics.

Theoretical Perspectives on Masculinity

I frame my discussion of masculinity around two main theoretical camps. The first is represented by scholars such as Townsend (2002) and Nock (1998) who discuss masculinity as having a singular, universal form. Men either measure up to this form of masculinity or they simply do not. The second is represented by scholars like Connell (1987, 2005), Coles (2009), Hearn and Kimmel (2005), and Messner (2004) who challenge the universal model of

masculinity. These scholars argue that there may be one hegemonic form of masculinity, but other forms of masculinity emerge as men either fail to meet the criteria for this the masculinity or refuse to adopt the ideal masculinity and establish alternative forms of masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, Hearn, and Kimmel, 2005; Messner, 2004).

Model of Universal Masculinity

Townsend (2002) outlines four facets of fatherhood in his "package deal": economic provision, protection, emotional closeness, and endowment. He also notes four key elements necessary for a man to obtain the package deal: steady employment, home ownership, marriage, and finally fatherhood (Townsend, 2002). In this manner, Townsend (2002) discusses the exclusive nature of masculinity, arguing that men who do not meet the package deal also fail at masculinity.

Nock (1998) presents a similar argument regarding the exclusive nature of masculinity in formulating three historical implications of what masculinity entails, "...[a man] should be the father of his wife's children, he should be the provider for his wife and children, and he should protect his family." (pg. 6). Nock's (1998) model of masculinity differs slightly from Townsend's as his focus centers around marriage instead of fatherhood, but he ultimately comes to a similar conclusion. Both of these scholars arrive at the notion of one universal form of masculinity that is primarily concerned with the male as provider/protector within the confines of the institution of marriage (Nock, 1998; Townsend, 2002). Although Townsend's (2002) "package deal" includes emotional involvement and support, he argues that emotionality is secondary or incidental to economic providership. Thus, ultimately in their conceptualization, men either succeed or fail at a unitary normative, uncontested form of institutionalized masculinity.

Model of Multiple, Possibly Competing Masculinities

Connell (1987, 2005) and Messerschmidt (2005) provide a more complex perspective on masculinity by discussing hegemonic masculinity and marginalized forms of masculinity that emerge as men either reject or fail to meet the criteria for hegemonic masculinity. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) describe hegemonic masculinity as representing all things thought to be the epitome of masculinity in a given society. They repeatedly stress that hegemonic masculinity is not the statistical norm; rather, it is often associated with the status of a mythical man that men often strive for but rarely achieve (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005). This hegemonic masculine ideal is not the only form of masculinity that Connell (1987, 2005) and Messerschmidt (2005) acknowledge. For instance, Connell (1987) finds that subordinate and marginal masculinities emerge among those men who either reject the hegemonic ideal or craft an oppositional or marginalized form of masculinity due to structural constraints. Connell (1987) provides several examples of these marginalized masculinities such as gay masculinities, racial minority masculinities, and feminist masculinities.

Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) acknowledge individual agency within social structures; however, they focus primarily on socioeconomic positioning and demographic characteristics and their influence in constructing men's masculinities. Coles (2009) takes a different approach by focusing more heavily on multiple hegemonic masculinities. He suggests that each man subscribes to his own ideal form of masculinity based on the different roles/statuses and attitudes he holds (Coles, 2009). For example, one man's attitudinal characteristics may encourage him to select a form of hegemonic masculinity valuing the more generative form of masculinity, while another man's attitudinal characteristics may encourage

him to select a different from of hegemonic masculinity valuing either the traditional or marginalized from of masculinity.

I have developed a theoretical framework combining the work of both Connell and Coles. My conceptual framework regarding socioeconomic and demographic characteristics is more closely aligned with Connell as I expect men may be displaced into alternative forms of masculinity due to structural constraints. The framework regarding attitudinal characteristics is more closely aligned with Coles as I expect men may select different forms of masculinity based on the roles/statuses and attitudes that they currently hold. Although the motive for selecting different forms of masculinity varies slightly, both Connell and Coles acknowledge the presence of both an ideal form of masculinity and multiple marginalized forms of masculinity.

Models of Fatherhood

Many scholars study whether norms surrounding father involvement are changing (e.g. Marsiglio, 1998; Marsiglio and Pleck, 2005; Roy, 2004; Wall, Aboim, and Marinho, 2007; Shows and Gerstel, 2009). These studies have yielded inconsistent findings suggesting multiple models of fatherhood might exist. Each model of fatherhood holds different norms and expectations.

Some scholars argue that expectations about fatherhood now include a more generative form of parenting (Marsiglio, 1998; Marsiglio and Pleck, 2005). Marsiglio (1998) discusses pressures on men to avoid following the model of the distant, authoritative "bad" dad and embrace a model of a more socially involved "good" dad. Marsiglio and Pleck (2005) note that men hope to exceed the provider role and engage in a generative form of fatherhood in which providership is important, but emotional closeness surpasses providership. Townsend's (2002) "package deal" embodies this more generative vision of fatherhood as well, as a father is

expected to be emotionally available and active in his child/ren's life after successfully fulfilling the role of provider (resembling generative masculinity).

Finn and Henwood (2009) find that men show an interest in adopting more modern fathering practices (primarily concerned with providing direct care); however, they find minimal social support for this active model of fathering. They argue that society considers a traditional father (primarily concerned with providership) to be more mature and responsible than an active father focusing on providing direct care (Finn and Henwood, 2009). I argue that the lag between men's goals of active fathering and societal expectations for traditional fathering result in different models of fatherhood on a continuum between the purely traditional fathers (resembling traditional masculinity) and purely active fathers (resembling marginalized masculinity).

Shows and Gerstel (2009) find evidence of more active fathering among the working class. This active fathering refers to helping with schoolwork, providing childcare, and other behind the scenes tasks (resembling marginalized masculinity). Shows and Gerstel (2009) do not find evidence of active fathering among upper-middle class fathers who are more likely to engage in public fathering such as attendance to sporting events, recitals, school functions, etc. Shows and Gerstel (2009) note, "...fathers who are least likely to ideologically endorse gender equality (the working class) are most likely to engage in equitable actions" (pg. 179) suggesting that active fathering is not necessarily coupled with egalitarian attitudes.

Contemporary research on fatherhood suggests that multiple models of fatherhood may exist. Scholars like Marsiglio and Pleck (2005) illustrate that men strive to fit a model of emotionally involved and active parenting. Fin and Henwood's (2009) research suggests that men strive for a more active model of fatherhood; however, society's lack of support for this model of fathering results in a lag between more traditional and active models of fatherhood.

Finally, Shows and Gerstel (2009) argue that different models of fatherhood emerge due to class differences. My study discusses these different models of fatherhood in terms of multiple forms of masculinities. I find that these models of fatherhood/masculinities are associated with varying socioeconomic, demographic, and attitudinal characteristics.

Fatherhood in Fragile Families

The Fragile Families data have been instrumental in recent empirical studies regarding fatherhood. Research topics range from differences in father involvement across fields such as relationship status, race/ethnicity, residential status, involvement during pregnancy, etc. (e.g. Fagan, Palkovitz, Roy, and Farrie, 2009; Cabrera, Fagan, and Farrie, 2008; Woldoff and Cina, 2007; Carlson, McLanahan, and England, 2004), to the influences of father involvement on the child's wellbeing (e.g. Osborne and Berger, 2009; Meadows, McLanahan, and Brooks-Gunn, 2007), to father involvement as it is mediated by the child's mother (e.g. Castillo and Fenzl-Crossman, 2010; Guzzo, 2009; Waller and Swisher, 2006; Fagan and Palkovitz, 2007), and to the effects of child support payment on paternal involvement (e.g. Nepomnyaschy, 2007; Lin and McLanahan, 2007).

My study differs from the majority of research using Fragile Families because I focus on identifying men's perceptions of fatherhood as opposed to discussing levels of father involvement or fatherhood's impact on child wellbeing. Of the studies previously cited, two focus on perceptions of fatherhood as opposed to actual father involvement or fatherhood's impact on child wellbeing. The first, by Lin and McLanahan (2007), discuss men's perceptions of fatherhood as they are influenced by the nonresident father's payment of child support. They find that fathers who pay child support perceive higher levels of involvement in fatherhood (Lin and McLanahan, 2007).

The second, by Garfield and Chung more closely resembles my research agenda. Garfield and Chung (2006) examine variation in perceptions of fatherhood based on the father's relationship with the child's mother. Garfield and Chung (2006) test for possible differences in perceptions of fatherhood across various relationship contexts using measures of perception of fatherhood (such as, "Were you present at the birth?", "Do you plan to pass on your last name?", and "Will your name appear on the birth certificate?"). They find minimal variation across relationship types (Garfield and Chung, 2006). The measures included in my study differ considerably from Garfield and Chung's as I examine men's attitudes about fathering (importance of caregiving, providership, showing love, teaching about life, protecting, and serving as an authority figure).

