The Myth of Familial AWOL: Kin Support among Black and White Men

Natalia Sarkisian*
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Presented at the Population Association of America Annual Meeting, Boston, April 1-3, 2004

*Please direct all correspondence to Natalia Sarkisian, Department of Sociology, Thompson Hall, University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA, 01003; e-mail: natalia@sarkisian.net.

Abstract

Disorganization theories postulate that Black men have in many ways abandoned their familial roles. Using the NSFH data, the paper tests this hypothesis by examining Black men's extended family involvement relative to White men. Overall, the hypothesis of Black men's familial disengagement is refuted by the data: Black men are quite similar to White men in their kin support, even though they differ on a number of socioeconomic, familial, and cultural predictors of kin support. This paradoxical outcome is due to the fact that the effects of different groups of predictors cancel each other out as far as race differences are concerned: Whereas Black men's economic disadvantage hinders their kin support, their cultural values and extended family structures tend to bring their involvement with kin to the levels of the more economically advantaged White men. These data highlight the inaccuracy of the either/or approaches to Black families (Black families are either "better" or "worse" organized, and it is either culture or structure that shapes family organization) and underscore the need for synthetic approaches to discussing Black families.

The debate on whether Black families are better or worse organized than White families has a long history (Allen 1979). Scholars on one side of this debate argue that Blacks have more abundant family ties, and therefore greater family integration, than Whites (Allen 1979; Aschenbrenner 1975; Hill 1972; Hill 1999; Ladner 1972; McCray 1980; Newman 1999; Nobles 1978; Stack 1974; Staples 1981; Sudarkasa 1988). On the other side of this debate, a number of scholars suggest that even though such thriving family networks among Blacks might have existed in the past, economic and social changes destroyed them, leaving Blacks with fewer family ties than Whites (Anderson 1990; Jewell 1988; Murray 1984; Patterson 1998; Roschelle 1997; Wilson 1987).

This second group of scholars, to whom I refer as "disorganization theorists," has been particularly stressing the role of men (or rather lack of it) in Black families. They argue that Black men have in many ways abandoned their familial roles, and attribute this trend either to "dysfunctional" cultural patterns of family life among Blacks, such as single mother families and "matriarchy," or to Black men's social marginalization due to concentrated poverty and high criminal involvement. At the same time, those who argue that Black family ties are abundant usually focus mostly on women and their networks (Aschenbrenner 1973; Aschenbrenner 1975; Billingsley 1968; Hill 1972; Hill 1999; Johnson 2000; Ladner 1972; McCray 1980; Nobles 1978; Stack 1974; Staples 1973; Staples 1981; Sudarkasa 1988). This creates a gap in empirical research on men's familial involvement that would address this debate.

This paper aims to fill this gap. Using the National Survey of Families and Households data, I test the hypothesis about Black men's familial disengagement by examining their extended family involvement relative to White men. Further, I explore the factors that explain men's familial involvement among Whites and Blacks, assessing the impact of socioeconomic factors,

cultural values, and family structure. The paper begins with a brief review of the literature surrounding disorganization vs superorganization debate, the empirical evidence concerning men's familial involvement, and the factors that may explain racial variation in such involvement. Then, it turns to a three part empirical analysis. Because there is a consensus in the literature regarding the validity of kin support as a family integration measure, my indicator of family involvement is kin support –giving financial, practical, and emotional support to extended kin. The first part of the analysis assesses the assumptions of the disorganization-superorganization debate by evaluating the differences and similarities between White and Black men's kin support involvement. The second part explains the racial differences in kin support using socioeconomic characteristics, cultural values, and family composition aspects. The third part focuses on understanding the similarities of Black and White men's kin support involvement. The paper concludes with a discussion of the implications of the findings for theory, research, and social policy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

DISORGANIZATION VS SUPEROGRANIZATION DEBATE

The first group of scholars, whom I term "superorganization" theorists, focus on what they see as positive aspects of Black family organization, including strong mother-child relationships, communal patterns of childcare, extended and fictive kin ties, and extensive exchange of support within kin networks. (They were the first to highlight the importance of kin support as an indicator of family integration.) Importantly, these theorists mostly focus on women's familial involvement, emphasizing woman-centered family and community ties, and frequently leave men's role in familial networks out of discussion. When discussing men's roles, however, they frequently note

that Black women rather than men are located in the center of kin networks (Stack 1974; Staples 1985). Men may be contributing to households of their mother, an ex-wife, and a girlfriend raising their children, and may be active in matrifocal extended families either of their mother, sister, or wife (Aschenbrenner 1973; Aschenbrenner 1975). In other words, superorganization theorists argue that Black men form several families rather than being without families (Johnson 1999). Despite this acknowledgement, however, superorganization theorists do not pay due attention to men's familial roles in their research (Lempert 1999).

