2005-07-14

IS THE PARTY OVER? Unmarried Fatherhood and Drug and Alcohol Use

Jonathan A. Jarvis
Brigham Young University - Provo

www.manaraa.com

IS THE PARTY OVER? UNMARRIED FATHERHOOD AND DRUG

AND ALCOHOL USE

by

Jonathan A. Jarvis

A thesis submitted to the faculty of

Brigham Young University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

Department of Sociology

Brigham Young University

July 2005

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Jonathan A. Jarvis

This thesis has been read by each member of the following graduate committee and by majority vote has been found to be satisfactory.

_____   _____

Date   Renata Forste, Chair

_____   _____

Date   John P. Hoffmann

_____   _____

Date   Stephen J. Bahr

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

As chair of the candidate's graduate committee. I have the thesis of Jonathan A. Jarvis in its final form and have found that (1) its format, citations, and bibliographical style are consistent an acceptable and fulfill university and department style requirements; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the graduate committee and is ready for submission to the university library.

_____ _____
Date   Renata Forste
                                          Chair, Graduate Committee

Accepted for the Department

                                          _____
                                          John P. Hoffmann
                                          Graduate Coordinator

Accepted for the College

                                          _____
                                          Renata Forste
                                          Associate Dean, College of Family,
                                          Home and Social Sciences

ABSTRACT

IS THE PARTY OVER? UNMARRIED FATHERHOOD AND DRUG

AND ALCOHOL USE

Jonathan A. Jarvis

Department of Sociology

Master of Science

Using waves two and three of the National Survey of Adolescent Males (1990 and
1995) I examine the effects of marriage, paternity and father involvement on the use of
drugs and alcohol by young men. Despite the importance of fatherhood as an adult role, I
argue that commitment to the role of fatherhood and not paternity itself is what alters
behavior. I hypothesize that young men who assume responsibility for fathering their
children are more likely to reduce their drug and alcohol use over time than young men
who father children but do not assume the role of parent. Results show that the
assumption of adult roles and father involvement affect drug and alcohol use differently.
Paternity is found to deter alcohol use independent of marriage, while marriage reduces
illicit drug use. Closer examination of paternity and alcohol use supports my hypothesis
that father involvement is associated with decreased alcohol use. Young men residing

with their children were also more likely to smoke infrequently than non-resident

uninvolved fathers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee for their valuable insight, energy and encouragement. All three of them have been instrumental in the completion of this project and have provided a wonderful learning experience. I would especially like to thank my committee chair, Renata Forste, for her patience, guidance, support and helpful mentoring. I would also like to thank my wife Jodi, whose faith in my potential has helped me weather the storm of self-doubt and frustration graduate life has so amply provided. Lastly, I want to thank my cohort friends for creating a vibrant and warm atmosphere of philosophical, political and sociological discussion. I'll miss our times in the carrels. I'm afraid the party *is* over.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Introduction

With half of all adolescents participating in one form of high-risk behavior or another (Kulbok & Cox 2002), adolescent deviance and its effect on development is an issue of great concern. Adolescent risk behaviors are complex and most often a product of many factors involving adversity and potential developmental problems (Thornberry et al. 1997). Studies show risky behaviors, such as drug and alcohol use, peak at around the age of 20 for unmarried men (Chen & Kandel 1995). Nevertheless, extensive research monitoring the habits and lifestyles of this volatile age group concludes that drug and alcohol use eventually decreases with age (Chen & Kandel 1995; Bachman et al. 1997). What is it about getting older that brings about this change in behavior?

Several theorists argue that the acceptance of adult roles is responsible for decreased alcohol and drug use (Nielsen 2001; Bachman et al. 1997; Yamaguchi & Kandel 1985), with the transition to marriage having the greatest impact on the drug and drinking patterns of young adults (Bachman et al. 1997; Akerlof 1998). Whether involvement or commitment to the transition is paramount (Sampson & Laub 1990, 1993; see also Shover 1985) or the timing and nature of the transition, marriage appears to decrease drug and alcohol use and improve overall health (Waite & Gallagher 2000; Bachman et al. 1997; Miller-Tutzauer, Leonard & Windle 1991; Akerlof 1998). However given trends in non-marital fertility, for many young men and women, parenthood rather than marriage is the first adult transition they experience (Casper & Bianchi 2002; Fields & Casper 2001; Forste 2002).

In addition to marriage, the transition and commitment to other adult roles also affects young adult drug and alcohol use. Although it is distinct from marriage, parenthood is an

1

important adult transition. Despite concern over the increasing prevalence of non-marital childbearing, little research has examined "off-timed" transitions, such as early or non-marital parenthood, and its influence on young adult substance use (Krohn, Lizotte & Perez 1997).

To address these issues, I examine young men who become fathers and the influence of this transition on their use of drugs and alcohol over time. In particular, I explore how young single fathers' involvement as parents influences their use of alcohol and drugs. Using the National Survey of Adolescent Males (1990, 1995) I focus not only on fatherhood, but father involvement and how it affects the use of drugs and alcohol among young adult men.

Deviance and the Life Course

Adolescence and young adulthood are times of great transition and change. During these turbulent periods, role models, responsibilities and external influences change and are often unclear. This is when individuals are most susceptible to experimentation with drugs, alcohol and deviant behavior (Chen & Kandel 1995). Although young adult drug and alcohol use plateaus in the early twenties and gradually decreases (Chen & Kandel 1995; Bachman et al. 1997), young adult and adolescent substance use is positively associated with negative outcomes such as deviance and early fatherhood (Kiernan, 1997; Jafee et al., 2001; Krohn et al. 1997). Jessor (1991, 1993) also argues that continued substance use "can compromise adolescent development" (1991:599) impeding successful transitions to marriage or parenthood and altering individual trajectories.

The life course perspective focuses on transitions and trajectories throughout an individual's life. *Trajectories* are long term patterns of behavior, pathways or lines of

2

development; *transitions* are life events that occur along one's trajectory—such as first child, job or marriage (Sampson & Laub 1992; Krohn et al. 1997). The timing of transitions and individual adaptation to transitions are crucial because they alter trajectories and the success of transitions (Elder 1985). Thus childhood and adolescent development have long-term effects on transitions into important adult roles such as marriage and parenthood (Krohn et al. 1997).

In addition to the life-course perspective, criminological theories such as social control and strain theory focus on adult transitions along the life course. They explain criminal activity in adolescence, the general cessation of this tendency in young adulthood, and the effects of deviant activity on life-course trajectories.

Social control theory assumes that social bonds keep individuals from committing delinquent acts (Hirschi 1969). Social bonds are strengthened by one's attachment and commitment to roles and involvement in the activities that accompany these roles and relationships (Hirschi 1969; Akers 2000). The more invested individuals are in socially sanctioned roles the less likely they are to jeopardize these investments through deviant acts. Sampson and Laub's (1990, 1993, 1997) adaptation of social control theory complements the life-course perspective's emphasis on major life events, such as fatherhood and marriage, focusing on the commitment to the transition and the impact this has on social control (Sampson & Laub 1997). From this perspective, drug and alcohol use decreases in the early twenties as young adults transition to and become committed to adult roles such as marriage and work. Commitment to these transitions or roles increases commitment to social norms, decreasing the likelihood of deviant behavior. Conversely, the absence or weakened state of these commitments in

3

adolescence explains higher levels of drug and alcohol use.

Role transition, especially when "off-timed", can result in strain if the demands of the new role are difficult to meet. Recent developments in strain theory focus on the demands of social roles and how these demands may lead to role strain or role incompatibility during the life course (Yamaguchi & Kandel 1985; Marsiglio 1995). Most adult roles (such as husband, wife, father or mother) are particularly incompatible with high drug and alcohol use (Chilcoat & Breslau 1996). Because maintaining adult roles requires certain responsibilities and various sacrifices, transitioning from adolescence to adulthood can result in role strain if deviant behavior continues.

Role strain arises if those transitioning to adult roles have not acquired the necessary skills and resources to successfully accomplish the role. This implies a social awareness concerning suitable sequences and timetables for transitions and 'appropriate' behaviors conducive to particular roles (Hagan & Wheaton 1993; Labouvie 1996; Chilcoat & Breslau 1996). Therefore role strain can push individuals towards deviance if there are not the skills or resources needed to deal with the strain and if social control (by way of a significant other or attachment to children) is weak, making deviance appear less consequential (Agnew 2001).

Young men who have made "off-timed" transitions to fatherhood are also prone to strain in that the new role may prevent goal attainment and, because many are unable to provide financially for their children, challenge their masculinity (Agnew 2001). As a result many of these young men consider continuing deviant activities, such as using high levels of drug and alcohol use, rather than changing and adapting to their new roles (Hagan & Wheaton 1993; Akers 2000 see also Agnew 1985; Agnew 2001). The result is

4

that in order to alleviate this strain, individuals either can become socialized or look to exit the role (Goode 1960; Yamaguchi & Kandel 1985).

Based on these perspectives, I expect young men with fewer transitions and ties to family roles to have higher levels of drug and alcohol use compared to those transitioning to adult family roles. The timing of transitions and resources available are associated with commitment to adult roles and the likelihood of role strain and role exit. Thus, I hypothesize that commitment to adult role transitions will decrease the use of drugs and alcohol over time compared to young men uncommitted to family roles.

Adult Roles and the Life Course

Getting married and having children are associated with decreased criminal activity and substance use. The timing of and investment in the roles are also important determinants of these behaviors.

Marriage

Research suggests that the transition to marriage contributes to a decrease in substance use over time (Yamaguchi & Kandel 1985; Miller-Tutzauer et al. 1991; Bachman et al. 1997; Bachman et al. 2002; Akerlof 1998; Chilcoat & Breslau 1996). This effect is especially apparent among men. Akerlof (1998) shows that married men are significantly less likely than single men of the same age to use alcohol or marijuana. However, less is known about why this transition motivates men to change and if these factors are also present in the assumption of other family roles.