Hypotheses

I integrate Townsend's "package deal" with Connell and Coles'discussions of multiple forms of masculinity by considering generative masculinity (similar to Townsend's "package deal") to be the new hegemonic form of masculinity. My decision reflects the work of scholars like Townsend (2002), Marsiglio (1998), and Marsiglio and Pleck (2005) who argue that fathers are still concerned with providing for their children, but in addition these men hope to be emotionally available and actively involved in their children's lives.

My first two hypotheses concern the effect of a father's relationship status with the child's mother. I expect that nonresident fathers (both romantically and not romantically involved with the child's mother) will be more likely than married fathers to adopt the traditional vision of masculinity as these men will not have as many opportunities to provide direct care or participate in active parenting. I also expect that cohabiting fathers will be more likely than married fathers to adopt a marginalized vision of masculinity as they will have the opportunity to

provide direct care, but may not feel as much pressure to fulfill the role of provider and may not have the social support to participate in generative fathering. Townsend's (2002) "package deal" suggests that married fathers report a generative form of parenting that values emotional closeness in addition to providership. Consistent with both Connell's framework (1987), I expect that married fathers are in a position of structural advantage (compared to cohabiting and nonresident fathers) and are better equipped to pursue the hegemonic ideal form of generative masculinity.

- Nonresident fathers will be more likely to adopt the traditional vision of masculinity focusing on providership than married fathers.
- Cohabiting fathers will be more likely to adopt the marginalized vision of masculinity focusing on caregiving than married fathers as they will have access to provide direct care but might not feel the social pressure to provide for the child or have the social support to engage in generative fathering.

My next set of hypotheses examines the effect of a man's socioeconomic standing (educational attainment, personal income, and home ownership) on his vision of masculinity. I expect fathers reporting higher educational attainment will be more likely to hold a generative vision of masculinity than lower educated fathers as they might be better equipped to pursue the hegemonic form of masculinity. In addition I expect that father's reporting the lowest levels of educational attainment will be more likely to adopt a marginalized vision of masculinity as these men might struggle to provide for their child/ren and attempt to compensate for their limited providership capacity by through caregiving. Connell's (1987) notion of structural disadvantage and marginalized masculinities informs this hypothesis as well, as I expect advantaged men will adopt the hegemonic, generative form of masculinity, while disadvantaged men will be filtered into the marginalized vision of masculinity.

- Better educated fathers will be more likely to adopt the generative vision of masculinity as they might be better equipped to pursue the hegemonic form of masculinity that encourages active fathering.

- Poorly educated fathers will be more likely to adopt the marginalized vision of masculinity as their educational disadvantage might limit their capacity to provide for their children.

I expect personal income to behave differently than both relationship status and educational attainment. For both relationship status and educational attainment, I expect advantaged men to adopt the hegemonic, generative form of masculinity and disadvantaged men to either adopt the traditional or marginalized form of masculinity. In both of these instances, the critical gender perspective simply adds to the mainstream perspective by acknowledging the presence of additional forms of masculinity. However, in examining the effects of personal income the mainstream and critical gender perspectives present different predictions. According to the mainstream gender perspective, I expect high-earning men to adopt the more traditional vision of masculinity. In contrast, the critical gender perspective, predicts that high-earning men would adopt the hegemonic, generative vision of masculinity as they would be in a privileged socioeconomic position. Both the mainstream and critical gender perspectives predict that low-earning men will adopt the marginalized vision of masculinity.

- High-earning fathers will be more likely to adopt the traditional vision of masculinity than lower-earning fathers.

- High-earning fathers will be more likely to adopt the generative vision of masculinity than lower-earning fathers.

- Low-earning fathers will be more likely to adopt the marginalized vision of masculinity than higher-earning fathers.

Consistent with Townsend's (2002) "package deal", I expect fathers who own their homes will more likely to adopt a generative vision of fatherhood as they have met one of the more challenging prerequisites required for the "package deal". Once again, the critical gender

perspective simply adds to the mainstream gender perspective by acknowledging alternative visions of masculinity. I predict that advantaged men will adopt the hegemonic, generative vision of masculinity while disadvantaged men will either adopt the traditional or marginalized visions of masculinity.

- Fathers who own their home will be more likely to adopt a generative vision of masculinity than fathers who do not own their home.

The demographic controls included in my models are closely aligned with Connell's (1987) discussion of structural positioning's influence on forms of masculinity. I expect that individuals in positions of socioeconomic and demographic advantage will adopt the generative vision of masculinity while, individuals of minority statuses or disadvantage will be more likely to be filtered into either the traditional or marginalized vision of masculinity. In addition, I consider the attitudinal controls included in my model to be aligned with Coles' (2009) discussion of attitudinal influence on forms of masculinity. Therefore, I expect that attitudes toward fatherhood will be positively associated with the more active, generative and marginalized visions of masculinity. I also expect that traditional men will report greater support for traditional gender. I predict that relationship quality with the child's mother will be positively associated with the active, generative and marginalized visions of masculinity. Finally, I expect that the father's vision of masculinity will reflect the child's mother's expectations for fatherhood.

Data

I use baseline data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (Fragile Families) a longitudinal, birth cohort study including 3743 cases from the father's baseline questionnaire and 3743 matched cases from the mother's questionnaire. The Fragile Families data provide a nationally representative sample of non-marital births in large cities, with a

population exceeding 200,000 (Reichman, Teitler, Garfinkel, and McLanahan 2001). These data address non-marital childbearing, welfare reform, and fathering (Reichman et al. 2001). The baseline questionnaires were administered at the hospital shortly after the birth yielding a much better response rate of fathers (both resident and nonresident) than previous studies; these data capture approximately 75% of unwed fathers, which is typically a difficult population to recruit (Reichman et al. 2001).

Measures

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this analysis is constructed by integrating two indices from the Fragile Families data about dimensions of fatherhood. First, Fragile Families asks men to rate the level of importance for each dimension of fatherhood: providership, caregiving, teaching the child about life, showing the child love, protecting the child, and serving as an authority figure to the child (open-choice). The response categories for this task include, "Not at all important", "Somewhat important", and "Very important." Second, Fragile Families asks men to select the single most important dimension of fatherhood among providership, caregiving, teaching the child about life, showing the child love, protecting the child, and serving as an authority figure to the child (forced-choice).

[See Appendix A]

Based on the models of fatherhood I highlighted previously, the primary response categories I am interested in concern providership and caregiving. However, I use the protection and authority figure responses on the forced-choice to categorize some men as adhering to traditional masculinity. On the open-choice I only focus on rating of importance for providership and caregiving. Responses for the open-choice are coded as "neither providership nor caregiving

are very important", "providership is very important, but caregiving is not", "caregiving is very important but providership is not", and "both providership and caregiving are very important."

[See Appendix B]

Men who claim that "neither providership nor caregiving are very important" (60 cases) and men who are inconsistent in rating both providership and caregiving in the forced and open-choice questions (13 cases) are placed into an "other" category that will be included in the analyses, but not interpreted or presented in the tables.

The final response categories for my dependent variable are *Traditional Masculinity*, *Marginalized Masculinity*, and *Generative Masculinity*. Traditional masculinity consists of men who either state that on the open-choice *providership is very important, caregiving is not* or men who claim both providership and caregiving are very important, but choose providership, protection, or serving as an authority figure as the single, most important dimension of fatherhood. I use the forced-choice items to code them as traditional because they elect a "traditional" item as being most important in contrast to the modal response of teaching the child about life or showing the child love (2215 cases, 60% of the sample). Marginalized masculinity consists of men who either state that *caregiving is very important, providership is not* or men who claim that both providership and caregiving are very important, but caregiving is the most important dimension of fatherhood on their forced-choice item. Generative masculinity consists of men who acknowledge that providership and caregiving are both very important dimensions of fatherhood, but the single most important dimension of fatherhood is either showing the child love or teaching the child about life.

[See Appendix C]

Measurement Error in the Dependent Variable

I find two forms of measurement error in the forced-choice index of the most important dimension of fatherhood. First, men might struggle to define a most important dimension of fatherhood in a close-ended format. The second type of error is rooted in the response labels provided. The dimensions of fatherhood provided might have very different contextual meanings. For example, man living in a dangerous neighborhood might feel that protecting his child is his most appropriate means of showing love. In addition, the response label "love" is problematic as this is a value-laden response category that might generate a social desirability bias in turn leading to a Halo Effect. These men might be drawn to the socially acceptable response of showing love in order to save face.