Superorganization theorists propose various explanations for these unique patterns of Black family organization. Some of the them (cultural resiliency theorists) attribute Black family organization to the preservation of traditional Black cultures and continuing preferences for family organization forms found in these cultures, manifested through extended familistic values, a high value placed on childrearing and motherhood, acceptance of non-maternal care of children, but also the matrilateral focus placing women rather than men in the center of family functioning (Aschenbrenner 1973; Aschenbrenner 1975; Billingsley 1968; Hill 1972; Hill 1999; Johnson 2000; Ladner 1972; Nobles 1978; Staples 1973; Staples 1981; Sudarkasa 1988). Other cultural resiliency theorists focus on the cultural outcomes of slavery and oppression, and argue that the common experience of oppression generated integration-boosting ethnic solidarity, altruism (Carson 1989; Stoll 2001), and religiosity (Littlejohn-Blake and Darling 1993; Musick, Wilson, and Bynum 2000; Robinson and Godbey 1997; Taylor, Hardison, and Chatters 1996; Taylor 1988). This approach, locating Black distinctiveness in the past (in Africa and during slavery), has been critiqued for understating the effects of contemporary economic and social institutions on Black families (Roschelle 1997), and social class diversity among contemporary Blacks. It also tends to romanticize the strength of Black women (especially mothers), neglecting the burdens that gender

and race oppression place on them (Collins 2000; McCray 1980; Roschelle 1997).

Yet another group of superorganization theorists, structural resiliency theorists (Allen 1979; Hays and Mindel 1973; Lempert 1999; Newman 2001; Newman 1999; Stack 1974; Stack 1981), argue that the differences between Black and White families result from the different contemporary structural positions of these two groups, such as education, income, and wealth differences. Structural resiliency theorists argue that poor families need to maintain higher levels of integration in order to make ends meet. They at least implicitly argue that race yields little effect independent of socioeconomic position. This approach often romanticizes poor families (Roschelle 1997). Although the proponents of this approach acknowledge the tolls of poverty, attributing higher marital instability and other familial difficulties to the problems and strains of living in poverty, they mainly focus on positive aspects, even glorifying the survival strategies of the poor. This approach also avoids discussing any cultural differences between Blacks and Whites (Roschelle 1997).

The disorganization approach, in contrast, characterizes Black families as disorganized, deficient and dysfunctional as compared to White families. These scholars frequently stress the importance of nuclear family structure, focusing on "absent Black fathers" and mother-headed families and as a sign of disorganization (Murray 1984; Wilson 1987). Some of them, however, also address the issue of extended kin integration. Focusing on social support among extended kin, these scholars argue that the kin support among Blacks has declined rapidly over the past few decades, so that now Blacks are less likely to be involved in support transfers than Whites. This argument usually does not differentiate between women and men, but when it does, it stresses men's greater familial disengagement and substitution of street-corner networks for familial networks (Anderson 1990; Scott and Black 1999).

Some proponents of this approach, so-called cultural deficiency theorists, stress culture as the primary explanation for Black family patterns, attributing Black family disorganization to deviant Black cultural values, especially the absence of cultural norms promoting marriage, tolerance for non-marital childbearing, preference for so-called "matriarchy" (typically implying that "strong" Black women prefer to head families and thus push men away), and general mistrust and cynicism (Aldous 1969; Bernard 1966; Frazier 1932; Frazier 1939; Frazier 1949; Gilder 1981; Moynihan 1965; Patterson 1998; Rainwater 1970; Wilson and Musick 1997). Even though cultural deficiency scholars attribute the origins of these cultural values to slavery and the subsequent years of oppression, they argue that cultural transmission to the next generation created a self-perpetuating cycle of pathology. These scholars have been extensively critiqued for assuming that the patriarchal nuclear family structure is (or should be) the norm, for ignoring contemporary structural oppression of Blacks, for overemphasizing findings derived from studies of "underclass" Black families, and for misrepresenting the societal position of Black women (Baca Zinn 1989; Collins 1989; Collins 2000; Ladner 1972; Roschelle 1997; Scanzoni 1977; Staples 1981).

Others, whom I call structural destruction theorists, stress structural explanations to Black family disorganization, locating the cause in contemporary social structure far more than in past oppression and cultural values (Hogan, Eggebeen, and Clogg 1993; Jewell 1988; Kaplan 1997; McDonald and Armstrong 2001; Murray 1984; Oliker 2000; Roschelle 1997; Staples 1988; Tolnay 1999; Wilson 1987). They attribute the perceived decline in Black family integration, and especially in familial involvement of Black men, to Blacks' declining economic position: persistent and residentially concentrated poverty, increasing joblessness (Wilson 1987) and associated social problems such as drugs, crime, and high incarceration rates (Anderson 1990), lack of resources (Kaplan 1997; Oliker 2000; Roschelle 1997), and liberal social policy said to disrupt kin networks

(Jewell 1988; McDonald and Armstrong 2001; Murray 1984). Structural destruction approach, however, has been criticized for its tendency to generalize "underclass" findings to all Blacks, neglecting diversity among them.