Research suggests that the transition to marriage requires commitment, alters the environment and friends of young people (Labouvie 1996) and adds new responsibilities. Not surprisingly, this in turn affects young adult drug and alcohol consumption

5

(Bachman et al. 1997; Labouvie 1996; Chilcoat & Breslau; Miller-Tutzauer et al. 1991). The marriage commitment is a public contract with social expectations. Those who undertake the transition not only change, but are also treated differently in social situations (Waite & Gallagher 2000). The social capital they receive from this institutional relationship exerts social control over those in the marriage relationship (Sampson & Laub 1992). The roles found in marriage create a change in social influences, role models, learning opportunities and positive and negative reinforcements as the environment changes (McIntyre 2002; Akers 1998; Jessor 1993). Marriage is also related to diminished contact with peers (Fischer & Phillips 1982; Warr 1998), and a decrease in events such as going to parties or bars (Bachman et al. 2002), limiting peer influence on drug and alcohol use (Warr 1998).

Marriage positively affects employment and financial conditions (Akerlof 1998). This is due to expectations from the spouse, but also from the pooling of resources and aid from in-laws (Nock 1998). Married couples are more likely to receive help from their in-laws than unmarried couples as marriage "not only changes the way spouses behave, it changes the way spouses' relatives behave as well" (Waite & Gallagher 2000:118). This further strengthens the social bonds, expectations and the demand for socially acceptable behavior.

Rutter and Hill (1990) find that support from marriage to a non-deviant spouse inhibits deviance. Spouses hold each other accountable for inappropriate actions and expect socially accepted behaviors—such as full-time employment or involvement with children (Waite & Gallagher 2000). Spouses also monitor each other's physical health, thus improving quality of life. As a result, decreased deviant or unhealthy activities can

6

be demanded by spouses and constructive or positive behaviors expected (Waite & Gallagher 2000). Farrington and West (1995) find that this protective effect decreases when spouses no longer reside with each other, implying that the effect is most apparent for intact marriages where couples share residence.

As noted previously, the role transition, and the commitment to that role (Sampson & Laub 1990), affects alcohol and drug use and changes behavior. If the relationship is not valued or if there is little commitment, the spouse's influence is negated. Sampson and Laub (1990, 1993) argue that *strong* marital attachments inhibit deviant behavior. They claim that it is social bonds that are of primary importance: stronger ties inhibit deviance. Similar to Farrington and West's (1995) findings, they argue that individuals attached to their spouses are less involved in criminal behavior than those in unstable relationships.

Engagement

Studies suggest that the anticipation of adult role transitions affects drug and alcohol use (Waite & Gallagher 2000; Yamaguchi & Kandel 1985; Bachman et al. 1997; Miller-Tutzauer et al. 1991). Yamaguchi & Kandel (1985) find that men and women generally stop using marijuana within a year of marriage (during a time when couples are typically engaged to be married). They believe this effect is an example of Merton's (1957) concept of 'anticipatory socialization': prior to the assumption of a new role (like husband) the change is anticipated and behavior is appropriately modified to successfully assume the role (Merton 1957; Yamaguchi & Kandel 1985). Bachman and colleagues (1997) also find that anticipation of marriage is almost as strong a deterrent as marriage itself for both heavy drinking and marijuana use. These findings are consistent with the previously mentioned claims that commitment strengthens social bonds (Sampson &

7

Laub 1990, 1993; Waite & Gallagher 2000). Engagement, a step leading to marriage that requires commitment, strengthens social bonds and deters deviant or antisocial behavior.

Traditionally, marriage has been the first adult transition for young adults. However, changes in educational and employment opportunities for both men and women and the increasing prevalence and social acceptance of cohabitation has led to changes in the sequence of adult role transitions. For many young adults, parenthood is their first adult role (Fields & Casper 2001; Forste 2002; Casper & Bianchi 2002). However, little is known about whether parenthood and marriage differentially affect deviance. The limited research on unmarried fatherhood and drug and alcohol use finds that without marriage, single fathers exhibit almost no change in alcohol and drug use (Bachman et al. 1997). I argue, however, that not paternity alone but involvement in the role of father reduces drug and alcohol use in a manner similar to marriage.

Fatherhood

Despite common misperceptions, being a father is central in the lives of many unmarried fathers (Dudley & Stone 2001; Lerman & Sorenson 2000). Being an actively engaged father matures men in a manner that noninvolved fathers do not experience (Palkovitz 2002). However, the role of father is different than that of husband and faces several obstacles. Similar to succeeding in a marriage, I argue that involvement in and identification with the role of father is important and necessary to decrease substance use over time (Palkovitz 2002).

Husbands and Fathers

The lack of socially defined expectations and sanctions, the solitary nature of the unmarried father role, and non-residence with the child are three common problems

8

limiting father involvement. The social expectations of an unmarried father and the sanctions for not participating are poorly defined. Compared to the socially sanctioned and highly visible transition to marriage, commitment to a child born out-of-wedlock is backed by fewer legal or social consequences, thereby increasing the likelihood of role exit or neglect of duties (Nock 1998). Financial contributions to non-resident children born out-of-wedlock are less likely to be legally established and are generally less frequent and smaller than those from divorced non-resident fathers (Casper & Bianchi 2002).

The timing of the transition to parenthood is also important in regards to equipping oneself with the necessary resources to fill the new role. Consequently, when fathers have limited or deficient resources their likelihood of role exit increases (Dudley & Stone 2001). Unmarried fathers are usually young, have low incomes and educational attainment (Casper & Bianchi 2002), and fewer familial resources relative to married fathers (Nock 1998; Waite & Gallagher 2000; Marsiglio 1995). Dudley and Stone (2001) find that men with low-paying jobs and low education are discouraged from father involvement because they feel unable to provide financial resources.[1] They are also more likely to have used substances and committed acts of deviance (Kiernan, 1997; Jafee et al. 2001). These anti-social behaviors further weaken ties to society and increase their vulnerability to deviant influences (Akers 2000). The expectations to provide and parent may be unclear or undesirable for single men, especially if positive role models or strong social ties to support their commitment are absent. Thus, young, single fathers are often without the financial or social resources needed to appropriately contribute as a parent.

---

[1] Educational success has generally been found to have a negative effect on substance use although this varies along the life-course; college attendance may increase the likelihood of the use of substances such as alcohol (Bachman et al. 1997).

9

Although McLanahan and Sandefur (1994) determine that one-fourth of children born out-of-wedlock are born to cohabiting parents (two-thirds of whom later marry), the majority of unmarried fathers are not living with the mother of their children and are in more tenuous relationships. Consequently, many of these young men do not have a partner to motivate them as a parent. Because they are unlikely to have custody of the child (Casper & Bianchi 2002), these young men are generally not required to actively participate as fathers beyond financial support. Unlike single mothers, who often have custody and direct responsibility for the welfare of the child, single fathers are less involved and often left out of the parenting process altogether (Forste 2002; Seccombe & Warner 2004; Marsiglio 1995; Casper & Bianchi 2002).

Role Identification and Commitment

Fatherhood can be a dramatic event in the lives of young men. Despite a lack of role models, financial resources, a spouse or limited contact with their child, many young men want to be involved fathers and are willing to change. Qualitative research describes the "jolt" of fatherhood as something that "snaps" young men out of their previous immature lifestyles (Palkovitz 2002; Roy 1999). However, those most susceptible to a lasting, life-altering change are those who best identify with their new role; paternity itself does not appear to change fathers as much as involvement changes fathers (Palkovitz 2002).

Identification with the role of father depends in part on the perceived expectations men associate with their circumstances. Father involvement is not static but changes as relationships with the mother or resources change (Marsiglio 1995). Past experience with father figures, and contact with family or peers, can shape the father identity or social roles of young men as fathers. Marsiglio (1995, 1998) argues that nonresident fathers

10

who feel a strong commitment to their social roles as fathers are more likely to provide financial assistance and help, and are more likely to alter their lifestyle. This is consistent with Sampson and Laub's (1990, 1993) argument that, similar to marriage and work, it is the investment in the institutional relationship that encourages social control and socially conforming behavior.

Father involvement is also influenced by a man's relationship with the mother of the child (Carlson & McLanahan 2004; Marsiglio 1995). As previously mentioned, unmarried fathers are less likely to reside with their children or have custody. Being a nonresident father often results in gatekeeping by the mother (Fagan & Barnett 2003). Mothers can encourage father involvement or limit opportunities to be involved based on how well they believe the fathers are fulfilling their roles (Doherty, Kouneski & Erikson 1998; Fagan & Barnett 2003). As a result, the mother of the child can directly control the father's involvement or force him into the role *she* wants in her child's life. This is another element that can cause role strain for young fathers, especially if they want to be more involved. Unmarried fathers in particular are less likely to have legal custody and depend on informal agreements with the mother of their child concerning visitation. The extent of involvement is determined by the condition of their relationship with the mother of the child and, if there is friction, may be out of their control completely.

I contend that decreased use of drugs and alcohol, substances generally in conflict with the role of father, are an outcome of young men identifying with the role of father and adapting their behavior in a manner that facilitates participation.

Controls

In addition to family roles, other factors also influence substance use. Therefore, I

11

include the following demographic/background characteristics in the analysis: race, socio-economic-status, family structure, age, and peer influence.

Race

While the notion of biological differences existing among racial groups has been refuted (See Cornell & Hartman 1998), the social meaning of race continues to have powerful consequences. Evidence of these consequences exists in areas such as drug and alcohol use, deviance, and educational attainment. Research shows that levels of drug and alcohol use and the impact of adult roles on substance use varies by respondent's racial/ethnic background (Nielson 2001). This may in part be a result of role selection and the timing of role transitions, events affecting individual drug and alcohol use, which vary by race (Krohn et al. 1997; Bachman et al. 1997; Jaffee et al. 2001; Buchanan & Robbins 1990). Educational attainment has also been found to vary by race (Wei, Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber 2002; Fagot et al. 1998; Pirog-Good 1995; Kao & Thompson 2003). This is important because as previously mentioned low income or earning potential discourages single father involvement (Dudley & Stone 2001). Therefore, race is an important characteristic when considering substance use and the likelihood of father involvement which might serve as a deterrent.