The open choice indices are less problematic concerning measurement error. In these questions, men are asked to complete a more reasonable task by allowing men to rate the level of importance across each dimension of fatherhood. However, I still find measurement error concerning the response labels. This survey labels responses as being "important", "somewhat important", and "not very important". These response categories also invite a social desirability bias. Respondents might be encouraged to conduct an error of leniency by selecting the most positive response for each question in order to present themselves in the best light.

The typology I have constructed is created using two indices in the Fragile Families data that are susceptible to considerable measurement error. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect some measurement error in my typology. I am primarily concerned that there might be heterogeneity issues within my categories of masculinity. In addition, I need to find substantial differences across the categories of masculinity in order to justify my typology of masculinities.

I conduct bivariate analyses comparing measures of human capital (race/ethnicity,

personal income, home ownership, and educational attainment) both within and across the groups of generative, traditional, and marginalized men, to address these concerns. Although I find significant differences within my marginalized masculinity category, these differences are less problematic as the marginalized men remain disadvantaged when compared to the full sample. I find no significant differences within the traditional men, and generative men are significantly different than both traditional and marginalized men. Ultimately, these bivariate comparisons yield support for my typology of masculinities.

[See Appendices D-G].

Focal Independent Variables

The focal variables for this analysis primarily include socioeconomic indicators. Relationship status is a nominal measure coded into four mutually exclusive categories: married to the child's mother, cohabiting with the child's mother, or nonresident but romantically involved with the child's mother, and not romantically involved with the child's mother. Father's socioeconomic status includes measures of father's educational status, father's annual income, and home ownership.

Demographic Controls

This study controls for age, race/ethnicity, household income (ratio, per capita household income), and previous child/ren as attitudes toward masculinity are likely to vary based on each of these characteristics. I collapse Asian, American Indian, and other into an "other" category for race measures given the small sample sizes in these response categories

Attitudinal Controls

Attitudinal indicators are characterized as preparation for fatherhood, gender ideology, relationship quality, and a control for the child's mother's vision of an ideal father. Preparation

for fatherhood is measured by two variables. The first includes an index of father involvement during the pregnancy ranging from 0-5. Respondents receive +1 for reporting "yes" across five measures ("Did you provide economic support during the pregnancy?", "Did you provide any other type of support during the pregnancy?", "Do you expect the child to have your last name?", "Do you expect your name to appear on the birth certificate?", "Were you present at the child's birth?"). The second includes a scale of attachment to identity as a father ranging from 0-6 with "6" reporting the highest level of attachment to identity as a father. This scale includes two measures of attachment to fatherhood (α=0.70): "Being a father is one of the most fulfilling experiences for a man (0-strongly disagree, 1-disagree, 2-agree, 3-strongly agree)" and "I want people to know I have a new child (0-strongly disagree, 1-disagree, 2-agree, 3-strongly agree)". Gender ideology is measured using a traditional gender role scale ranging from 0-6 (6 reporting most support of traditional gender roles) using two measures concerning gender roles (α=0.55). First, "The important decisions in the family should be made by the man (0-strongly disagree, 1-disagree, 2-agree, 3 strongly agree)." Second, "It is better if the man earns the main living and the woman cares for the family (0-strongly disagree, 1-disagree, 2-agree, 3 strongly agree)."
I attempt to control for behavioral relationship quality as opposed to perceived relationship quality which might focus more on gender distrust or suspected infidelity. Therefore, I include two scales measuring relationship quality[1]: the first scale measures the amount of informal

[1] I conduct an exploratory factor analysis in constructing my relationship quality scales which indicated that my selected measures should be broken down into two separate scales. One with variables measuring social outings with the partner (in the last month) and the other with variables measuring frequency of conflict (combined α=0.65). I also considered a scale measuring social support from the partner (α=0.63). According to factor analysis, using all scales posed a multicolinearity problem; therefore, I decided to omit the social support scale as it yielded a lower crohnbach alpha and was geared toward perceived relationship quality more than behavioral relationship quality.

socialization in the previous month ranging from 0-3. Respondents receive +1 for responding "yes" to each measure ("In the last month you and BM visited with friends." "In the last month, you and BM went out to movies, sporting events, etc." "In last month, you and BM ate out in a restaurant."). The second scale measures level of relationship conflict ranging from 0-12 across six measures. Respondents received +1 for reporting "sometimes" across each measure and +2 for reporting "often" across each measure ("In the last month how often did you disagree about money?" "In the last month how often did you disagree about spending time together?" "In the last month, how often did you disagree about sex?" "In the last month how often did you disagree about the pregnancy?" "In the last month how often did you disagree about drinking/drug use?" "In the last month, how often did you disagree about being faithful?").

I control for the child's mother's vision of what an ideal father should be as Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) note that masculinities are affected and influenced by expectations from women as well. I use a coding scheme identical to the one used in constructing my dependent variable in order to create a parallel typology to measure the child's mother's vision of what an ideal father should be.

Method

This study employs multinomial logistic regression techniques for analyses to compare men's characteristics across generative, traditional, and marginalized forms of masculinity. Model 1 introduces the focal independent variables (relationship status, educational attainment, personal income, and home ownership). Model 2 expands the previous model by including demographic controls. Finally Model 3 adds attitudinal controls to the focal independent variables and demographic controls.

Many of the predictors included in my model are categorical variables. The selection of my reference groups for these predictors can considerably alter my results given the nature of multinomial logistic regression. Therefore, I select my reference categories based on my theoretical framework as opposed to selecting the modal response categories as reference groups. I select my reference groups based on the characteristics of Townsend's (2002) sample since this study hopes to expand Townsend's model and integrate it with some of the ideas presented by critical gender theorists. Therefore, my reference groups reflect positions that are associated with the highest levels of socioeconomic advantage (white, at least a Bachelor's degree, and highest personal income bracket) as well as positions associated with the highest level of expected father involvement (married and child's mother wants a Generative father). By selecting these more privileged characteristics as reference groups, I can examine differences in visions of masculinity among more disadvantaged men that might have been excluded in Townsend's sample.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

First, I provide a discussion of my sample's descriptive characteristics. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for my total sample as well as each masculine typology category. Of the 3,743 men included in this sample, approximately 60% of men adopt a *Generative* vision of masculinity, 22% of men are *Traditional*, and 16% of men adopt a *Marginalized* vision of masculinity, and only 2% of men cannot be classified. Thus, I find support considering generative masculinity as the hegemonic form of masculinity

[See Table 1]

Concerning my focal independent variables, the majority of fathers in my sample (44%) are cohabiting with the child's mother. Only 6% of the fathers included in my sample are not romantically involved with the child's mother. In addition, 28% of my sample is married to the child's mother with 21% being nonresident, but romantically involved, with the child's mother. The majority of the fathers in my sample report lower levels of educational attainment with 66% of my sample having a high school diploma/GED or less, 21% reporting some college experience, and finally 11% earning at least a Bachelor's degree. I construct personal income based on approximate quartiles; however, only 18% of the fathers in this sample earn at least $35,000 a year suggesting that this sample as a whole might be economically disadvantaged. Only 24% of the men in this sample report living in a home (either alone or with a partner) which is owned.

Approximately 50% of the men in my sample are black with 28% of the men in this sample being Hispanic, and 20% being white. The average age is approximately 28 years old suggesting that these fathers are not particularly young or old fathers. The majority (57%) of men in this sample have at least one other child.

The men in this sample report being involved during the pregnancy (mean 3.9; upper limit 5), attached to their identity as a father (mean 5.4; upper limit 6), and do not hold particularly strong egalitarian or traditional views concerning gender roles (mean 2.7; neutral point of 3). Men report higher levels of informal socialization (mean 2.1; upper limit 3) and lower levels of relationship conflict with the child's mother (mean 2.4; upper limit 12). Finally, 54% of the children's mother's consider a generative father to be the ideal type of father suggesting that most women want their child's father to participate in active fathering. While 24% of mothers favor a traditional man as the ideal father, 16% of mothers favor a marginalized

man, and 4% of mothers do not have an ideal vision of fatherhood that fits into my typology of masculinities.

Bivariate Relationships

Table 1 also presents bivariate results by reporting descriptive statistics by type of masculinity. In examining Townsend's Package Deal, we see that generative men are more likely to be married than traditional men (who are more likely to be nonresident) and marginalized men (who are more likely to be cohabiting). Generative men are also more likely to report higher educational attainment than traditional men and marginalized men (who are most likely to report lowest educational attainment). At the bivariate level, there are few differences in comparing personal income for generative and traditional men, but marginalized men report lower personal incomes. On demographic characteristics, generative men are more likely to be white than marginalized men, report the highest household incomes, and report fewer children than traditional men. Traditional men are more likely to be black and less likely to be Hispanic than both generative and marginalized men, report a moderate household income, are older than both generative and marginalized men, and report more other children than both generative and marginalized men. Marginalized men are more likely to be Hispanic and less likely to be white than both generative and traditional men, report the lowest household income, and are younger than both generative and traditional men. At the bivariate level, there is little variation in terms of attitudinal characteristics by type of masculinity. However, I find that the mother wanting a traditional father is positively correlated with being a traditional father.