Finally, some theorists, especially multiracial feminist theorists, have begun to criticize the general either/or terms of debate – that this debate presupposes that Black families are either "better" or "worse" organized, as well as that it is either culture or structure that shapes family organization (Baca Zinn 1994; Billingsley 1992; Collins 2000; Roschelle 1997; Sewell 1992; Sudarkasa 1988; Taylor 2000). They propose a synthetic rather than dichotomous approach to discussing Black families. However, few have implemented such a synthetic approach in empirical research.

RESEARCH ON MEN'S FAMILIAL INVOLVEMENT

In their extensive review of the research literature, Taylor and his colleagues (Taylor et al. 1990) concluded that studies of Black men's family life are exceedingly rare and one of the most conspicuous gaps in the literature. Thus, limited evidence exists to substantiate the claims of either disorganization or superorganization theorists when it comes to men's familial involvement. The research that does exist can be broadly divided into two groups: the more abundant research on Black men's participation in nuclear families, and very scarce research on Black men's extended family involvement.

Marriage and Parenting

The vast majority of the existing research on Black men's familial involvement focuses on nuclear family, and more specifically, on marriage and parenting. The research on marriage overwhelmingly agrees that Black men are less likely to be married (Anderson and Massey 2001; McLoyd et al. 2000; Taylor et al. 1997b; Tucker and Mitchell-Kernan 1995; Wilson 1987). The

research has linked this difference in marriage rates to economic factors, especially employment, and gender ratio imbalance caused by high mortality and incarceration of men (McLoyd et al. 2000; Taylor et al. 1997b; Tucker and Mitchell-Kernan 1995), though a few scholars relied on cultural explanations (Furstenberg 2001; Patterson 1998).

The research on parenting has demonstrated that Black men are more likely to be nonresident fathers – that is, to live separately from their children (Anderson and Massey 2001; Eggebeen 2002; Mott 1990; Seltzer and Bianchi 1988; Taylor et al. 1997b). Scholars attribute this higher prevalence of nonresidential fatherhood among Blacks to the differential rates of marriage discussed above, racial differences in socioeconomic standing (Lerman 1986; Marsiglio 1995; Taylor et al. 1997b), and the effects of incarceration (Browning, Miller, and Spruance 2001). Both research and media discussions have also repeatedly stressed Black men's higher likelihood to become "deadbeat dads" – fathers who do not pay child support (Garfinkel, McLanahan, and Sarah 1986; Graham and Beller 1996; Roberts 1998). Others have argued, however, that despite separate residences, non-payment of child support and even incarceration, Black nonresident fathers are very involved in day-to-day care of their children (Hamer 1998; Lempert 1999; Samuel 2002; Thompson and Lawson 1999; Wade 1994). Some researchers find that Black nonresident fathers are as involved as White ones (Seltzer and Bianchi 1988), and others show Black fathers to be even more involved (Mott 1990; Seltzer 1991; Stier and Tienda 1993). Some scholars have also stressed Black men's role as "other fathers" – men who as family members or community members assume responsibilities traditionally associated with paternity and therefore are deeply involved in parenting children other than their own (Lempert 1999; Whitmore 1999).

Another set of literature has focused on residential fatherhood, and compared the involvement of Black and White fathers in a variety of day-to-day parenting tasks. The findings of

this literature are contradictory. Some scholars reported that Black and White fathers are quite similar in terms of their paternal involvement (Ahmeduzzaman and Roopnarine 1992; Harris, Furstenberg, and Marmer 1998; Hossain and Roopnarine 1993; Hossain and Roopnarine 1994; Julian, McKenry, and McKelvey 1994; Toth and Xu 1999; Wilcox 2002). Others, however, found that Black fathers are less involved in eating meals with children (Hofferth 2003; Wilcox 2002), reading (Hofferth 2003; Marsiglio 1991), playing with children (Marsiglio 1991; Yeung et al. 2001), and giving personal care and helping with achievement-related activities (Yeung et al. 2001). Some also reported that Black fathers exhibit less warmth (Hofferth 2003), even though others demonstrated that Black and White fathers are similar in terms of expressing affection (Toth and Xu 1999). Others, however, demonstrated that Black fathers are more involved with children: They monitor and supervise their children more and exhibit more responsibility for childcare (Sanderson and Thompson 2002; Toth and Xu 1999), they are more involved in youth-related activities (Wilcox 2002) and in joint household activities with their children (Yeung et al. 2001), and have more private talks with children (Marsiglio 1991) than White fathers. Scholars have also shown that Black fathers are more likely to head single-parent families than White fathers (Eggebeen, Snyder, and Manning 1996).