SES/Family Structure

Family of origin's structure and resources influence the likelihood of unmarried fatherhood, the subsequent level of involvement and future substance use (Bachman et al. 1997; Marsiglio 1995). Negative marital relationships and stressful home environments are predictive of early pregnancy and deviant behaviors such as drug and alcohol use (Jaffee et al. 2001; Farrington 1996). Marsiglio (1995) finds that young men with parents

12

who had not completed high school were much more likely to have fathered a child out of wedlock.[2] This also affects the probability of young fathers having the capacity to help with child support and feel involved as this depends largely on family of origin's resources and support (Marsiglio 1995).

Hagan (1991) suggests that there are "class-specific effects" on the trajectories of males with delinquent pasts. He determines that males from non-working class backgrounds might be protected from the effects of adolescent deviant behavior while working class males may suffer long-term consequences. Thus it appears that resources provided to upper class children help them to not only provide child support, but also more successfully overcome the effects of deviant behavior and off-timed transitions.

Social learning theory posits that past and present influences in the family-of-origin shape attitudes toward parenting (Carlson & McLanahan 2004) as prior experience affects involvement or disengagement as a parent (Yeung, Duncan & Hill 2000). This implies that what children observe while growing up is modeled in their own relationships (Amato & Booth 2001) and consequently affects how successful children are with their future spouses and children (Pope & Englar-Carlson 2001).

Age

Labouvie (1996) finds that transitions to adult roles do not have an effect on substance use until respondents are in their later twenties. Similarly, Uggen (2000), in his research on recidivism and employment as a deterrent, finds that employment's positive effect is greater for criminals in their late twenties. When older individuals transition to adult roles they are more likely to have the necessary resources to successfully fulfill

---

[2] "Among males who fathered a child as a teenager, 42% reported having a father and 45% reported having a mother who had not completed high school, whereas the comparable figures for young men who had not fathered a child as a teenager were 28.5% and 27% respectively." (Marsiglio 1995:332).

13

their responsibilities and to have friends in similar roles (Labouvie 1996). With educational opportunities and better paying employment increasing with age, along with individual maturation, respondent's age is an important consideration in examining drug and alcohol use.

Peers

Research also finds a strong association between substance use and peers (Bahr et al. 1998; Warr 1998, 1993; Fagot et al. 1998; Krohn et al. 1997). Controlling for this effect is important as married men and single men are influenced differently by their peers. Married men spend less time with their peers—high risk peers in particular—than single men. This may contribute to higher substance use among single men (Warr 1998, 1993). Warr (1998) argues that Sampson and Laub (1990, 1993) overlook the effect peers have on young delinquents by giving too much credence to marriage itself and the social bond to the spouse rather than the effect marriage has on time spent with delinquent peers. Moreover, Agnew's (2001) research on strain theory suggests that deviant peers provide a deviant option for dealing with stress or strain. Young adults with more deviant peers have more options for coping in deviant manners and are conversely less likely to have peers who are themselves participating in involved relationships.

Limitations of the Existing Literature

Few researchers have focused on the effects of unmarried fatherhood on substance use. The few studies that examined this relationship find that without marriage, single fathers exhibit little or no change in their use of alcohol and drugs (Bachman et al. 1997; Nock 1998; Akerlof 1998). Are researchers correct in their assumption that marriage is the key transition behind change or can other family transitions lead to changes in drug

and alcohol use as long as there are strong ties to the role? Palkovitz's (2002) qualitative study with a sample of 40 men of varying backgrounds suggests that involved fathers decrease their use of alcohol, cigarettes and illicit drugs.

Similar to Palkovitz's (2002) findings, I argue that paternity itself is not enough to change the behaviors of unmarried fathers; only involvement or commitment to the social role of father will lead to change in the lives of young men. Previous studies examining this transition and its effect on drug and alcohol use are limited. Bachman and colleagues (1997) include unmarried fathers in their research on substance use over time but do not consider father involvement. Neither does Krohn, Lizotte and Perez's (1997) study focus on involvement: they merely assume that the weak pro-social bonds associated with 'precocious transitions' make unmarried men more likely to use drugs. Nock (1998), in looking at the economic outcomes of unmarried fatherhood, also overlooks the importance of including the level of involvement these fathers have with their children. Warr (1998) finds that married respondents' time spent with peers decreases substantially (those with and without kids), while the time unmarried respondents spent with peers shows very little change (those with or without children). However, he also looks at the presence of children only and not involvement with children. I address these gaps in the literature in this study.

Hypothesis

By examining not only the transition to fatherhood, but father involvement, I examine how fathering influences the use of drugs and alcohol among young adult men over time. I hypothesize that the more involved single fathers are in the lives of their children, the less likely they are to use drugs and alcohol.

15

Contrary to Krohn, Lizotte and Perez's (1997) findings, I hypothesize that the transition to fatherhood before marriage acts as an inhibitor to such deviant acts as drug and alcohol use if the fathers are involved in the role. If the bonds attaching them to the child are strong they are more likely to change their behavior. Without this involvement, unmarried fathers are less likely to change and their use of drug and alcohol will resemble single men without children over this period of time.

Data and Methods

Data

Using the second and third waves of the National Survey of Adolescent Males (NSAM-1990/1991 and 1995) I examine the impact of paternity and father involvement on drug and alcohol use. In particular, I focus on the fathering of a child out-of-wedlock between 1990 and 1995 and its association with drug and alcohol use between the two time periods. To more clearly examine the effect of paternity on risk behavior, I distinguish between involved and less-involved fathers. I also examine the effect of marriage on drug and alcohol use and include controls for past drug and alcohol use, age, race, education, family of origin and peer influence.

The NSAM is a nationally representative survey of 1,880 non-institutionalized, never married males between the ages of 15-19 in the United States in 1988 (Sonenstein et al. 1989). The second and third waves were conducted in 1990/91 and 1995. The sample was stratified, over-sampling Black and Hispanic young men, with a 73.9 percent response rate. The three phase longitudinal study begins in adolescence and tracks the respondents as they move into adulthood and make the transition to adult roles. Extensive questions about the respondent's sexual behavior, drug and alcohol use and current relationships

16

with partners and children were asked.

The original sample size was 1,880. Of this sample 1,377 completed all three waves of the survey. Due to the fact that those respondents lost to attrition between 1988 and 1995 appeared to have had "somewhat riskier behaviors" (Sonenstein et al. 2000:9), the data set may be a conservative representation. Weights are provided in the data to adjust for over-sampling and attrition between waves. In order to observe the change in alcohol and drug use during young adulthood I examine changes in drug and alcohol use between 1990/91 and 1995. The age of the respondents ranges from 17 to 22 in 1990/91 and from 22 to 26 in 1995. This captures the age group experiencing the greatest change in drug and alcohol use—adolescents and young adults transitioning into adult roles (Bachman et al. 1997; Chen & Kandel 1995).

In order to observe changes in behavior due to adult role transitions I removed all respondents who were married or had fathered children before 1990/91 and those respondents with multiple marriages. This decreased the sample size from 1,377 to 1,103. The final sample size of 1,103 includes 264 fathers.

Using listwise deletion (see Allison 2002 for listwise deletion as an appropriate method for dealing with missing data), missing data in the primary dependent and independent variables were removed from the data sets.[3] The final sample sizes are alcohol use (N=902), cigarette use (N=927) and illicit drug use (N=908).

Methods

In this study I model the effect of marriage and parenthood on changes in drug and alcohol use among young adult males between 1990 and 1995. In particular, I measure

---

[3] A somewhat higher percentage of respondents from minority racial/ethnic backgrounds were lost through listwise deletion, compared to the percentage of respondents in the total dataset.

17

fatherhood not only in terms of paternity, but also in terms of father involvement.

Dependent Variable

A self-administered portion of each NSAM survey asked questions about drug and alcohol use such as, "During the <u>last 12 months,</u> how often have you smoked marijuana or pot?" Responses are divided into five categories: 'Never', 'A few times', 'Monthly', 'Weekly' and 'Daily' for smoking, alcohol, marijuana and cocaine or crack use.

The respondent's use of illicit drugs, cigarettes and alcohol in 1995 are the main dependent variables.[4] The primary focus of this paper is whether the frequency of drug and alcohol use changes between 1990 and 1995 (due to the assumption of and or involvement in adult family roles). Historically, there are different trends in the use of illicit drugs, alcohol and cigarettes (Bachman et al. 2002) and social differences, resulting in different distributions for the substances. As a result, illicit drug use, alcohol use and cigarette use are examined separately. Marijuana and cocaine use are combined to make a dichotomous variable indicating whether or not respondents used illicit drugs weekly or daily in the past 12 months. Alcohol use is dichotomized in the same fashion. This distinguishes the frequent users of these substances (i.e. the partiers) from those who use these substances infrequently. Due to the bimodal nature of the cigarette use distribution, users are separated into two categories: daily smokers and non-daily smokers. This allows me to examine how frequent users of each substance are affected by the

---

[4] The use of cigarettes over the life-course differs slightly from illicit drugs and alcohol. Similar to other drug and alcohol use, past research on smoking found evidence of role incompatibility as a result of smoking but the effects varied by role (Chassin et al. 1992). While both marriage and engagement affected cigarette use, the effects differed by gender (Bachman et. 1997). Many also argue that smoking is a non-deviant behavior, however cigarettes are commonly viewed as a gateway to other drugs and often taken in conjunction with other harmful substances. Also, until the age of 18, cigarettes must be illegally obtained and therefore the use reflects deviant behavior for adolescents. In relation to fathering, cigarette use is potentially incompatible with the role of resident father as second-hand smoke is harmful for children.

18

assumption of adult family roles over time.