Multivariate Results

Table 2 presents coefficients from multinomial logistic analyses predicting type of masculinity. This table includes analyses from two regression equations in order to make

comparisons across all three types of masculinity. Reference groups are included in parentheses. The difference in log likelihood of Models 1 and 2 yields a Chi square of 140.32 with 21 degrees of freedom ($p<0.001$) suggesting that the addition of demographic controls significantly improves my model. The difference in log likelihood of Models 2 and 3 yields a Chi square of 207.8 with 46 degrees of freedom ($p<0.001$) suggesting that the addition of attitudinal controls (including the BM's vision of an ideal father) significantly improves my model.

[See Table 2]

Townsend's Package Deal: Relationship Status

I presented two hypotheses concerning relationship status and vision of masculinity that nonresident fathers will be more likely than married fathers to be traditional men and cohabiting fathers will be more likely than married fathers to be marginalized men. I find partial support for my hypothesis on nonresident fathers; however, I find no support for my hypothesis concerning cohabiting fathers. Models 1 and 2 illustrate those nonresident fathers who remain romantically involved with the child's mother report a significantly greater likelihood of being traditional as opposed to both generative and marginalized. The demographic controls included in Model 2 do not result in significant changes in coefficients or level of significance. The attitudinal controls included in Model 3 explain the effect of relationship status, as there are no significant differences in comparing nonresident and married fathers in Model 3. Cohabiting fathers are more likely than married fathers to be marginalized men at the bivariate level, but there are no significant differences in terms of married and cohabiting fathers at the multivariate level.

Townsend's Package Deal: Educational Attainment

I presented two hypotheses concerning educational attainment and vision of masculinity. First, better educated fathers will be more likely than less educated fathers to be generative men.

Second, poorly educated fathers will be more likely than higher educated fathers to be marginalized men. I find partial evidence supporting both of these hypotheses. Model 1 demonstrates that failure to earn a high school diploma or GED (compared to at least a Bachelor's degree) increases the likelihood of being either traditional or marginalized as opposed generative. According to Model 1, earning a high school diploma (compared to at least a Bachelor's degree) increases the likelihood of being traditional as opposed to generative. The educational effect is most pronounced among marginalized men as both the coefficient and level of significance is higher for marginalized than traditional men.

Demographic controls included in Model 2 have considerable influences on the effects of educational attainment. Among traditional men, demographic controls suppress the effect of education. After controlling for race, household income, age, and other children, both the coefficients and significance levels for less educated, traditional men increase. Among marginalized men, demographic controls completely explain the effect of education. Net of demographic controls, failure to earn a high school diploma/GED drops to nonsignificance for marginalized men. The attitudinal controls included in Model 3 seem to explain some of the effect of education for traditional men as both the coefficients and levels of significance are smaller in Model 3. There are no significant differences between earning a bachelor's degree and some college at the multivariate level. In addition, there are no significant differences in educational attainment while comparing traditional and marginalized men.

Townsend's Package Deal: Personal Income

I presented three hypotheses concerning personal income and vision of masculinity. First, high-earning fathers will be more likely to be traditional than lower-earning fathers. Second, high-earning fathers will be more likely to be generative than lower-earning fathers.

Third, low-earning fathers will be more likely to be marginalized than higher-earning fathers. I find support for the first and third hypotheses. Model 1 illustrates that, compared to all other reported income brackets, earning at least $35,000 increases the likelihood of be traditional as opposed to both generative and marginalized. The effects are strongest when comparing traditional and marginalized men. In addition, Model 1 demonstrates that earning less than $10,000 (compared to at least $35,000) increases the likelihood of being marginalized as opposed to both generative and traditional.

Demographic controls included in Model 2 considerably influence the effect of personal income. Net of demographic controls, the only income difference that remains significant in comparing traditional and generative men is earning between $10,000-$19,999 and at least $35,000. Earning at least $35,000 (as opposed to $10,000-$19,999) continues to increase the likelihood of being traditional as opposed to generative. After controlling for demographic characteristics, differences in traditional and marginalized men become less pronounced. Earning at least $35,000 (as opposed to $19,999 or less) continues to increase the likelihood of being traditional as opposed to marginalized, however the effect is considerably diminished and the differences between earning $20,000-$34,999 and at least $35,000 become nonsignificant. The attitudinal controls included in Model 3 have no real influence on the effect of personal income.

Townsend's Package Deal: Home Ownership

I presented one hypothesis concerning home ownership and vision of masculinity; fathers who own their homes will be more likely to be generative men. If find no support for this hypothesis. Bivariate analyses suggest that homeownership significantly increases the likelihood

of being both generative and traditional as opposed to marginalized; however, these effects never approach significance in the multivariate models.

Demographic Controls

I expected that positions of socioeconomic disadvantage would result in adherence to either the traditional or the marginalized vision of masculinity. Results yield inconsistent findings on this expectation. Model 2 illustrates that being Hispanic increases the likelihood of being marginalized as opposed to both generative and traditional. In addition, being Hispanic increases the likelihood of being generative as opposed to traditional. There are no significant differences between black and white males at the multivariate or bivariate level of analysis. On average, traditional fathers are older than both generative and marginalized fathers. Similarly, marginalized fathers are younger than both generative and traditional fathers. There are no significant differences in terms of per capita household income or previous children at the multivariate level.

Attitudinal Controls

I expected that men reporting greater involvement in and attachment to fatherhood would be more likely to be generative. I also expected that men holding more traditional views concerning gender roles, in general, would be more likely to be traditional. Finally, I expected that men's vision of masculinity would mirror the child's mother's vision of what an ideal father would be. Results yield support for these expectations. Model 3 illustrates that reporting lower attachment to identity as a father increases the likelihood of being a traditional rather than generative father. In addition, reporting greater support for traditional gender roles increases the likelihood of being traditional rather than generative or marginalized. I find no significant differences in measures of positive relationship quality with the child's mother; however,

reporting greater instances of relationship conflict increases the likelihood of being traditional rather than generative or marginalized. Finally, a mother expecting an ideal father to be traditional increases the likelihood of a man being traditional; however, this shared vision of masculinity does not hold for marginalized fathers. In addition, a mother not having a clear vision of what an ideal father should be increases the likelihood of a men being either traditional or marginalized as opposed to generative. I find no significant differences in terms of involvement during the pregnancy for generative, marginalized, or traditional men.

Conclusions

Table 3 presents the odds ratios for predictors from multiple multinomial regression equations. I begin by discussing the significant predictors that increase the likelihood of being a traditional man. Ultimately, being a nonresident, romantically involved father (compared to married) increases the odds of being traditional rather than generative by 45% and marginalized by 33%. However, this effect becomes nonsignificant after controlling for attitudinal characteristics. Generally speaking, lower levels of education increase the odds of being traditional rather than generative. Model 3 demonstrates that failure to earn a high school diploma increases the odds of being traditional rather than generative by 45%, while earning a high school diploma/GED increases the odds of being traditional compared to generative by 41%. Demographic controls in Model 2 partially suppress the effect of education for traditional men while attitudinal controls in Model 3 partially mediate this effect. High-earning men (at least $35,000) are more likely to be traditional than generative or marginalized. Model 3 illustrates that earning between $10,000-$19,999 (as opposed to at least $35,000) decreases the odds of being traditional rather than generative by 30%. This effect of personal income becomes more pronounced in comparing traditional and marginalized men. Ultimately, earning between

$10,000-$19,999 (compared to at least $35,000) decreases the odds of being traditional rather than marginalized by 62% whereas earning less than $10,000 decreases the odds of being traditional rather than marginalized by 74%. Hispanic men appear to reject the traditional vision of masculinity as being Hispanic decreases the odds of being traditional (rather than generative) by 38%. Again this effect is exaggerated when comparing traditional and marginalized men with an odds decrease of 118%. A mother preferring a traditional father (rather than a generative father) increases the odds of being traditional rather than generative by 25%. More striking, a mother not holding a clear vision of what an ideal father should be increases the odds of being traditional rather than generative by 54%.