Those explaining Black men's parenting evoke either cultural explanations, such as the cultural deficit model, matriarchy model, or Africentric model (Cochran 1997), or socioeconomic explanations for race differences. Whereas cultural theories are usually not empirically tested, both the literature on residential and on nonresidential fatherhood have demonstrated the power of socioeconomic explanation in understanding Black father-child involvement. For a residential father, structural characteristics such as level of education, income, and rates of employment influence the accessibility of a father to his child, the amount of direct interaction with that child,

and the assumption of responsibility for childcare (Ahmeduzzaman and Roopnarine 1992; Bowman 1993; Bowman and Forman 1997; Coley 1998; Fagan 1998; Hofferth 2003; Hudspeth 2003; Landale and Oropesa 2001), whereas for a nonresidential father these characteristics shape the amount of money a non-residential father contributes toward his child and the frequency of his visits with the child (Graham and Beller 1996; Seltzer, Schaeffer, and Charng 1989; Smock and Manning 1997).

Extended Families

Very limited research exists on Black men's extended family involvement. In assessing Black men's involvement, some scholars compare it to the familial participation of Black women. For example, Johnson (Johnson 1999) found no significant gender differences in elderly Blacks' relationships with members of their extended families: Men and women do not differ in their contact with kin, or in the instrumental and expressive supports they received from kin. In contrast, other scholars found that Black men are less involved with their extended families than Black women: They reported that older Black men have significantly smaller and less extended informal social support networks (Barker, Morrow, and Mitteness 1998) and have less contact with their children than Black women (Spitze and Miner 1992). They also reported that Black men are less likely than Black women to live in extended family households (Hunter 1997), and less likely to give be involved in most types of practical and emotional support, even though these differences essentially parallel gender differences among Whites (Laditka and Laditka 2001; Roschelle 1997; Silverstein and Waite 1993). Overall, these studies seem to suggest that Black men are somewhat less involved in extended family life than Black women. Such gender comparisons among Blacks, however, can be misleading as they do not allow determining whether the observed gender differences are race-specific: i.e., there could be similar differences in extended family

involvement among Whites.

Studies that compare Black and White men allow for a better understanding of the degree of uniqueness of Black extended family involvement. These studies, however, are quite rare. Examining extended family coresidence, scholars found that both Black men are more likely to share residence with extended kin than White men (Coward et al. 1996; Goldscheider and Bures 2003; Raley 1995). Further, Raley (1995) found that Black men have more frequent contact with their mothers and socialize with relatives more often, but have less contact with their siblings than White men. Kivett (1991) reported that the grandfather role in the rural South is more central to Black men than White men.

Very few studies compared Black and White men's involvement in giving kin support.[1] Silverstein and Waite (1993) found Black men to be less likely to be involved in practical and emotional support transfers with parents and adult children, but somewhat more likely to be involved in such transfers with siblings and other relatives. Raley (1995) used a measure of kin support combining two types of practical and one type of emotional support, and found that Black and White men to be equally likely to give support to kin. Laditka and Laditka (2001) found that Black men are less likely to give practical help to parents, but when they do, they give significantly more hours of help than White men. Finally, Roschelle (1997) found that Black men are less likely to give help with household tasks than White men. Such variation in the findings can be primarily attributed to differences in the types of kin support analyzed, the types of kin included in the analyses (e.g., parents, adult children, siblings, etc.), as well as the methodologies used (e.g., type of sample, definitions of variables, use of controls, methods of analysis); see Peterson (Peterson

[1] Even though the differential involvement of women and men in kin support networks was extensively demonstrated in both ethnographic and survey research (Cancian and Oliker 1999; Rossi and Rossi 1990; Sarkisian and Gerstel 2004; Walker 2001), most studies that examine race differences do so without separating women and men. Instead, they seem at least implicitly to assume an equivalence of women and men within racial groups.

1996) for meta-analysis of kin support studies and discussion of some of these.

Thus, the research on men's extended family integration is very scarce. This paper aims to fill this gap. Whereas there is a consensus in the literature regarding the validity of kin support as a family integration measure, the research examining Black men's kin support contains the most contradictions. Therefore, my indicators of family involvement are the measures of kin support – giving financial, practical, and emotional support to extended kin. Next, I will review the empirical research on the potential determinants of race differences in such kin support involvement.

RESEARCH ON FACTORS SHAPING KIN SUPPORT

In addition to controls such as age or health, studies of the factors shaping kin support, and, more specifically, race differences in kin support, focus on three major groups of factors: cultural values, socioeconomic characteristics, and nuclear and extended family composition.