Independent Variables

The primary independent variables indicate transitions to adult family roles.
Respondents are separated into dichotomous measures distinguishing the currently
married respondents and those who are unmarried.[5]

Dummy variables measure paternity and father involvement between 1990 and 1995.
Key factors influencing non-residential father involvement include contact with the child,
and financial contributions or child support. Using dummy variables, paternity and father
involvement are measured in four mutually exclusive categories. The first category
consists of those respondents not fathering a child by 1995. The next category includes
all the respondents fathering a child and residing with them in 1995. I assume that shared
residence with children involves both regular contact and financial support and a high
level of involvement (Furstenberg & Weiss 2000). The third category includes non-
resident fathers that reported weekly contact with their children and or paid child support.
The fourth category includes non-resident fathers not providing child support and
reporting less than weekly contact with their children. The respondents without children
are the reference category.

Rather than merely measuring paternity, this father involvement measure represents
varying degrees of involvement in parenting. I anticipate that the fathers with the least

---

[5] The marital status from 1990 to 1995 was originally separated into five categories distinguishing the
never married, the currently married, the cohabiting, the divorced and the separated as of 1995. Due to
small a number of cases among those divorced and separated respondents, I first combined them into one
category and further I collapsed them into the single respondents' group. The combined divorced/separated
category before being included in the single category was only 33 cases. After running models with single,
married and cohabitation variables, the results showed only a single and married effect. Therefore to
maintain model parsimony I used a simplified measure distinguishing only between the currently married
and unmarried.

ties to their children will demonstrate little change in their use of drug and alcohol use compared to resident fathers or more involved non-resident fathers. Conversely, I expect those involved with their children to show a decrease in their drug and alcohol use between 1990 and 1995.

Control Variables

Respondent education in 1990 is included in the model as a control. Education is measured using dummy variables based on three categories: less than high school; high school graduate only; and some college, trade school or more.[6] Respondents who have not graduated from high school are the reference category. Race is included in the model and measured by dummy variables distinguishing Black, White, Hispanic and other race. White is the reference category. I expect respondents with more education to exhibit lower drug and alcohol use and I expect minority respondents to be less likely to reside with children and therefore less likely to decrease drug and alcohol use.

Parent's education in 1988 (when respondents are between the ages of 15-19) is used as an indicator of socio-economic status. Parent's education is measured based on three categories: less than high school; high school graduates only; and some college or trade school. In determining which parental education level to include, the parent with the highest educational attainment was used for respondents with two parents.[7] Those parents that had not graduated from high school are the reference category.

To assess family structure in the family-of-origin, the presence of a father in the home at age 14 is also included in the model. A dichotomous variable measures whether the

---

[6] Among those respondents included in the 'less than high school' category, some were too young to have graduated in 1990 (this included all of the respondents age 21 and some of the respondents age 22 in 1995). As a result, the category may be somewhat biased and not reflect those normally dropping out of high school.

[7] Respondent's and parent's education was correlated at a level of .232**.

20

respondent lived with his father or not at age 14 (coded one if the respondent lived with his father). The respondent's age in 1995 is measured in years. I expect older respondents, from higher socio-economic backgrounds, and from intact families to exhibit lower levels of drug and alcohol use than younger respondents from single-parent families and families of lower socio-economic status.

In order to control for the influence of peers, questions regarding peer drug use in 1990 are included in the model. The question asked "how many of your male friends do you think sometimes use drugs, such as cocaine or marijuana". Responses are divided into five categories: "None of them, A few of them, About half of them, Most of them, or All of them." Due to small numbers of respondents with about half of their peers, most of their peers and all of their peers using drugs I collapsed these three categories into one. Respondents with at least half of their peers using drugs are the reference category. I hypothesize that respondents with fewer peers using drugs will be less likely to use drugs and alcohol.

Estimation

Dichotomous variables measure if the respondents smoke daily or not or use alcohol or illicit drugs frequently or not. I therefore use logistic regression to estimate the models. When using a logistic regression model, the least squares regression equation is transformed using the link function below.

$$\log(Y/1-Y)$$

In this equation, Y equals the dependent variable (alcohol, smoking or drug use). This function is appropriate for this estimation because it keeps the estimates within the zero to one range of the dependent variables.

21

The procedure used to estimate the model is similar to the *Static-Score* or *Conditional Change Model.* In this model the respondent's previous use of illicit drugs, alcohol and cigarettes in 1990 acts as a control variable accounting for the lagged effect of earlier reported drug and alcohol use. This is necessary to specify models accurately and account for change (Finkel 1995), as the respondent's prior history of alcohol and drug use is a predictor of their use of drugs and alcohol five years later. The inclusion of prior substance use in the model is also consistent with past literature suggesting that a history of substance use can inhibit the formation of strong social bonds making individuals more likely to experience off-timed transitions such as unmarried fatherhood (Krohn et al. 1997). The equation is represented by the formula below.

$$logit(Y_2) = B_o + B_1X_1 + B_2Y_1 + B_3X_2 + e_t.$$

Y_2 indicates illicit drug, alcohol or cigarette use in 1995, X_1 represents adult roles, Y_1 is the substance use in 1990/91 and X_2 is a vector of control variables. The coefficients represent the log odds of the respondents using these substances frequently or not, for a set of independent variables. The exponential of the log odds are reported in the tables and give the likelihood or odds of the respondents using the substance frequently in light of the various independent and control variables.

While tobacco, marijuana, cocaine and alcohol are different substances and have somewhat varying distributions, I include them in the model comparing the frequent users of these substances versus the infrequent and non-users. This includes first estimating a model using alcohol use in 1995 as the dependent variable separating the weekly and daily users from the less frequent users to see if various social roles are particularly incompatible with these risk behaviors over time. The same process is used to

examine those using illicit drugs frequently versus infrequently and daily versus the non-daily smokers.

Analytic Strategy

The analysis proceeds in three stages. First the descriptive statistics are presented to show the distribution of the variables by marital status and fatherhood. Second, using cross tabulations I examine the percent change in frequent substance users between 1990 and 1995 by marital status and fatherhood. Third, using multivariate logistic analysis I examine five primary models and two models including only the single respondents. Model (1) includes only the control variables to see the effects of these controls on the three substances. Model (2) includes marriage only as the primary independent variable along with the controls. Model (3) includes paternity (fathered a child or not) as the independent variable along with the controls without the marriage variable. Model (4) includes the fatherhood involvement measure along with the controls independent of marriage. Model (5) includes both the father involvement measure and the marriage variable and controls. Models (6a) and (6b) include only the currently unmarried respondents, first examining the paternity effect (6a) and then father involvement (6b). This allows me to examine the influence of the transition to parenthood both separate from and jointly with the transition to marriage while controlling for other influential factors. The data are weighted to adjust for over-sampling of minority respondents and cases lost between waves.

Results

Demographics

Background characteristics are included in table 1. The first column gives the

23

percentages for the total sample by variables included in all six models. The second and third columns show percentages by whether the respondent is married or not in 1995. The fourth and fifth columns show percentages by whether the respondent fathered a child or not by 1995. Substance use among respondents in 1995 varies quite dramatically by marital status and paternity in 1995. For example, frequent alcohol users are less likely to be married (43 percent) and more likely to have fathered a child (52 percent). Fathers are more likely to smoke daily (36 percent) than respondents who have not fathered a child and unmarried respondents are also more likely to use illicit drugs regularly (17 percent) than married respondents.

While married respondents make up only around 20 percent of the sample, not surprisingly, about 50 percent of the fathers are married and nearly all of the married fathers reside with their children. Unmarried respondents are much less likely to reside with their children (35 percent), while a quarter of the unmarried fathers are not only living apart from their children but are uninvolved with them. Consistent with literature, despite making up nearly 15 percent of the total sample, only 5 percent of the married respondents were Black whereas 27 percent of the respondents fathering a child by 1995 were Black. Conversely, while whites made up 73 percent of the total sample, 82 percent of the married respondents were white and only 56 percent of those respondents fathering a child by 1995 were white.

Of respondents fathering a child between 1990 and 1995 only 20 percent had attended college or trade school, whereas 39 percent of respondents fathering a child during the same time period did not complete high school. Marital status and paternity also vary by residence with fathers at age 14. Eighty percent of the married respondents resided with

24

their father at age 14 compared to 72 percent of the unmarried respondents. Whereas only 65 percent of those respondents fathering a child lived with their fathers at age 14, approximately three-quarters of the respondents not fathering a child by 1995 lived with their fathers at age 14.

Table 2 shows the percent of frequent/infrequent drug, alcohol and cigarette users in 1990 and 1995 by marriage and paternity. The first column shows the percentage of infrequent substance users in 1990 remaining infrequent substance users in 1995. The second column shows the percentage of frequent substance users in 1990 remaining frequent substance users in 1995. The third column shows the percentage of infrequent substance users becoming frequent substance users in 1995. The fourth column shows the percentage of frequent substance users in 1990 becoming infrequent substance users in 1995.

Columns three and four in table 2 show the percentages of respondents initiating and desisting frequent or daily substance use between 1990 and 1995 by various adult roles. The fourth column shows that a higher percentage of respondents marrying by 1995 became infrequent users of alcohol (15 percent) by 1995, compared to those who remained single (9.7 percent). Similarly, a higher percentage of respondents fathering a child by 1995 became infrequent users of alcohol (17.6 percent) than respondents without children in 1995 (9.4 percent). Between 1990 and 1995, 8 percent of unmarried respondents in 1995 became daily smokers compared to only 4 percent of married respondents in 1995. There was an even larger difference among married and single illicit drug users between 1990 and 1995. Twelve percent of unmarried respondents in 1995 became frequent drug users, whereas just over 4 percent of married respondents in 1995

25

became frequent drug users.