[See Table 3]

Next, I discuss the predictors that significantly increase the likelihood of being a marginalized man. As mentioned previously, earning a low income significantly increases the odds of being marginalized rather than traditional net of demographic and attitudinal controls. Initially, I find a similar effect in comparing marginalized and generative men. Earning less than $10,000 (compared to at least $35,000) increases the odds of being marginalized rather than generative by 54%; however, demographic controls in Model 2 reduce this effect to nonsignificance. Similarly, I find failure to earn a high school diploma increases the odds of being marginalized rather than generative by 84%, but this effect becomes nonsignificant after including demographic controls. Ultimately, Hispanic ethnicity increases the odds of being marginalized as rather than generative by 36%. Finally, a mother not holding a clear vision of what a father should be increases the odds of being a marginalized father (compared to generative) by 102%.

Finally, I discuss the predictors that significantly increase the likelihood of being a generative father. As mentioned previously, reporting higher educational attainment increases the likelihood of being generative rather than either traditional or marginalized. This effect remains significant across all models in comparing traditional and generative men, but demographic characteristics (primarily Hispanic ethnicity and age) account for the educational differences in generative and marginalized men. I reiterate, married fathers are more likely than nonresident, romantically involved fathers to be generative compared to traditional, but there are no significant differences between generative men and marginalized men in terms of relationship status.

Discussion

My research makes four key contributions to current research on masculinities in fatherhood. First, I demonstrate that multiple forms of masculinity do exist and are associated with various social positioning and attitudinal values. Second, a man's personal income behaves quite differently than other markers of socioeconomic status such as educational attainment and relationship status suggesting that both mainstream sociological and critical gender theories have some explanatory power in discussing masculinities. Third, I find support of both a structural and attitudinal explanation of multiple forms of masculinity. Finally, I find home ownership does not appear to be a significant predictor of masculinity for urban, disadvantaged men.

Generally speaking, I find greater differences in comparing traditional men against either marginalized or generative men. The few differences between generative and marginalized men are completely explained by controlling for Hispanic ethnicity and age. I acknowledge that the marginalized category of my typology is the most heterogeneous. However, I want to consider some implications regarding the similarities between generative and marginalized men. Is the

convergence of generative and marginalized masculinity a result of measurement error, or could this convergence suggest that men holding the traditional vision of masculinity are the "new" select group of different men?

The effects of personal income, relationship status, and educational attainment on masculinity raise interesting questions in identifying normative masculinity (hegemonic masculinity for critical gender theorists; universal masculinity for mainstream sociological theorists). Both relationship status and educational attainment behave in a manner consistent with a critical gender perspective. Men in more advantageous positions have a greater likelihood of adopting the hegemonic form of masculinity. However, personal income behaves in a manner consistent with mainstream sociological theorists; high-earning men have a greater likelihood of being traditional. The different effect of personal income highlights the connection between providership and masculinity that remains net of more egalitarian values associated with higher educational attainment and new norms for fatherhood.

In my conceptual framework, I draw more heavily from Connell in explaining alternative forms of masculinity through structural positioning and demographic constraints while I primarily use Coles to explain multiple forms of masculinity through attitudinal characteristics. I find that structural characteristics have a greater explanatory power regarding the effects of education and income while attitudinal characteristics are useful in explaining the effects of relationship status. This suggests that both structural constraints and attitudes play an active role in constructing masculinities; however, each the perspectives mediate different predictors and might construct masculinities through different processes.

Finally, my study provides no evidence supporting home ownership's influence in shaping masculinities. This finding is inconsistent with Townsend's (2002) work which

highlighted home ownership as a prerequisite to fatherhood and a primary factor in constructing a masculine identity. My study suggests that either the effect of home ownership has waned since Townsend collected his data, or home ownership is not a significant predictor among young, urban, economically disadvantaged men. This finding might have considerable implications given the current instability in the economy and housing market. I note the data on home ownership from the baseline in Fragile Families is somewhat messy. It becomes difficult to establish true home ownership from ties to home ownership. I clean this measure by conceptualizing home ownership as living in a residence that is owned and either living alone or with a partner. While I hope my measure adequately measures home ownership, one might expect that my conceptualization confounds the effect of true home ownership.

Limitations

This study has three major limitations. First, this cross-sectional analysis cannot establish a temporal order between men's attitudes toward masculinity and the socioeconomic and attitudinal indicators examined. Second, the baseline data do not provide clean measures of home ownership. Townsend (2002) finds that home ownership is intricately connected to masculinity in fatherhood; however the Fragile Families data do not provide clear measures of true home ownership. Third, this quantitative approach lacks the higher level of face validity that a qualitative approach might offer as men are limited to discuss their masculinity within the confines of responses provided by the survey.

I create an innovative typology that integrates the Fragile Families' two approaches in defining masculinity in fatherhood. Ideally, I would have preferred that the Fragile Families data ask men to rank-order the six dimensions of fatherhood from most to least important. However,

I expect the ideal rank-order quantitative approach would still be inferior to an in-depth qualitative approach to understanding how men construct and defend their own masculinities.

Implications

First, my methodological approach utilizes an innovative typology that can inform future studies using the Fragile Families data to study social phenomena surrounding both masculinities and perceptions of fatherhood. I note considerable measurement error in the forced and open choice measures of perceptions of fatherhood, but my typology works to combine both measures to depict a clearer picture of how men perceive their role as fathers. Second, my results depict three distinct visions of masculinity that differ in terms of socioeconomic, demographic, and attitudinal characteristics. These findings can inform future qualitative approaches that might hope to better understand the pressures that men feel from socioeconomic, demographic, and attitudinal positioning and how these pressures play an active role in constructing different forms of masculinity. Finally, my results indicate a strong "Hispanic effect" in constructing masculine identities. My conceptual framework is not equipped to explain this race effect; therefore, future research can hope to better understand the mechanisms or processes that explain why Hispanic men are drawn to marginalized masculinity and reject the traditional form of masculinity.

REFERENCES

Cabrera, Natasha, Jay Fagan, and Danielle Farrie. (2008). "Explaining the long reach of Fathers' Prenatal Involvement on Later Paternal Engagement". *Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol. 70. Issue 5. Pp. 1094-1107.

Carlson, Marcia, Sarah McLanahan, and Paula England. (2004). "Union Formation in Fragile Families". *Demography*. Vol. 41. No. 2. Pp. 237-261.

Castillo, Jason T. and Ashley Fenzyl-Crossman. (2010). "The Relationship between Non-marital Fathers' Social Networks and Social Capital and Father Involvement." *Child and Family Social Work*. Vol. 15 Issue 1. Pp. 66-76.

Coles, T. (2009). "Negotiating the field of masculinity: The production and reproduction of multiple dominant masculinities." *Men & Masculinities*. Vol.12 Issue 1. Pp. 30-44.

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). "HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY: Rethinking the concept." *Gender & Society*. Vol. 19 Issue 6. Pp. 829-859.

Fagan, Jay and Rob Palkovitz. (2007). "Unmarried, Nonresident Fathers' Involvement with Their Infants: A Risk and Resilience Perspective". *Journal of Family Psychology*. Vol. 21 Issue 3. Pp. 479-489.

Fagan, Jay, Rob Palkovitz, Kevin Roy, and Danielle Farrie. (2009). "Pathways to Paternal Engagement: Longitudinal effects of Cumulative Risk and Resilience on Non Resident Fathers". *Developmental Psychology*. Volume 45. Issue 5. Pp. 1389-1405.

Finn, M., & Henwood, K. (2009). "Exploring masculinities within men's identificatory imaginings of first-time fatherhood." *British Journal of Social Psychology*. Vol. 48 Issue 3. Pp. 547-562

Garfield, Craig F. and Paul Chung. (2006). "A Qualitative Study of Early Differences in Fathers' Expectations of their Child Care Responsibilities". *Ambulatory Pediatrics*. Vol. 6. Issue 4. Pp. 215-220.

Guzzo, Karen Benjamin. (2009). "Maternal Relationships and Nonresidential Father Visitation of Children born outside of Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol. 71. Issue 3. Pp. 632-649.

Jordan, A. (2009). "'Dads aren't demons. mums aren't madonnas.' constructions of fatherhood and masculinities in the (real) fathers 4 justice campaign." *Journal of Social Welfare & Family Law*. Vol. 31 Issue 4. Pp. 419-433.

Kimmel, Michael S., Jeff Hearn, and R.W. Connell (2005). *Handbook of Studies on Men & Masculinities*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lin, I-Fen and Sara McLanahan. (2007). "Parental Beliefs about Nonresident Fathers' Obligations and Rights." *Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol. 69. Pp. 382-398.

Marsiglio, William. (1998). *Procreative Man*. New York: New York University Press.

Marsiglio, William and Joseph H. Pleck. (2005). "Fatherhood and Masculnities" taken from *Handbook of Studies on Men & Masculinities* eds. Kimmel, Hearn, and Connell. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Meadows, Sarah O., Sara S. McLanahan, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. (2007). "Parental Depression and Anxiety and Early Childhood Behavioral Problems across Family Types". *Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol. 69. Issue 5. Pp. 1162-1177.