CULTURAL VALUES. Even though both disorganization and superorganization theorists developed arguments that cultural values are crucial in understanding race differences in familial involvement, the actual cultural predisposition to kin integration is rarely measured. Cultural difference usually enters the equation only as a residual category – those race differences that remain after controlling for socioeconomic variables and family structure are typically interpreted as a product of cultural differences. Very few studies attempt to evaluate the direct impact of cultural values. Those few who do attempt to measure culture examine values, such as "respect for young" and "respect for old" (Mutran 1985) or "familism" (Roschelle 1997), and find no effect or a limited positive effect of such values on kin support involvement.

SOCIOECONOMIC STANDING. In contrast, most studies of race differences in kin support involvement include some measures of socioeconomic standing, usually income and education,

and sometimes employment. The findings differ substantially across studies. Some studies find that higher economic standing (as measured by higher income and education) increase the likelihood of kin support involvement (Cooney and Uhlenberg 1992; Eggebeen 1992; Hatch 1991; Hogan, Eggebeen, and Clogg 1993; Lee and Aytac 1998; Roschelle 1997; Silverstein and Waite 1993). Others find that higher economic standing decreases kin support (Benin and Keith 1995; Laditka and Laditka 2001; Mutran 1985). Yet other studies report education and income operate in opposite directions (Jayakody 1998; Marks 1996) or have no effect on kin support (Jayakody, Chatters, and Taylor 1993). Some studies account for employment status as well, finding either that those employed are less likely to give support (Marks 1996), or that they are more likely to give support (Silverstein and Waite 1993), or that they are no different from those not employed (Cooney and Uhlenberg 1992; Hatch 1991; Roschelle 1997). Finally, despite the demonstrated wealth differential between Blacks and Whites (Oliver and Shapiro 1997), the studies of kin support usually do not take wealth into consideration. One study, however, examined vehicle ownership and found no relationship to kin support (Hatch 1991).

FAMILY COMPOSITION. In the case of extended family composition there is agreement regarding its effects on kin support. Studies show that more relatives and their closer proximity boost kin support (Eggebeen 1992; Hogan, Eggebeen, and Clogg 1993; Jayakody, Chatters, and Taylor 1993; Parish, Hao, and Hogan 1991; Roschelle 1997). There is much confusion, however, regarding the effects of nuclear family composition. It is well established that Blacks are less likely to have spouses/partners and more likely to be single parents, and have more children on average than Whites (Heaton, Chadwick, and Jacobson 2000; Hill 1999; Taylor et al. 1997a; Tucker and Mitchell-Kernan 1995). Scholars, however, disagree on the effects of these differences. Some argue that having a spouse or a partner increases the size of an individual's familial network, providing

more opportunities for kin support (Campbell and Lee 1992; Lewis 2001), and that divorce decreases such networks (Kelly 1986; Wallerstein and Kelly 1980). Others, however, have argued that "marriage is a greedy institution" which takes away time and resources that might otherwise be spent on helping extended kin (Albeck and Kaydar 2002; Barrett 1980; Coser and Coser 1974; Fischer 1982; Gerstel 1988; Johnson and Leslie 1982). A similar debate exists around the effects of children on kin support. Whereas some argue that children consume parents' time and resources, reducing their availability for support involvement (Fischer and Oliker 1983; Moore 1990; Munch, McPherson, and Smith-Lovin 1997; Rawlins 1992), others argue that they increase the need for support as well as connect individuals to others, especially to extended kin (Amato 1993; Ambert 1992; Dwyer, Lee, and Jankowski 1994; Gallagher and Gerstel 2001; Lawton, Silverstein, and Bengston 1994). Furthermore, many have demonstrated that the effects of marriage/partnership, divorce, and children on social support differ by gender (Gallagher and Gerstel 2001; Gerstel 1988; Milardo 1987); it is unclear, however, whether they also differ by race, or how, if at all, race and gender interact.

Thus, there is much disagreement regarding the effects of cultural values, socioeconomic standing, and family composition (especially nuclear) on race differences in kin support. Little research provides the basis for a systematic evaluation of the role of cultural, socioeconomic, and family composition factors in shaping racial differences in kin integration.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The first objective of this paper is to assess the proposition of the disorganization theorists that Black men are less integrated into families. Focusing on kin support, I analyze the differences and similarities between Blacks and Whites. If disorganization theorists are correct, I would

expect to find that Black men are less involved in all sorts of kin support transfers than White men. If superorganization theorists are right, then Black men should be more likely to be involved in such support transfers.

The second objective of this research is to explain the racial differences in kin support using measures of socioeconomic standing, cultural values, and nuclear and extended family composition. Here I evaluate the relative importance of these groups of factors in explaining the differences.