Tables 3, 4 and 5 show the odds of frequent (weekly or daily) compared to infrequent or nonuse of alcohol, cigarettes and illicit drugs in 1995 among young men. Model (1) shows the relationship between the control variables and drug or alcohol use. Model (2) includes the control variables and marriage as the primary independent variable. Model (3) includes control variables and paternity as the primary independent variable without marriage. Model (4) includes control variables and the father involvement variable independent of marriage. In Model (5) I examine father involvement controlling for marriage and the previously mentioned controls. In model (6a) I examine the effects of paternity on substance use for the unmarried respondents only and in model (6b) I examine father involvement on the substance use for unmarried respondents.

Alcohol Use

In model (1) of table 3 when controlling for race, respondent and parental education, residence with fathers at age 14 and peer drug use, each one year increase in age is associated with a 26 percent decrease in the odds of frequent alcohol use. Respondents reporting no friends or only a few friends using drugs were nearly 40 percent less likely to use alcohol frequently than those respondents reporting that at least half of their friends used drugs. These two controls are consistently associated with decreased alcohol use throughout all the models in table 3.

Marriage is included with the controls in model (2) and does not significantly decrease the odds of frequent alcohol use. Fathering a child (included in model (3)) is associated with a 40 percent decrease in the odds of using alcohol regularly. In model (4), the more detailed father involvement measure is also associated with a decrease in

26

frequent alcohol use. Residence with children is significantly associated with a 42 percent decrease in the odds of using alcohol regularly compared to respondents without children. As seen in model (5), father involvement with marriage as a control, while in the same direction as model (4), is not significantly associated with the odds of regular alcohol use. Paternity in model (6a) is associated with a 50 percent decrease in the odds of regular alcohol use among single respondents. Running a split-file analysis of married versus single respondents to further examine model (6a), demonstrated that fatherhood's impact on alcohol use holds true for single respondents only (see appendix A). Among single respondents, the father involvement measure in model (6b) shows that residence with children is the most powerful part of the paternity measure. The odds of using alcohol frequently are 70 percent lower for unmarried respondents living with their children, than for those unmarried respondents without children.

Smoking

Model (1) in table 4 indicates the relationship between the control variables and daily cigarette use. Unlike alcohol use, when controlling for race, respondent and parental education, residence with fathers at age 14 and peer drug use, age is not significantly associated with daily cigarette use. However respondent's education is significantly associated with the odds of daily cigarette use across all models. Both high school graduates and respondents with some college are more than 50 percent less likely than respondents not graduating from high school to smoke daily. Similar to alcohol use, the odds of respondents smoking daily are 50 percent lower for those with a few or no peers using drugs compared to respondents reporting at least half of their peers using drugs.

Neither marriage nor fatherhood alone is significantly associated with the odds of

27

daily cigarette use. However in model (4), one category in the father involvement measure is associated with an increase in the likelihood of daily cigarette use. Non-resident uninvolved fathers are nearly 4 times more likely to smoke daily than respondents without children. Results are similar in model (5) which controls for the effects of marriage. Uninvolved fathers were again nearly 4 times more likely to smoke daily. As seen in model (6b), the effects of father involvement on daily cigarette use, while in the same direction as models (4) and (5), are not significant for single respondents but may be a result of a small number of cases.

Illicit Drug Use

Model (1) in table 5 indicates the relationship between the control variables and frequent illicit drug use. Similar to alcohol use, when controlling for race, respondent and parental education, residence with fathers at age 14 and peer drug use, age is significantly associated with frequent drug use across all models. In model (1) each one year increase in age is associated with a 22 percent decrease in the odds of using drugs weekly or daily. Peer drug use, not surprisingly, is also strongly associated with the odds of respondent frequent drug use in each model. Respondents reporting no peers or only a few peers using drugs are more than 60 percent less likely to be frequent drug users compared to respondents reporting at least half of their peers using drugs. Unlike either alcohol or cigarette use, residing with a father at age 14 is a strong deterrent to frequent drug use. The use of illicit drugs is more than 60 percent less likely for respondents that lived with their father at age 14 compared to those who did not. An unexpected finding is the effect of parent's education on illicit drug use. Consistent across all models, the odds of regular drug use more than doubles for respondents with parents attending at least some college,

28

compared to respondents with parents not completing high school.

Marriage is included with the controls in model (2) and is significantly associated with a decrease in the odds of illicit drug use (58 percent less likely) and becomes a stronger deterrent in model (5) when the father involvement variable is controlled for. Paternity alone, as seen in both model (3) and model (6a) (unmarried respondents), does not significantly decrease the odds of frequent drug use. The father involvement measure is also not associated with a significant decrease in the frequent use of illicit drugs.

Discussion

These findings support transitioning to adult roles as an explanation for the decreased use of or cessation of adolescent levels of drug and alcohol use (Nielsen 2001; Bachman et al. 1997; Yamaguchi & Kandel 1985). Marriage has commonly been regarded as the adult role with the greatest impact on deviant behavior such as drug and alcohol use (Yamaguchi & Kandel 1985; Miller-Tutzauer et al. 1991; Bachman et al. 1997; Bachman et al. 2002; Akerlof 1998). However with the sequence of adult role transitions changing, many people are becoming parents before getting married. The effect of other adult roles on deviance and substance use demands further inquiry. In order to examine this I have not only included marriage and fatherhood in the analysis of drug and alcohol use over time, but father involvement.

Results show that understanding the intersection of drug and alcohol use and adult roles, or perhaps more importantly involvement in these roles, is a complex issue. Between 1990 and 1995 net of the effect of the control variables, frequent or daily substance use varied not only by substance but by adult role and involvement.

Unlike what Bachman and colleagues (1997) and Akerloff (1998) found, respondent

29

alcohol use over this period is affected by paternity. In fact paternity is an even stronger deterrent of alcohol use for unmarried fathers. This supports the notion that fatherhood can be meaningful for unmarried young men (Palkovitz 2002). However, the elements of paternity affecting young adult frequent alcohol use are left to speculation without a more specific measure of fathering. By examining the father involvement measure, it becomes evident that in regards to frequent alcohol use not only paternity, but residence with children acts as a powerful deterrent. Of the three substances examined, frequent alcohol use is the most affected by paternal involvement with children, especially among single fathers. There are several possible explanations for this effect.

First, the decrease in frequent alcohol use is consistent with Palkovitz's (2002) findings: Involvement with children led many fathers to want to change their lifestyles and become healthier. It was the motivation to change many unhealthy elements in their lives, including substance use. Particularly with residency as a measure of involvement, unhealthy or excessive use of alcohol can strain or damage relations with children, while the modeling of unhealthy lifestyles might also be seen as a negative.

Second, residency requires day to day responsibilities, caretaking and opportunities for modeling both appropriate and inappropriate behavior not usually required from nonresident fathers. And yet, with single fathers in particular, the motivation to be an involved father must often come from personal determination rather than social sanctions or encouragement from a spouse or significant other. This is similar to Marsiglio's (1995 1998) findings concerning role identity and non-resident fathers' financial assistance. The fathers in this analysis, like those Marsiglio mentions paid more financial aid, appear to have identified with the role of father in a manner that has motivated them to be a part of

30

their children's lives and adapt their behavior accordingly. Successful role identity may be a result of positive relations with the mother of the child, positive parental role models helping fathers relate to the role and understand what behaviors are appropriate, or even the absence of involvement by the mother of the child. Sampson and Laub (1990 1993) would likely argue that this change in behavior is an example of how the transition to fatherhood is less important than the commitment to the role. As a result of commitment to the role and subsequent social control and investment, the consequences of frequent alcohol use become more severe and less desirable to these young men.

Respondent daily cigarette use is also affected by father involvement over this time period. Nonresident uninvolved fathers are much more likely to smoke daily than respondents without children or those that reside with children. Just as residency deterred frequent alcohol use, the lack of involvement appears to require very little change from these fathers as far as desistance of behaviors possibly incompatible with regular involvement with children. Without the investment, identification or involvement in this role, there appears to be very little motivation for curbing daily smoking habits.

These findings are similar to Krohn, Lizotte and Perez's (1997) argument that weak pro-social bonds associated with 'precocious transitions' make unmarried men more likely to use drugs. It appears that the same is true for daily cigarette use. Without strong social bonds these young men continue to use at high levels. Table 2 shows that a higher percentage of respondents becoming fathers by 1995 were daily smokers in 1990. Therefore many of those respondents becoming fathers were smokers to begin with. Unlike other substances, more of the respondents becoming fathers in 1995 also initiated daily use between 1990 and 1995, and most telling, more remained smokers. The

31

increased initiation and lower levels of desistance may be a result of strain felt among these young men who are not able to be involved fathers and have weaker pro-social bonds or may be the result of the particularly addictive nature of cigarettes.

Illicit drug use (marijuana and cocaine) was directly affected by marriage. Consistent with the litany of past research on the 'marriage effect', respondents were much less likely to use illicit drugs frequently if they were married. I argue that what makes frequent marijuana and/or cocaine use particularly taboo or incompatible with marriage, compared to frequent cigarette and alcohol use, is that frequent use of these substances are particularly disagreeable to spouses. Therefore frequent (weekly or daily) use of and procurement of these illegal substances is more severely sanctioned by spouses where as alcohol and cigarettes can be obtained and used legally. As mentioned previously, socially acceptable behaviors for husbands are not only more clearly defined but can be demanded by a spouse and extended family (Waite & Gallagher 2000). I conclude that with marriage, more so than other transitions, respondents have to either adapt to the role and substantially decrease drug use, or exit the role altogether. The two seem to be particularly incompatible.

It appears that the transition to social roles and involvement in these roles does affect substance use, however not for the same reasons or in the same way. Certain substances are less compatible with certain roles. For some substances it may require a spouse and a socially defined role to alter behavior, while for others becoming a father—even a single father—deters the frequent use of alcohol over time, especially if sharing residence with the child. Conversely, for daily smokers, lack of involvement with children allows for continued use of cigarettes and may even deter further involvement. Initiation and

32

desistance of substance use also varies by substance and adult role. With daily smokers and frequent illicit drug users, marriage appears to affect initiation rather than desistance. While with alcohol, adult roles (such as father and husband) appear to primarily affect desistance. Also, many substance users use multiple substances. This suggests that varying adult roles and role assumption sequences may affect different substances used by the same person at different times. A multiple substance user may decrease or desist frequent illicit drug use upon marrying, but not decrease frequent alcohol use until after having a child. Whereas an unmarried multiple substance user may decrease use of alcohol as a result of becoming a father, perhaps to spend time with the child on weekends, but not curb illicit drug use without the support, sanctions and social control a spouse can exert.