Messner, M. A. (2004). "On patriarchs and losers: Rethinking men's interests." *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 48. Pp. 74-88.

Nepomnyaschy, Lenna. (2007). "Child support and Father-child contact: Testing Reciprocal Pathways." *Demography*. Vol. 44. Issue 1. Pp. 93-112.

Nock, Steven L. (1998). *Marriage in Men's Lives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Osborne, Cynthia and Lawrence Berger. (2009). "Parental Substance Abuse and Child Well-being: a Consideration of Parents' Gender and Residence." Journal of Family Issues. Vol. 30 Issue 3. Pp. 341-370.

Reichman, Nancy, Julien Teitler, Irwin Garfinkel, and Sara McLanahan. (2001). "Fragile Families: Sample and Design." *Children and Youth Services Review*. Vol. 23, Issue 4-5. 303-326.

Roy, Kevin M. (2004). "You Can't Eat Love: Constructing Provider Role Expectations for Low-Income and Working-Class Fathers." *Fathering*. Vol. 2 Number 3. Pp. 253-276.

Shows, C., & Gerstel, N. (2009). "Fathering, Class, and Gender: A comparison of physicians and emergency medical technicians." *Gender & Society*. Vol. 23 Issue 2. 161-187.

Townsend, Nicholas W. (2002). The Package Deal Marriage, Work, and Fatherhood in Men's Lives. Temple University Press: Philadelphia.

Wall, K., Aboim, S., & Marinho, S. (2007). "Fatherhood, family and work in men's lives negotiating new and old masculinities." *Recherches Socilogiques Et Anthropologiques*. Vol. 38 Issue 2. Pp. 105-122.

Waller, Maureen R. and Raymond Swisher. (2006). “Fathers’ Risk Behaviors in Fragile Families: Implications for ‘Healthy’ Relationships and Father Involvement”. *Social Problems*. Vol. 53. Issue 3. Pp. 392-420.

Woldof, Rachel A. and Michael G. Cina. (2007). “Regular work, underground jobs, and hustling: an examination of Paternal Work and father involvement”. *Fathering*. Vol. 5 Issue 3. Pp. 153-172.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Full Sample and by Masculine Typologies

Predictors	Total Sample (n=3743)		Generative Men (n=2215)		Traditional Men (n=842)		Marginalized Men (n=613)	
	μ/p	s/Frequency	μ/p	s/Frequency	μ/p	s/Frequency	μ/p	s/Frequency
Townsend's Package Deal								
Married	0.28	1052	0.30	667	0.25	216	0.24	150
Cohabiting	0.44	1652	0.43	960	0.43	367	0.47	294
Nonresident	0.21	788	0.20	445	0.24	205	0.2	126
Not Involved	0.06	251	0.06	143	0.06	54	0.07	43
At least a Bachelors	0.11	419	0.12	278	0.09	83	0.07	47
Some College	0.21	805	0.22	507	0.20	175	0.17	108
HS/GED	0.34	1303	0.34	766	0.37	318	0.31	192
Less than HS	0.32	1216	0.29	664	0.31	266	0.43	266
At least $35K	0.18	682	0.19	422	0.20	171	0.12	74
$20K-$34,999	0.22	824	0.22	508	0.21	184	0.20	123
$10K-$19,999	0.23	884	0.23	526	0.21	180	0.26	164
Less than $10K	0.23	868	0.21	484	0.22	193	0.29	178
No reported Income	0.09	485	0.12	275	0.13	114	0.12	74
Homeowner	0.24	921	0.25	565	0.26	219	0.19	120
Demographic Controls								
White	0.20	759	0.21	476	0.21	182	0.15	94
Black	0.47	1767	0.46	1026	0.53	450	0.41	255
Hispanic	0.28	1051	0.27	615	0.20	174	0.39	240
Other	0.04	166	0.04	98	0.04	36	0.03	24
Household Income[A]	13.4	15.6	14.1	16.1	13.5	15.2	10.7	13.6
Age	27.9	7.1	27.9	7.0	28.6	7.6	26.7	6.5
No other Children	0.42	1600	0.43	972	0.40	337	0.42	263
One other Child	0.29	1087	0.29	647	0.28	243	0.28	174
2+ Other Children	0.28	1056	0.26	596	0.31	262	0.28	176
Attitudinal Controls								
Involvement during Pregnancy[B]	3.9	1.1	3.9	1.0	3.9	1.0	3.9	1.1
Attachment to Father Identity[C]	5.4	0.9	5.4	0.9	5.3	1.0	5.3	0.9
Support for Traditional Roles[D]	2.7	1.2	2.6	1.2	2.8	1.2	2.7	1.3
Informal Socialization[E]	2.1	0.9	2.2	0.9	2.1	0.9	2.1	1.0
Relationship Conflict[F]	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.1	2.7	2.3	2.2	2.1
BM wants Generative BF[G]	0.54	2037	0.56	1250	0.51	434	0.52	321
BM wants Traditional BF	0.24	928	0.23	516	0.29	247	0.23	142
BM wants Marginalized BF	0.16	601	0.16	367	0.13	115	0.17	109
BM wants Other BF	0.04	183	0.03	85	0.05	48	0.06	42

A. Household per capita income reported in thousands.
B. Involvement during Pregnancy: index ranging from 0-5 (higher scores reflecting higher involvement)
C. Attachment to Father Identity: index ranging from 0-6 (higher scores reflecting higher attachment)
D. Support for traditional roles: index ranging from 0-6 (higher scores reflecting more support for traditional gender roles)
E. Informal Socialization: index ranging from 0-3 (high scores reflecting more social outings with BM)
F. Relationship Conflict: index ranging from 0-12 (high scores reflecting higher levels of relationship conflict)
G.BM (baby's mother), BF j(baby's father)

N=3743

Table 2. Multinomial Logistic Regression Analyses

Predictors	*Model 1*			*Model 2*		
	(Generative)		(Traditional)	(Generative)		(Traditional)
	Traditional	Marginalized	Marginalized	Traditional	Marginalized	Marginalized
Townsends Package Deal						
(Married)						
Cohabiting	0.18	0.01	-0.17	0.21	-0.006	-0.22
Nonresident	0.36**	-0.09	-0.45**	0.37**	-0.01	-0.39*
Not Involved	0.15	0.000	-0.15	0.16	0.07	-0.09
(At least a Bachelors)						
Some College	0.19	0.09	-0.1	0.22	-0.02	-0.24
HS/GED	0.39*	0.18	-0.2	0.43**	0.03	-0.4
Less than HS	0.37*	0.61**	0.24	0.5**	0.34	-0.16
(At least $35K)						
$20K-$34,999	-0.27*	0.17	0.44*	-0.25	0.07	0.32
$10K-$19,999	-0.4**	0.32	0.72***	-0.32*	0.14	0.47*
Less than $10K	-0.29*	0.43*	0.73***	-0.25	0.28	0.54*
No Reported Inc	-0.21	0.15	0.37	-0.22	0.05	0.27
Homeowner	0.08	-0.12	-0.2	0.05	-0.08	-0.13
Demographic Controls						
(White)						
Black				-0.01	-0.04	-0.02
Hispanic				-0.41**	0.33*	0.75***
Other				-0.05	0.11	0.16
Per Capita Household Income				-0	-0	-0
Age				0.01**	-0.01**	-0.03**
(No Other Child/ren)						
1 Other Child				0.03	0.04	0.009
At least 2 Other Children				0.07	0.16	0.08
Log Likelihood		7522.70			7452.536	

P<0.05 *, P<0.01 **, P<0.001 ***

Note. Table 2 includes results from two different multinomial logistic regression analyses to incorporate all possible comparisons between types of masculinity. Analyses include 73 "other" men, not categorized by my typology, who are not represented in the table. I do not make any interpretations for these men because they fail to highlight a clear form of masculinity; however, I include them in the analyses to improve the total sample size.

N=3743

Table 2. Multinomial Logistic Regression Analyses (Cont.)