The third objective is to understand the origins of the similarities in kin support, once again using measures of socioeconomic standing, cultural values, and nuclear and extended family composition. Here I assess two main potential explanations for racial similarities in kin support. The first explanation suggests that those cultural values, socioeconomic characteristics, and family composition aspects that have different average values for Blacks and Whites do not shape kin support involvement. The second explanation suggests that such cultural values, socioeconomic characteristics, and family composition aspects do shape kin support involvement but their effects push the race differential in opposite directions thus producing similarities.

DATA AND METHODS

This paper utilizes data from the second wave (1992-94) of the National Survey of Families and Households (Sweet, Bumpass, and Call 1988), in which a total of 10,005 main respondents were interviewed. For additional information on the NSFH, see the data documentation (Sweet and Bumpass 1996; Sweet, Bumpass, and Call 1988). I focus on a subsample limited to White and Black men (N=3573).[2]

[2] To obtain generalizable results, all of the analyses utilize analytic weights constructed to adjust for both

Dependent variables are categorical, measuring respondent's involvement in giving six different types of kin support as well as any kin support at all. Even though it is important to examine kin support transfers within the household, this paper is limited to an analysis of inter-household transfers due to data availability problems (such data are available only for parents and adult children of respondents). This accords with most literature comparing Black and White kin support patterns, as it usually focuses on inter-household support transfers.

To examine the full spectrum of support, I use measures of each of the three major types of kin support identified in the literature: financial, emotional, and practical. I include: 1) a measure of financial support that combines giving a gift over $200, giving a loan over $200, and help paying living and educational expenses; 2) one measure of emotional kin support (advice, encouragement, moral or emotional support); 3) three measures of practical support (help with transportation; help with housework, yardwork, car repairs, and other work around the house; and help with baby sitting or child care).[3]

Financial support variables were constructed using questions asking whether the respondent or spouse (1) gave a gift worth more than $200 at any one time in the last 12 months to anyone not

---

oversampling and the attrition bias, as well as to match the sample to the U.S. adult population in race, age, and gender composition weights. Following the suggestions of those who examined sampling design effects in NSFH (Johnson and Elliott 1998), we also use standard error estimates corrected for sample design, that is, for clustering and stratification.

[3] Unfortunately, all measures of kin support used in this paper are categorical since no information on the time spent on specific kinds of kin support is available in the data. This places certain limitations on the analysis, as I can only discuss the likelihood of kin support transfers but not the amount of support transferred. Because the data are limited in this way for both Blacks and Whites, this problem does not significantly impair my analysis. Future data collection efforts, however, should include questions on the amounts of kin support.

living with them at the time, (2) gave such a loan worth more than $200; (3) paid someone's day-to-day living expenses or educational expenses, and, if involved any of such transfers, to whom they gave the highest gift amount and the highest loan (for help paying expenses, the respondent was asked to name only one person to whom the respondent provided such help). Note that his measure of financial help involved determining whether the respondent or spouse gave to kin the most rather than whether they were involved in such transfers with kin at all. This potentially underestimates transfers with kin for the cases when both kin and nonkin were involved in the transfers and the transferred amount for non-kin was larger than for kin.

Emotional and practical support variables were constructed using the questions asking whether respondents gave each of those types of support in the last month to/from (a) parents/children; (b) siblings; (c) other relatives; (d) friends, neighbors, coworkers. Because the primary goal of this paper is analyzing kin support overall, the first three categories were collapsed to create kin support measures.[4]

For multivariate analyses, five groups of independent variables are used along with race: cultural variables, socioeconomic variables, nuclear family composition, extended family

[4] These three categories were collapsed for simplicity purposes as the primary goal of the paper is describing and explaining kin support overall. However, studies documented variation in specific support sources by age, gender, marital status, etc. (Turner and Marino 1994). Further, some scholars have suggested that Blacks and Whites have differing types of kinship organization, with White kinship structures emphasizing lineal generational bonds between parents and children, and Black kinship structures emphasizing collateral sibling bonds and possessing expansive properties that allow inclusion of a variety of kin (Johnson 2000; Sudarkasa 1988). In separate analyses, not presented here, looking at support transfers in each of these kinship categories separately, I find some limited confirmation of this theory, as Blacks are more likely to be involved in many support transfers with "siblings" and "other relatives" but not "parents/children"; for additional supporting evidence, see Waite and Harrison (Waite and Harrison 1992).

composition, and controls (see Appendix A for full description, along with means and standard deviations by race, and significance tests, for all independent variables).