While I hypothesized that father involvement would be a significant deterrent to all forms of substance use, independent of the 'marriage effect', this proved not to be the case. Father involvement affected frequent alcohol and cigarette use in the hypothesized direction, but for frequent illicit drug use, marriage was the primary deterrent.

Other Findings

Peer influence proved to be the most consistent influence across all three substances. The presence of non-deviant peers is strongly associated with decreased alcohol, cigarette and illicit drug use. This appears to support Warr's (1998) argument that understanding young adult deviance requires more than the examination of commitment to adult roles, but how commitment alters peer influence. However, Warr (1998) examines declining peer influence among married young men as a deterrent, while the non-deviant peer influence in this examination is also a powerful deterrent among unmarried young men. I

33

expect that commitment to other adult roles beyond marriage, such as fatherhood, may also decrease influence and time spent with deviant peers.

Another interesting finding concerning illicit drug use is that living with a father as a teenager is significantly associated with decreased illicit drug use. Illicit drugs are the only substance exhibiting the 'marriage effect' and the only substance where living with a father as a teenager significantly affects substance use. It may be that this is because the presence of a father in the respondent's developmental years and the likelihood of marriage measure similar characteristics.

Parent's marital problems affect children's marital success suggesting that exposure to poor relationship role modeling can inhibit successful relationships and make adult children's marriages less likely (Amato & Booth 2001). As seen in table 1, 80 percent of married respondents lived with their fathers at age fourteen. Social learning and identity theory offer explanations as to why paternal residence positively affects children's future success in relationships. Social learning theory suggests that past and present influences shape attitudes toward parenting (Carlson & McLanahan 2004) as children take what they observe in their families of origin and bring it into their own relationships throughout their life (Amato & Booth 2001). Modeling what they have observed in their own families consequently affects how well they deal with their future spouses and children (Pope & Englar-Carlson 2001). Therefore, growing up in the presence of a positive maternal and paternal relationship, where spousal sanctions and parental sanctions from both parents for such behavior as illicit drug use are real and positive behavior is rewarded, provides young men with an understanding of appropriate behaviors and prepares them for their own relationships later in life.

34

Identity theorists believe that the adoption of adult roles, and the subsequent importance placed on these roles, is a matter of successful role identification—something influenced by past familial role models and current relationships with significant others. Young men raised in divorced or father absent families often lack a positive gender/father identity (Furstenberg & Weiss 2000; Pope & Englar-Carlson 2001) and may lack a successful model for working in intimate relationships (Amato & Booth 2001; Pope, Englar-Carlson 2001). This influences the success by which these young men marry and their involvement in the role as father and husband, both of which lead to increased social control and decreased substance use. Therefore, what makes some respondents more likely to marry is that they have been taught the ramifications of illicit drug use and they identify with the role of husband/father and have learned appropriate behavior for relationships.

Limitations

Limitations in this research include an involvement variable that is not very detailed. Due to limitations in the data, the measure was based primarily on residence and financial contributions rather than time spent with children or activities done together. If regular contact is made up primarily of activities such as going to movies or eating out and includes little of the disciplinary action or responsibilities required by involved parents then this measure lacks validity and may not measure what is responsible for altering behavior. Perhaps different measures of involvement correlate with decreasing use of different substance use such as smoking or illicit drug use. Another limitation with this measure is the relatively few cases that fall into the involvement categories. The non-resident but involved category and non-resident uninvolved category had few cases in

comparison to the resident fathers or those respondents not fathering a child. A sample with more single fathers and, more importantly, more non-resident single fathers would allow for a more detailed analysis.

Another limitation in this analysis involves the marriage variable. Unlike most research on marriage and substance use, marriage had a very limited effect on smoking and alcohol use among these respondents. This may be a result of early marriage. As evident in table 1 the average age of the married respondents was 24 years old. The median age of married men in the United States in 1995 was 27 years old (United States Bureau of the Census 2004). I suspect that, similar to Uggen (2000) and Labouvie's (1996) findings, the transition to marriage might have more of an impact on substance use for those closer to the national median age. Because the sample is of adolescents moving into young adulthood, the married subsample may not be representative of married men in the United States. A preliminary examination of marriage dates and pregnancy dates between 1990 and 1995 found a large number of what could be called "shot-gun" weddings where the couples are married as a result of pregnancy. This may alter the effect of marriage on substance use as the ordering of adult transitions (marriage then children) is in traditional order in name only. Furthermore, those respondents becoming pregnant before marriage might have tendencies toward other risk behaviors such as substance use or select partners who are also frequent users. They may then be more impervious to the positive effects of marriage, especially if the marriage is a matter of dealing with a problem. Lastly, as Laub, Nagin and Sampson (1998) suggest, the marriage effect may be cumulative and take time to influence behavior. I treat all married couples between 1990 and 1995 the same. However, further analysis is needed to

consider the length of marriage in order to provide a more complete examination of the 'marriage effect'.

The peer measures in the NSAM are also somewhat weak. The questions dealing with peers focus primarily on the percentage of peers acting in various ways or having various attitudes and do not include time spent with deviant and non-deviant peers. This is increasingly important considering Warr's (1998) findings that single men spend more time with deviant peers than married men. Like his criticism of Sampson and Laub (1993), it would be interesting to examine the effects of peer influence by way of time spent with deviant or positive peers rather than by percentage of peers using drugs. This is particularly important in that the affect of involvement of unmarried fathers on substance use may be due to a decrease in time spent with deviant peers.

Lastly, a method for assessing maternal 'gatekeeping' would help to understand variations in unmarried father involvement in general and non-resident unmarried father involvement in particular. Residence with children, unmarried or married, suggests somewhat of a positive relationship between the fathers and mothers of children. However outside of this assumption I have no way of assessing the relationship between the mother and father. This is particularly vital when the father is not residing with the child. As a result, there is no way to determine the effects of father involvement on substance use over time when involvement is blocked by maternal gatekeeping. As previously mentioned, mothers more often have custody of children and can affect young men's identification with the role of father.

Policy Implications

With more and more young adults altering the sequence of adult role assumption

37

(having children before marriage), understanding the influence of these different transitions on deviant behaviors such as drug and alcohol use is increasingly important. Findings from this research benefit policy and provide a better understanding of the impact of involvement in adult family roles.

Involvement or commitment to adult roles appears to deter substance use. This is important because decreased substance use among these young men is an indicator of involvement, maturity and a significant change in behavior. Conversely, frequent use of drugs and alcohol are indicators of young men who are not adjusting their lifestyles to be involved as husbands or fathers. Policies aimed at decreasing frequent drug and alcohol use (behaviors incompatible with effective, involved fathering) and increasing paternal responsibility can draw hope from the fact that involvement matters, especially among young men more likely to father children outside of wedlock.

If fatherhood is the primary adult role in the lives of more and more young men, then policy should focus on removing obstacles to father involvement. Marriage may be a helpful and powerful deterrent, but is not always a feasible option. Programs educating fathers, similar to health campaigns targeting the physical consequences for children associated with second-hand smoke, should be aimed at reducing substance use among fathers.

Further research on the effect of involvement in adult roles is necessary to better understand this period of transition in the life course and what deters deleterious behaviors and encourages pro-social, constructive relationships between fathers and their children especially outside the bonds of marriage.

38

REFERENCES

Agnew, Robert. 1985. "A Revised Strain Theory of Delinquency." *Social Forces* 64:151-167.

Agnew, Robert. 2001. "Building on the Foundation of General Strain Theory: Specifying the Types of Strain Most Likely to Lead to Delinquency." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38:319-61

Akerlof, George, A. 1998. "Men Without Children." *The Economic Journal* 108:287-309.

Akers, Ronald. 1998. *Social Learning and Social Structure: A general Theory of Crime and Deviance.* Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Akers, Ronald. 2000. *Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation, and Application.* Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Allison, Paul D. 2002. *Missing Data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Amato, Paul & Alan Booth. 2001. "The Legacy of Parents' Marital Discord: Consequences for Children's Marital Quality." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 81:627-638.

Bachman, J. G., K. N. Wadsworth, P. M. O'Malley, L.D. Johnston, and J.E. Schulenberg. 1997. *Smoking, Drinking, and Drug Use in Young Adulthood: The Impacts of New Freedoms and New Responsibilities.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bachman, J. G., P. M. O'Malley, J. Schulenberg, L. Johnston, A. Bryant, & A. Merline. 2002. *The Decline of Substance Use in Young Adulthood: Changes in Social Activities, Roles, and Beliefs.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bahr, Stephen J., Suzanne L. Maughan, Anastasios C. Marcos, and Bingdao Li. 1998. "Family, Religiosity, and the Risk of Adolescent Drug Use." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60:979-992.

Buchanan, M. and C. Robbins 1990. "Early adult psychological consequences for males of adolescent pregnancy and its resolution*." Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 19:413-424.

Carlson, Marcia J. Sara S. McLanahan. 2004. "Early Father Involvement in Fragile Families." Pp. 241-271 in *Conceptualizing and Measuring Father Involvement,* edited by R. D. Day and M. E. Lamb. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Casper, Lynne M. and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 2002. *Continuity & Change in the American Family.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Chassin, Laurie, Clark C. Presson, Steven J. Sherman and Debra A. Edwards. 1992. "The natural history of cigarette smoking and young adult social roles." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 33:328-347.

Chen, K. and D. Kandel. 1995. "The Natural History of Drug use from Adolescence to the Mid-Thirties in a General Population Sample." *American Journal of Public Health* 85:41-47.

Chilcoat, H. and N. Breslau. 1996. "Alcohol Disorders in Young Adulthood: Effect of Transition in Adult Roles." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 37:339-49.