Model 3

Predictors	(Generative) Traditional	Marginalized	(Traditional) Marginalized
Townsends Package Deal			
(Married)			
Cohabiting	0.14	0.08	-0.06
Nonresident	0.24	0.04	-0.2
Not Involved	0.02	0.11	0.08
(At least a Bachelors)			
Some College	0.16	0.000	-0.16
HS/GED	0.35*	0.04	-0.3
Less than HS	0.37*	0.32	-0.04
(At least $35K)			
$20K-$34,999	-0.26	0.06	0.33
$10K-$19,999	-0.34*	0.13	0.48*
Less than $10K	-0.27	0.27	0.55*
No Reported Inc	-0.24	0.004	0.24
Homeowner	0.06	-0.06	-0.12
Demographic Controls			
(White)			
Black	-0.08	-0.04	0.03
Hispanic	-0.47***	0.3*	0.78***
Other	-0.15	0.09	0.24
Per Capita Household Income	-0	-0	-0
Age	0.01*	-0.01*	-0.03**
(No Other Child/ren)			
1 Other Child	0.03	0.05	0.02
At least 2 Other Children	0.05	0.17	0.11
Attitudinal Controls			
Involvement during Pregnancy	0.05	-0.03	-0.09
Attachment to Identity as a Father	-0.15***	-0.06	0.09
Support for Traditional Gender Roles	0.15***	0.05	-0.1*
Informal Socialization	-0.001	0.03	0.03
Relationship Conflict	0.05**	-0.03	-0.09***
Baby Mother's Idea of what an Ideal Father Should Be			
(Generative Father)			
Traditional Father	0.22*	0.1	-0.12
Marginalized Father	-0.06	0.07	0.13
Other Father	0.43*	0.7***	0.27
Log Likelihood	7348.591		

P<0.05 *, P<0.01 **, P<0.001 ***

Note. Table 2 includes results from two different multinomial logistic regression analyses to incorporate all possible comparisons between types of masculinity. Analyses include 73 "other" men, not categorized by my typology, who are not represented in the table.

Table 3. Odds Ratios for Multinomial Logistic Regression Analyses

Predictors	**Traditional (Generative)**			**Marginalized (Traditional)**		
	Model 1	*Model 2*	*Model 3*	*Model 1*	*Model 2*	*Model 3*
Townsend's Package Deal						
(Married)						
Cohabiting	1.20	1.24	1.15	0.84	0.79	0.94
Nonresident	***1.44***	***1.45***	1.28	***0.63***	***0.67***	0.81
Not Involved	1.17	1.17	1.02	0.85	0.91	1.08
(At least a Bachelors)						
Some College	1.21	1.24	1.17	0.90	0.78	0.84
HS/GED	***1.48***	***1.54***	***1.41***	0.81	0.66	0.73
Less than HS	***1.45***	***1.65***	***1.45***	1.27	0.85	0.95
(At least $35K)						
$20K-$34,999	***0.76***	0.77	0.76	***1.56***	1.38	1.39
$10K-$19,999	***0.67***	***0.72***	***0.70***	***2.07***	***1.60***	***1.62***
Less than $10K	***0.74***	0.77	0.75	***2.08***	***1.71***	***1.74***
No reported Income	0.80	0.80	0.78	1.45	1.31	1.28
Homeowner	1.08	1.05	1.06	0.81	0.87	0.88
Demographic Controls						
(White)						
Black		0.98	0.92		0.97	1.03
Hispanic		***0.65***	***0.62***		***2.12***	***2.18***
Other		0.95	0.85		1.18	1.28
Household Income		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Age		***1.01***	***1.01***		***0.97***	***0.97***
(No other Children)						
One other Child		1.03	1.03		1.00	1.02
2+ Other Children		1.07	1.06		1.09	1.12
Attitudinal Controls						
Involvement during Pregnancy			1.05			0.90
Attachment to Father Identity			***0.85***			1.09
Support for Traditional Roles			***1.16***			***0.90***
Informal Socialization			0.99			1.03
Relationship Conflict			***1.05***			***0.91***
(BM wants Generative BF)						
BM wants Traditional BF			***1.25***			0.88
BM wants Marginalized BF			0.93			1.14
BM wants Other BF			***1.54***			1.31

Significant odds ratios are in ***bold, italicized font.*** Table 3 includes results from two multinomial logistic equations.

Table 3. Odds Ratios (Cont.)

Predictors	**Marginalized (Generative)**		
	Model 1	*Model 2*	*Model 3*
Townsend's Package Deal			
(Married)			
Cohabiting	1.01	0.99	1.08
Nonresident	0.91	0.98	1.04
Not Involved	1.00	1.08	1.11
(At least a Bachelors)			
Some College	1.09	0.97	1.00
HS/GED	1.20	1.03	1.04
Less than HS	***1.84***	1.40	1.38
(At least $35K)			
$20K-$34,999	1.18	1.07	1.07
$10K-$19,999	1.38	1.15	1.14
Less than $10K	***1.54***	1.33	1.31
No reported Income	1.16	1.05	1.00
Homeowner	0.88	0.92	0.94
Demographic Controls			
(White)			
Black		0.95	0.95
Hispanic		***1.39***	***1.36***
Other		1.12	1.05
Household Income		1.00	1.00
Age		0.98	0.98
(No other Children)			
One other Child		1.04	1.06
2+ Other Children		1.17	1.19
Attitudinal Controls			
Involvement during Pregnancy			0.96
Attachment to Father Identity			0.93
Support for Traditional Roles			1.05
Informal Socialization			1.03
Relationship Conflict			0.96
(BM wants Generative BF)			
BM wants Traditional BF			1.10
BM wants Marginalized BF			1.07
BM wants Other BF			***2.02***

Significant odds ratios are in ***bold, italicized font.*** Table 3 includes results from two multinomial logistic equations.

Table of Contents for Appendices

Appendix A: Raw frequencies for variables used to construct Typology

F1C2A: "How important is it to provide regular financial support to children?"
1: Very important: 3447 cases
2: Somewhat important: 249 cases
3: Not important: 47 cases
Frequency missing: 11 cases

F1C2C: "How important is it to provide direct care to the child?"
1: Very important: 3429 cases
2: Somewhat Important: 298 cases
3: Not important: 16 cases
Frequency missing: 11 cases

F1C3: "Which of the following is the most important?
1: Provide regular financial support: 408 cases
2: Teach the child about life: 710 cases
3: Provide direct childcare: 434 cases
4: Show the child love: 1922 cases
5: Protect the child: 113 cases
6: Serve an authority figure/disciplinarian to the child: 156 cases
Frequency missing: 67 cases

Appendix B: Recode for variables in typology

Considering the skew in F1C2A and F1C2C, I have recoded respondents stating…

Neither providership nor caregiving are very important: 60 cases
Providership is very important, caregiving is not: 254 cases
Caregiving is very important, providership is not: 236 cases
Both providership and caregiving are very important: 3193 cases

F1C3 does not require any recoding aside from dropping the missing cases.

Appendix C: Color coded crosstab used in constructing typology

Frequency
Row Percent
Column Percent
Total Percent

Open Choice	What is the Single most important aspect of Fatherhood?						
	Providership	Caregiving	Show Love	Teach the Child about Life	Serve as an Authority Figure	Protect	Total
Neither Providership nor caregiving is Very Important	5 8% 1% 0.1%	5 8% 1.1% 0.1%	30 50% 1.5% 0.8%	15 25% 2.1% 0.4%	0	5 8% 4.4% 0.1%	60 1.6% NA
Providership is very important, caregiving is not	35 13.7% 8.5% 0.9%	3 1% 0.6% 0.00%	147 57.8% 7.6% 3.9%	54 21.2% 7.6% 1.4%	6 2.3% 3.8% 0.1%	9 3.5% 7.9% 0.2%	254 6.7% NA
Caregiving is very important, providrehsip is not	10 4.2% 2.4% 0.2%	39 16.5% 8.9% 0.1%	102 43.2% 5.3% 2.7%	69 29.2% 9.7% 1.8%	11 4.6% 7% 0.2%	5 2.1% 4.4% 0.1%	236 6.3% NA
Both providership and caregiving are very important	358 11.2% 87.7% 9.5%	387 12.1% 89.1% 10.3%	1643 51.4% 85.4% 43.8%	572 17.9% 80.5% 15.2%	139 4.3% 89.1% 3.7%	94 2.9% 83.1% 2.5%	3193 85.3% NA
Total	408 NA 10.9%	434 NA 11.5%	1922 NA 51.3%	710 NA 18.9%	156 NA 4.1%	113 NA 3%	3743

Other: 73
Traditional Masculinity: 842
Marginalized Masculinity: 613
Generative Masculinity: 2215