First, I use six measures of cultural values, including 1) a scale of attitudes toward marriage, 2) a scale measuring importance of having children, and 3) a scale measuring attitudes toward non-maternal care for children; 4) a scale measuring extended familistic attitudes focusing on attitudes towards financial help and coresidence with needy parents and adult children; 5) an altruism scale measuring respondent's attitudes towards giving time and money to others; and 6) two dummy variables indicating church attendance frequency, with moderate church attendance defined as at least once a year but less than once a week, and frequent attendance defined as once a week or more.[5] Second, I use seven measures of structural position: income, wealth, education, employment, vehicle ownership, and home ownership (see Appendix A for more detail). While these measures are significantly correlated with each other, these correlations do not introduce dangerous levels of multicollinearity (the highest pairwise Pearson correlation coefficient is .47). Third, my measures of nuclear family composition include relationship status, presence of minor children ages 0-12 and 13-18 in the household, and respondent's non-resident parent status. Fourth, presence of adult children, grandchildren, and parents, number of living siblings, number of coresident adults, and proximity of kin are included to describe extended family composition. Finally, my set of controls includes measures of age, health, and nuclear and extended family composition characteristics. I include both age and age squared to model potential curvilinear relationships between age and kin support transfers. I also control for health as it likely affects the

[5] Scale reliability was measured using Chronbach's alpha. Alphas for these scales ranged from .50 to.86 (see Appendix A for details). There is a considerable debate in the literature about what constitutes an acceptable alpha level (Peterson 1994). Following Nunnally, I consider alphas of .50 and over to indicate acceptable reliability (Nunnally 1978).

ability to give help.

The analysis consists of three parts. First, to assess the disorganization-superorganization debate, I calculate weighted means and survey[6] standard errors, and perform F-tests to determine the statistical significance of the differences in proportions for White and Black men giving specific types of kin support as well as kin support overall.

Second, to explain the racial differences, I construct explanatory models for kin support. I employ survey logistic regression to explain racial differences in kin support and explore the effects of culture, socioeconomic standing, and nuclear and extended family structure on such support. Five groups of predictor variables – cultural, socioeconomic, nuclear family structure, extended family structure, and controls -- are used to explain giving support among Blacks and Whites. To be able to identify more clearly which set of predictors is responsible for explaining racial differences, along with the full models including all groups of variables simultaneously, I also estimate additional partial models introducing each group of variables separately.

Third, to account for the similarities, I examine how the race differences in cultural values, socioeconomic characteristics, and family composition produce similar levels of kin support involvement. I assess two main potential explanations for racial similarities in kin support. The first explanation suggests that those cultural values, socioeconomic characteristics, and family composition aspects that have different average values for Blacks and Whites do not shape kin support involvement. The second explanation suggests that such cultural values, socioeconomic characteristics, and family composition aspects do shape kin support involvement but their effects push the race differential in opposite directions thus producing similarities. The information on the value and significance of individual regression coefficients for each of the characteristics is not

[6] Survey estimates and tests are calculated using weights and adjusting for sample design.

sufficient to determine which of these potential explanations is correct. This information should be combined with the information on the size and significance of the differences between Blacks and Whites in the average values of these characteristics. To account for both of these pieces of data simultaneously, I construct separate logistic regression models for White and Black men and perform regression decomposition. This technique makes it possible to separate out the effects of (1) group differences in the means of independent variables, and (2) differential responses of the groups to the same conditions.

In the case of an ordinary least squares regression, a 1-unit change in an independent variable x is associated with a change of size b in the dependent variable. Here, regression decomposition would involve estimating two equations,

$$y_{white} = a_{white} + b_{white}x_{white} \text{ and } y_{black} = a_{black} + b_{black}x_{black}$$

and then decomposing the White-Black differential

$$y_{white} - y_{black} = (a_{white} - a_{black}) + b(x_{white}-x_{black}) + x(b_{white}-b_{black}),$$

where:

$$x = (x_{black} + x_{white})/2 \text{ and } b = (b_{black} + b_{white})/2.$$

In a logistic regression equation, however, a 1-unit change in an independent variable x is associated with a change of size p(1 - p)b, where p is the proportion giving kin support. Following Glick, Bean and Van Hook (Glick, Bean, and Van Hook 1997), I calculate the decomposition components from logistic regression results by multiplying the above components of decomposition by p(1 – p). I estimate p as the average of p for Blacks and Whites:

$$p=(p_{black}+p_{white})/2$$

Thus, decomposition equation becomes:

$$p_{white} - p_{black} = (a_{white} - a_{black})\, p(1 – p) + b(x_{white}-x_{black})\, p(1 - p) + x(b_{white}-b_{black})\, p(1 - p).$$

(See Fairlie 2003; Glick and Van Hook 2002; Glick, Bean, and Van Hook 1997 for more details on this technique.)

The most interesting component that we obtain through such decomposition is $b(x_{white}-x_{black})$, called the compositional effect. For each independent variable used in regression (whether a measure of socioeconomic standing, cultural values, or family structure), this component indicates the amount and direction of racial difference in the dependent variable due to the difference by race in means of that independent variable. The second major component, $x(b_{white}-b_{black})$, indicates the amount and direction of racial difference that can be attributed to the differential response of Blacks and Whites to similar conditions (i.e., socioeconomic factors, cultural values, and family composition characteristics). Therefore, this technique allows us to see whether the similarities in kin support reflect the absence of racial differences in average levels and effects of the factors shaping kin support, or whether such racial differences exist but operate in opposing directions thus producing similarities.