Cornell, Stephen and Douglas Hartman. 1998. *Ethnicity and Race: Making Identities in a Changing World.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press

Doherty, W. J., E.F. Kouneski and M.F. Erikson. 1998. "Responsible fathering: An

overview and conceptual framework." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60: 277-292.

Dudley, James R. and Glenn Stone. 2001. *Fathering at Risk: Helping Nonresident Fathers*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.

Elder, Glen H., Jr. (Ed.). 1985. *Life Course Dynamics: Trajectories and Transitions, 1968-1980.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Fagan, Jay and Marina Barnett 2003. "The Relationship between Maternal Gatekeeping, Paternal Competence, Mothers' Attitudes about the Father Role, and Father Involvement." *Journal of Family Issues* 24:1020-1043.

Fagot, Beverly, Katherine C. Pears, Deborah M. Capaldi, Lynn Crosby and Craig Leve. 1998. "Becoming and Adolescent Father: Precursors and Parenting." *Developmental Psychology* 35:209-1219.

Farrington, David P. 1996. "Criminological Psychology: Individual and Family Factors in the Explanation and the Prevention of Offending." Pp. 3-39 in *Working with Offenders,* edited by C. R. Hollin. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Farrington, David P. and Donald J. West. 1995. "Effects of marriage, separation, and children on offending by adult males." In Zena Blau Smith and John Hagan (eds.), *Current Perspectives on Aging and the Life-Cycle.* Vol. 4: Delinquency and Disrepute in the Life-Course. Greenwich, Conn: JAJ Press.

Fields, J. and L. Casper. 2001. *America's Families and Living Arrangements March 2000.* (Current Population Reports, P20-537.) Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Finkel, Steven E. 1995. *Causal analysis with panel data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

41

Fischer, C. and S. Phillips 1982. "Who is alone? Social characteristics of people with
small networks." Pp. 21-39 in *Loneliness: A Sourcebook of current theory,
research, and therapy,* edited by L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman. New York, NY:
Wiley Interscience.

Forste, Renata. 2002. "Where Are All the Men?" *Journal of Family Issues* 23:579-600.

Furstenberg, Frank F. & Christopher Weiss. 2000. "Intergenerational Transmission
of Fathering Roles in At Risk Families." *Marriage and Family Review* 29:181-
200.

Goode, William J. 1960. "A Theory of Role Strain." *American Sociological Review*
25:483-496.

Hagan, John. 1991. "Destiny and Drift: Subcultrural Preferences, Status Attainments, and
the Risks and Rewards of Youth." *American Sociological Review* 56:567-582.

Hagan, John and Blair Wheaton. 1993. "The Search for Adolescent Role Exits and the
Transition to Adulthood." *Social Forces* 71:955-979.

Hirschi, Travis. 1969. *Causes of Delinquency.* Berkley, CA: University Of California
Press.

Jaffee, Sarah, Avshalom Caspi, Terrie Moffit, Alan Taylor, and Nigel Dickson. 2001.
"Predicting Early Fatherhood and Whether Young Fathers Live with their
Children: Prospective Findings and Policy Reconsiderations." *Journal of Child
Psychology and Psychiatry* 42:803-815.

Jessor, Robert. 1991. "Risk Behavior in Adolescence: A Psychosocial framework for
Understanding and Action." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 12:597-605.

Jessor, Robert. 1993. "Successful Adolescent Development Among Youth in High-Risk

Settings." *American Psychologist* 48:117-126.

Kao, Grace, and Jennifer S. Thompson. 2003. "Racial and Ethnic Stratification in
Educational Achievement and Attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:417-
442.

Kiernan, Kathleen E. 1997. "Becoming a Young Parent: A Longitudinal Study of
Associated Factors." *The British Journal of Sociology* 48:406-428.

Krohn, Marvin D., Alan J. Lizottte and Cynthia M. Perez. 1997. "The Interrelationship
between Substance Use and Precocious Transitions to Adult Statuses." *Journal of
Health and Social Behavior* 38:87-103.

Kulbok, P. and C. Cox. 2002. "Dimensions of Adolescent Health Behavior." *Journal of
Adolescent Health* 31: 394-400.

Labouvie, E. 1996. "Maturing out of Substance use: Selection and self-correction."
Journal of Drug Issue, 26:457-77.

Laub, John H., Daniel S. Nagin, & Robert J. Sampson. 1998. "Trajectories of Change in
Criminal Offending: Good Marriages and the Desistance Process." *American
Sociological Review* 63:225-238.

Lerman, Robert and Elaine Sorenson. 2000. "Single Fathers and Fathers with Nonmarital
Children." Pp. 137-158 in *Fatherhood: Research, Interventions and Policies*
edited by H. E. Peters, G. W. Peterson, S. Steinmetz and R. Day. New York, NY:
Haworth Press, Inc.

Marsiglio, William. 1995. "Young Nonresident Biological Fathers." *Marriage & Family
Review* 20: 325-348.

____. 1998. *Procreative Man.* New York, NY: New York University Press

McIntyre, G. 2002. "Differential Reinforcement, Drinking and 'Readiness to Change':
An Application of Social Learning Theory." *Digital Dissertations.* Retrieved
October 22, 2003 (http://wwwlib.umi.com/dissertations/gateway).

McLanahan, Sara and Gary Sandefur. 1994. *Growing up with a single parent: What
hurts, what helps.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Merton, Robert 1957. *Social Theory and Social Structure.* Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Miller-Tutzauer, C., K. Leonard and M. Windle. 1991. "Marriage and Alcohol Use: A
Longitudinal Study of 'Maturing Out'." *Journal of Studies of Alcohol* 52:434-
440.

Nielsen, A. 2001. "Drinking in Adulthood: Similarities and Differences in Effects of
Adult Roles for Hispanic Ethnic Groups and Anglos." *Journal of Studies of
Alcohol* 62:745-49.

Nock, S. L. 1998. "The consequences of premarital fatherhood." *American Sociological
Review 63*:250-263.

Palkovitz, Robert 2002. *Involved Fathering and Men's Adult Development.* London:
Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Pirog-Good, M. A. 1995. "The family background and attitudes of teen fathers." *Youth
and Society* 26:351-376.

Pope, Mark & Matt Englar-Carlson. 2001. "Fathers and Sons: The Relationship
Between Violence and Masculinity." *The Family Journal: Counseling and
Therapy for Couples and Families* 9:367-374.

Roy, Kevin. 1999. "Low-income Single Fathers in an African American Community and
the Requirements of Welfare Reform." *Journal of Family Issues* 20:432-457.

Rutter, Michael, David Quinton and Jonathan Hill. 1990. "Adult Outcomes of institution-reared children: Males and females compared." Pp. 135-157 in *Straight and Devious Pathways from Childhood to Adulthood,* edited by Lee Robins and Michael Rutter, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sampson, Robert J. and John H. Laub. 1990. "Crime and Deviance over the Life Course: The Salience of Adult Social Bonds." *American Sociological Review* 55:609-627.

____. 1992. "Crime and Deviance in the Life Course." Pp. 21-42 in *Life-Course Criminology: Contemporary and classic readings*, edited by Alex Piquero and Paul Mazerolle. Canada: Wadsworth.

____. 1993. *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

____. 1997. "A Life-Course Theory of Cumulative Disadvantage and the Stability of Delinquency." Pp. 133-161 in *Developmental theories of crime and delinquency: Advances in criminological theory,* edited by Terrence P. Thornberry. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Seccombe, K. and R. Warner. 2004. *Marriage and Families: Relationships in Social Context.* Canada: Thomson Wadsworth.

Shover, Neal 1985. *Aging Criminals.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Sonenstein, F., J. Pleck and L. Ku. 1989. "Sexual Activity, Condom Use and AIDS Awareness among Adolescent Males." *Family Planning Perspectives* 21:152-58.

Sonenstein, F., J. Pleck, L. Ku, and C. Turner. 2000. *National Survey of Adolescent Males, Old Cohort, Waves 1-3, 1988, 1990-91, 1995* (Data Set P1-P4, Carley, M.L. Lang, E.L., (Archivists) [machine-readable data file and documentation].

45

The Urban Institute (Producer). Los Altos, CA: Sociometrics Corporation, Data

Archive on Adolescent Pregnancy and Pregnancy Prevention (Producer &

Distribution).

Thornberry, Terrence P., C. Smith and G. Howard. 1997. "Risk Factors for Teenage

Fathers." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 59:505-522.

Uggen, Christopher. 2000. "Work as a Turning Point in the Life Course of Criminals: A

Duration Model of Age, Employment, and Recidivism." *American Sociological

Review* 65:529-546.

United States Bureau of the Census. 2004. Estimated Median Age at First Marriage, by

Sex: 1890 to Present. Retrieved June 13, 2005.

(http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/hh-fam/tabMS-2.pdf)

Waite, Linda J. and Maggie Gallagher. 2000. *The Case for Marriage: Why Married

People Are Happier, Healthier, and Better Off Financially*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Warr, M. 1993. "Age, peers, and delinquency." *Criminology* 31:17-40.

____. 1998. "Life Course Transitions and Desistance From Crime." *Criminology* 36: 183-

216.

Wei, E. H., R. Loeber and M. Stouthamer-Loeber. 2002. "How many of the offspring

born to teenage fathers are produced by repeat serious delinquents?" *Criminal

Behaviour and Mental Health* 12:83-98.

Yamaguchi, K. and D. Kandel. 1985. "On the Resolution of Role Incompatibility: A Life

Even History Analysis of Family Roles and Marijuana Use." *American Journal

of Sociology* 90:1284-1325.