Appendix D: Key for Heterogeneity/Homogeneity tests supporting Typology

Open Choice Typology		Forced Choice: The Single Most important Dimension of Fatherhood						
		Provide Economic Support	Provided Direct Care	Teach about Life	Show Love	Protect	Serve as Authority Figure	Total
1	Neither Providership nor Caregiving	5 8.1% 1.2% 0.1%	5 8.1% 1.1% 0.1%	16 26.2% 2.2% 0.4%	30 49.1% 1.5% 0.7%	5 8.1% 4.4% 0.1%	0	61 1.6%
2	Only Providership is very important	35 A 13.6% 8.5% 0.9%	3 1.1% 0.7% 0.07%	55 B 21.4% 7.7% 1.4%	148 C 57.8% 7.6% 3.9%	9 D 3.5% 7.9% 0.2%	6 E 2.3% 3.8% 0.1%	256 6.8%
3	Only Caregiving is very important	10 4.2% 2.4% 0.2%	39 F 16.5% 8.9% 1.0%	69 G 29.2% 9.6% 1.7%	102 H 43.2% 5.2% 2.7%	5 I 2.1% 4.4% 0.1%	11 J 4.6% 7% 0.2%	236 6.2%
4	Both Providership and Caregiving	359 K 8% 87.7% 9.5%	387 L 12.2% 89.2% 10.4%	572 M 16.4% 80.3% 15.2%	1643 N 51.4% 85.4% 43.8%	94 O 2.9% 83.1% 2.5%	140 P 4.3% 89.1% 3.7%	3202 85.2%
	Total	409 10.8%	438 11.6%	712 18.9%	1926 51.2%	113 3%	157 4.1%	3755

Marginalized Masculinity (n=613)
3FGHIJ
4L

Traditional Masculinity (n=842)
2ABCDE
4KOP

Generative Masculinity (n=2215)
4MN

Appendix E: Human Capital Tests for Marginalized Men

3FGHIJ (Marginalized) vs. 4L (Marginalized)

	Total Sample		3FGHIJ	4L	P-Value
Homeowner	1375(n)	37.63%	30.09%	35.22%	NS

	Total Sample	3FGHIJ	4L	Income Difference	P-Value
Mean (thousands)	10.8	10.3	4.9	5.4	*

	Total Sample		3FGHIJ	4L	P-Value
White	754 (n)	20.48%	15.93%	14.83%	NS
Black	1739 (n)	47.24%	27.43%	50.13%	***
Hispanic	1030 (n)	27.98%	53.54%	30.69%	***
Other	158 (n)	4.29%	3.1%	4.3%	NS (small N)

	Total Sample		3FGHIJ	4L	P-Value
Less than HS	1201 (n)	32.63%	43.36%	43.48%	NS
HS/GED	1281 (n)	34.8%	23.89%	35.81%	***
Some College	790 (n)	21.46%	20.35%	15.86%	NS
At least Bachelor's	409 (n)	11.11%	12.39%	4.86%	***

Appendix E: Human Capital Tests for Marginalized Men (cont)

3FGHIJ (Marginalized) vs. 2ABCDE (Traditional)

	Total Sample		3FGHIJ	2ABCDE	P-Value
Homeowner	1375(n)	37.63%	30.64%	45.82%	***

	Total Sample	3FGHIJ	2ABCDE	Mean Difference	P-Value
Mean (thousands)	10.8	10.3	21.2	10.9	**

	Total Sample		3FGHIJ	2ABCDE	P-Value
White	754 (n)	20.48%	15.25%	32.81%	***
Black	1739 (n)	47.24%	29.66%	44.14%	***
Hispanic	1030 (n)	27.98%	51.27%	17.58%	***
Other	158 (n)	4.29%	3.81%	5.47%	NS

	Total Sample		3FGHIJ	2ABCDE	P-Value
Less than HS	1201 (n)	32.63%	43.22%	28.13%	***
HS/GED	1281 (n)	34.8%	25%	29.3%	NS
Some College	790 (n)	21.46%	19.92%	22.66%	NS
At least Bachelor's	409 (n)	11.11%	11.86%	19.92%	*

Appendix E: Human Capital Tests for Marginalized Men (cont)

Human Capital: 4L (Marginalized) vs. 4MN (Generative)

	Total Sample		4L	4MN	P-Value
Homeowner	1375(n)	37.63%	35.22%	38.31%	NS

	Total Sample	4L	4MN	Income Difference	P-Value
Mean (thousands)	10.8	4.9	11.7	6.7	***

	Total Sample		4L	4MN	P-Value
White	754 (n)	20.48%	14.83%	21.5%	**
Black	1739 (n)	47.24%	50.13%	46.3%	NS
Hispanic	1030 (n)	27.98%	30.69%	27.7%	NS
Other	158 (n)	4.29%	4.3%	4.4%	NS

	Total Sample		4L	4MN	P-Value
Less than HS	1201 (n)	32.63%	43.48%	29.9%	***
HS/GED	1281 (n)	34.8%	35.81%	34.5%	NS
Some College	790 (n)	21.46%	15.86%	22.8%	**
At least Bachelor's	409 (n)	11.11%	4.86%	12.5%	**

Appendix F: Human Capital Tests for Traditional Men

2ADE (Traditional) vs. 4KOP (Traditional)

	Total Sample		2ADE	4KOP	P-Value
Homeowner	1375(n)	37.63%	48.98%	35.99%	NS

	Total Sample	2ADE	4KOP	Mean Difference	P-Value
Mean (thousands)	10.8	8.4	6.8	1.6	NS

	Total Sample		2ADE	4KOP	P-Value
White	754 (n)	20.48%	18%	16.69%	NS
Black	1739 (n)	47.24%	66%	57.67%	NS
Hispanic	1030 (n)	27.98%	10%	21.92%	NS
Other	158 (n)	4.29%	6%	3.71%	NS

	Total Sample		2ADE	4KOP	P-Value
Less than HS	1201 (n)	32.63%	34%	33.3%	NS
HS/GED	1281 (n)	34.8%	38%	41.3%	NS
Some College	790 (n)	21.46%	20%	19.9%	NS
At least Bachelor's	409 (n)	11.11%	8%	5.4%	NS

Appendix F: Human Capital Tests for Traditional Men (cont)

4K OP (Traditional) vs. 4L (Marginalized)

	Total Sample		4K OP	4L	P-Value
Homeowner	1375(n)	37.63%	35.99%	35.22%	NS

	Total Sample	4K OP	4L	Income Difference	P-Value
Mean (thousands)	10.8	6.8	4.9	1.8	NS

	Total Sample		4K OP	4L	P-Value
White	754 (n)	20.48%	16.69%	14.83%	NS
Black	1739 (n)	47.24%	57.67%	50.13%	*
Hispanic	1030 (n)	27.98%	21.92%	30.69%	**
Other	158 (n)	4.29%	3.71%	4.3%	NS

	Total Sample		4K OP	4L	P-Value
Less than HS	1201 (n)	32.63%	33.3%	43.48%	**
HS/GED	1281 (n)	34.8%	41.3%	35.81%	NS
Some College	790 (n)	21.46%	19.9%	15.86%	NS
At least Bachelor's	409 (n)	11.11%	5.4%	4.86%	NS

Appendix F: Human Capital Tests for Traditional Men (cont)

4KOP (Traditional) vs. 4MN (Generative)

	Total Sample		4KOP	4MN	P-Value
Homeowner	1375(n)	37.63%	35.99%	38.31%	NS

	Total Sample	4KOP	4MN	Income Difference	P-Value
Mean (thousands)	10.8	6.8	11.7	4.8	***

	Total Sample		4KOP	4MN	P-Value
White	754 (n)	20.48%	16.69%	21.5%	**
Black	1739 (n)	47.24%	57.67%	46.3%	***
Hispanic	1030 (n)	27.98%	21.92%	27.7%	**
Other	158 (n)	4.29%	3.71%	4.4%	NS

	Total Sample		4KOP	4MN	P-Value
Less than HS	1201 (n)	32.63%	33.3%	29.9%	NS
HS/GED	1281 (n)	34.8%	41.3%	34.5%	**
Some College	790 (n)	21.46%	19.9%	22.8%	NS
At least Bachelor's	409 (n)	11.11%	5.4%	12.5%	***

Appendix G: Human Capital tests for Generative Men

4MN (Generative) vs. 2BC (Traditional) vs. 3GH (Marginalized)

	Total Sample		4MN	2BC	3GH	P-Value
Homeowner	1375(n)	37.63%	38.31%	45.2%	29.8%	*

	Total Sample	4MN	2BC	3GH	P-Value
Mean (thousands)	10.8	11.7	24.3	11.2	**

	Total Sample		4MN	2BC	3GH	P-Value
White	754 (n)	20.48%	21.5%	36.9%	18.1%	***
Black	1739 (n)	47.24%	46.3%	38.4%	29.8%	*
Hispanic	1030 (n)	27.98%	27.7%	19.2%	48.5%	***
Other	158 (n)	4.29%	4.4%	5.2%	3.5%	NS

	Total Sample		4MN	2BC	3GH	P-Value
Less than HS	1201 (n)	32.63%	29.9%	26.11%	41.52%	**
HS/GED	1281 (n)	34.8%	34.5%	27.59%	23.39%	*
Some College	790 (n)	21.46%	22.8%	23.15%	20.47%	NS
At least Bachelor's	409 (n)	11.11%	12.5%	23.15%	14.62%	*