Yeung, W. Jean, Duncan, Greg J. & Hill, Martha S. (2000). Putting Fathers Back in the

Picture: Parental Activities and Children's Adult Outcomes. In H. E. Peters, G. W. Peterson, S. Steinmetz and R. Day (Eds.) *Fatherhood: Research, Interventions and Policies* (pp. 97-114). New York, NY: Haworth Press, Inc.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents by Marital Status and Paternity (Percentages)

Variables	Total Sample	Married		Fathered Children	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Alcohol Use 1995					
% frequent user	**51.2**	43.1	53.4	52.3	46.4
Cigarette Use 1995					
% smoke daily	**26.2**	27.6	25.8	36.5	24.0
Illicit Drug Use 1995					
% frequent user	**15.0**	6.7	17.2	14.5	15.1
Marital Status					
Single	**79.0**			50.2	85.5
Married	**21.0**			49.8	14.5
Father Involvement					
Residing with Child	**67.0**	99.0	35.3	67.0	
Non-Resident Involved	**20.2**	1.0	39.2	20.2	
Non-Resident Uninvolved	**12.8**	0.0	25.5	12.8	
Race					
White	**73.1**	82.3	70.7	56.2	76.9
Black	**14.5**	4.7	17.1	27.1	11.7
Hispanic	**9.7**	10.8	9.3	15.3	8.4
Other race	**2.6**	2.2	2.9	1.5	3.0
Age (in years)	**23.6**	24.2	23.6	24.0	23.6
(standard deviation)	**1.4**	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
Education (1990)					
Less than High School	**30.0**	26.0	31.1	39.0	27.9
High School Graduate	**34.4**	39.4	33.0	40.5	33.1
Some College	**35.6**	34.6	35.8	20.5	39.0
Parent's Education (1988)					
Less than High School	**9.4**	10.1	9.1	18.1	7.4
High School Graduate	**37.7**	44.5	35.9	49.2	35.1
Some College	**52.9**	45.4	55.0	32.6	57.5
Lived with Father at Age 14	**74.1**	80.4	72.4	64.7	76.3
Peers Using Drugs					
None of them	**36.1**	41.0	34.8	37.2	30.9
A few of them	**49.1**	49.5	49.0	49.1	49.1
At least half of them	**14.7**	9.4	16.2	13.7	20.0
[N]	[1103]	[189]	[914]	[264]	[839]

Note: Sample Statistics are weighted; N's are unweighted

Note: Frequent substance use refers to those reporting weekly or daily use

Source: The National Survey of Adolescent Males, 1988, 1990, 1995

Table 2.	Percent of Frequent/Infrequent or Daily/Nondaily Substance Users in 1990 and 1995 by Marriage and Paternity				
	Infrequent users in 1990 Infrequent users in 1995	Frequent users in 1990 Frequent users in 1995	Infrequent users in 1990 Frequent users in 1995	Frequent users in 1990 Infrequent users in 1995	Total Percentage
Alcohol					
Single	36.1	31.5	22.7	9.7	100.0
Married	42.3	24.9	17.8	15.0	100.0
No Child	37.3	31.0	22.4	9.4	100.0
Father	38.1	26.1	18.2	17.6	100.0
Total Sample	**37.4**	**30.1**	**21.6**	**11.0**	**100.0**
Cigarettes					
Single	72.1	17.1	8.2	2.7	100.0
Married	69.7	22.3	4.3	3.8	100.0
No Child	73.5	16.7	6.9	2.8	100.0
Father	61.5	25.3	9.2	4.0	100.0
Total Sample	**71.5**	**18.2**	**7.3**	**3.0**	**100.0**
Illicit Drugs					
Single	76.7	5.5	12.0	5.9	100.0
Married	85.8	2.8	4.2	7.1	100.0
No Child	77.9	6.1	9.4	6.6	100.0
Father	78.9	4.6	10.5	6.0	100.0
Total Sample	**78.7**	**4.9**	**10.3**	**6.1**	**100.0**

Table 3. Odds of Frequent Alcohol Use among Young Men by Marital Status, Paternity, Father Involvement and Demographic Factors

Variables	Model (1)	Model (2)	Model (3)	Model (4)	Model (5)	Unmarried Respondents Model (6a)	Model (6b)
White	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
Black	1.015	0.965	1.115	1.097	1.079	1.226	1.184
Hispanic	0.851	0.856	0.914	0.915	0.911	0.965	0.980
Other Race	0.496	0.490	0.481	0.481	0.480	0.523	0.514
Age in 1995	0.740***	0.757***	0.758***	0.759***	0.764***	0.803**	0.811**
Respondent's Education							
Less than High School	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
High School Graduate	1.065	1.059	1.017	1.017	1.018	0.857	0.836
Some College	0.962	0.926	0.874	0.874	0.869	0.646	0.625
Parent's Education 1988							
Less than High School	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
High School Graduate	1.030	1.036	1.006	1.002	1.008	0.850	0.813
Some College	0.981	0.974	0.915	0.913	0.916	1.048	1.023
Lived with Dad at Age 14	1.156	1.170	1.129	1.133	1.138	1.135	1.130
Peers Using Drugs							
None of them	0.611*	0.621*	0.565**	0.564**	0.572*	0.443**	0.431**
A few of them	0.626*	0.635*	0.595**	0.595**	0.601*	0.588*	0.575*
At least half of them	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
Single		- - - - -			- - - - -		
Married		0.762			0.907		
Currently a Father			0.599*			0.500*	
No Children				- - - - -	- - - - -		- - - - -
Reside with Child				0.578*	0.615		0.299*
Non-Resident Involved				0.667	0.665		0.680
Non-Resident Uninvolved				0.627	0.622		0.555
[N]	[902]	[902]	[902]	[902]	[902]	[733]	[733]

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

50

Table 4. Odds of Daily Cigarette Use among Young Men by Marital Status, Paternity, Father Involvement and Demographic Factors

Variables	Model (1)	Model (2)	Model (3)	Model (4)	Model (5)	Unmarried Respondents Model (6a)	Model (6b)
White	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
Black	1.352	1.296	1.295	1.073	1.038	1.023	0.912
Hispanic	0.377*	0.393*	0.363*	0.377*	0.377*	0.263*	0.263*
Other Race	1.886	1.907	1.901	1.909	1.933	1.881	1.836
Age in 1995	0.971	1.000	0.960	0.974	0.991	1.015	1.045
Respondent's Education							
Less than High School	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
High School Graduate	0.438**	0.429**	0.447**	0.448**	0.445**	0.349**	0.337**
Some College	0.439*	0.420*	0.455*	0.459*	0.451*	0.449*	0.416*
Parent's Education 1988							
Less than High School	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
High School Graduate	0.789	0.801	0.794	0.779	0.793	0.739	0.716
Some College	0.792	0.801	0.807	0.823	0.840	0.631	0.642
Lived with Dad at Age 14	1.381	1.417	1.111	1.488	1.516	1.075	1.068
Peers Using Drugs							
None of them	0.416**	0.431**	0.425**	0.428**	0.444**	0.295**	0.277***
A few of them	0.565*	0.577*	0.574*	0.563*	0.577*	0.684	0.648
At least half of them	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
Single		- - - - -			- - - - -		
Married		0.707			0.744		
Currently a Father			1.227			1.466	
No Children				- - - - -	- - - - -		- - - - -
Reside with Child				0.833	0.993		0.580
Non-Resident Involved				2.158	2.137		1.779
Non-Resident Uninvolved				3.975*	3.923*		3.290
[N]	[927]	[927]	[927]	[927]	[927]	[756]	[756]

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 5. Odds of Frequent Illicit Drug Use among Young Men by Marital Status, Paternity, Father Involvement and Demographic Factors

Variables	Model (1)	Model (2)	Model (3)	Model (4)	Model (5)	Unmarried Respondents Model (6a)	Model (6b)
White	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
Black	1.140	1.016	1.182	1.107	1.002	1.231	1.169
Hispanic	0.586	0.583	0.595	0.601	0.573	0.707	0.721
Other Race	2.808*	2.861*	2.772*	2.747*	2.908*	4.091**	4.034**
Age in 1995	0.777**	0.818*	0.787**	0.791*	0.811*	0.786*	0.796*
Respondent's Education							
Less than High School	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
High School Graduate	0.658	0.643	0.641	0.645	0.657	0.618	0.608
Some College	0.691	0.630	0.658	0.658	0.654	0.824	0.798
Parent's Education 1988							
Less than High School	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
High School Graduate	2.063	2.216	2.044	2.035	2.276	1.781	1.724
Some College	2.541*	2.564*	2.495*	2.494*	2.624*	2.691*	2.651*
Lived with Dad at Age 14	0.368***	0.381***	0.363***	0.368***	0.385***	0.373***	0.373***
Peers Using Drugs							
None of them	0.379**	0.394**	0.369**	0.371**	0.404**	0.379**	0.374**
A few of them	0.380***	0.393***	0.374***	0.372***	0.401***	0.483**	0.476**
At least half of them	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
Single			- - - - -		- - - - -		
Married		0.423**			0.374**		
Currently a Father			0.817			0.849	
No Children				- - - - -	- - - - -		- - - - -
Reside with Child				0.718	1.287		0.544
Non-Resident Involved				1.032	1.018		1.041
Non-Resident Uninvolved				1.123	1.110		1.055
[N]	[908]	[908]	[908]	[908]	[908]	[739]	[739]

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

52

Appendix A. Splitfile of Odds of Frequent Alcohol Use among Young Men by Paternity and Demographic Factors

Variables	Splitfile Married	Splitfile Single
White	- - - - -	- - - - -
Black	0.566	1.226
Hispanic	1.126	0.965
Other Race	0.081	0.523
Age in 1995	.630**	.803**
Respondent's Education		
Less than High School	- - - - -	- - - - -
High School Graduate	1.624	0.857
Some College	3.155*	0.646
Parent's Education 1988		
Less than High School	- - - - -	- - - - -
High School Graduate	2.233	0.850
Some College	0.617	1.048
Lived with Dad at Age 14	0.747	1.135
Peers Using Drugs		
None of them	1.911	.443**
A few of them	0.979	.588*
At least half of them	- - - - -	- - - - -
Currently a Father	**0.813**	**.500****
[N]	[169]	[733]

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001