ANALYSIS

EVALUATING RACIAL DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES

The analysis begins with a comparison of the prevalence of cross-household kin support giving among men. Table 1 compares percentages of men giving various types of support for Blacks and Whites.

(TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE)

Table 1 shows that although Whites are more likely than Blacks to be involved in giving financial support, Blacks are more likely than Whites to be involved in giving help with transportation. With these two exceptions, men are very similar across race. Thus, it is not possible to state that

either Black or White men are more integrated into their extended families. Rather, White and Black men are both actively involved in helping extended kin (only about 20% in each group are not involved at all in kin support). The racial differences are primarily in the type of support more often circulated, not in the overall levels of participation.

(TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE)

Next, before I turn to constructing explanatory models for giving kin support, I examine race differences in a variety of explanatory variables. Table 2 presents mean comparisons by race for all the independent variables used in multivariate models: cultural variables, structural variables, family composition variables, and controls (for variable definitions and standard deviations, see Appendix A). Table 2 demonstrates that Black and White men differ on most measures of cultural values: on average, Black men place less value on marriage, are more accepting of nonmaternal care of children, express more familistic, and altruistic attitudes, as well as more Christian fundamentalist beliefs than White men. Black men also attend religious services more often than White men. Similarly, we observe many differences between Blacks and Whites on measures of their structural circumstances: Black men have significantly lower incomes, less wealth, and less education; they are also less likely to own cars and houses. The two groups do not differ in the average rates of employment, however. There are also many differences in terms of the nuclear and extended family composition. Black men are more likely to be unpartnered, to have children 13-18 y.o., and to be nonresident parents than White men. Further, whereas Black and White men are equally likely to have adult children, grandchildren, or living parents, Black men have more siblings, live in households with more coresident adults, and live in closer proximity to their extended kin. Finally, in terms of the controls, I find that on average, Black men are younger than White men, but they do not differ significantly in their health conditions.

EXPLAINING RACIAL DIFFERENCES

Now I turn to the second question: what explains the racial differences in kin support? Here I construct explanatory models for kin support employing logistic regression in order to examine which of the many differences between Black and White men on the independent variables explain the differences in kin support. Because the only significant differences in kin support between Black and White men were in financial help and transportation help, I concentrate on these two types of kin support in explaining race differences.

(TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE)

Table 3 presents logistic regression results that examine which of these many differences between Black and White men help explain the racial differences in kin support. This table first presents the results of the five partial models, and then the full model results. The results appear in these tables as odds ratios, with odds ratios greater than one indicating positive effects, and odds ratios smaller than one indicating negative effects. Odds ratios are multiplicative coefficients that can also best interpreted in a form of 100*(Odds Ratio –1) as the percentage change in the likelihood of being involved in a specific support transfer per one unit change in the independent variable.

More specifically, the first row of coefficients presents the odds ratios of the race variable for the models containing only the race variable; the next four rows of coefficients present the odds ratios of the race variable for the partial culture, socioeconomic standing, nuclear family, and extended family models, respectively. Each of these partial models contained the race variable and the corresponding set of independent variables; for simplicity sake, we present the odds ratios for race variable only. Below the partial models, we present odds ratios for the full model (which combines race, the set of culture variables, the set of SES variables, the set of nuclear family

composition variables, the set of extended family composition variables, and all the controls). Assessment of the *changes in the race variable coefficient across the models* (from race only model, to partial cultural, partial socioeconomic, partial nuclear family structure, and partial extended family structure models, to the full model) allows us to discuss the power of culture, socioeconomic standing, and family composition in explaining the racial differences in kin support, whereas analysis of *individual coefficients for cultural, socioeconomic, family composition, and control variables* allows us to assess the relationship of each variable to the likelihood of specific kin support transfers.

As the race coefficients for partial models of *financial help* show, neither cultural factors nor family composition can explain the race differences in giving financial help observed in the race only model. This difference becomes non-significant, however, when we control for socioeconomic variables. As indicated by the socioeconomic variables' coefficients in the full model, the likelihood of giving financial help is strongly related to the economic standing of the respondent, including significant positive relationships with income, wealth, education, and employment. And because Black men have lower income and less wealth and education than White men (see Table 2), they are less likely to give financial help to their kin. Thus, the partial models demonstrate that socioeconomic variables are the most important ones in explaining race differences in giving financial help.

In contrast, the partial models for *transportation help* indicate that the higher propensity of Black men to give transportation help can be explained by either cultural variables or extended family structure. As the full model coefficients indicate for the culture variables, altruistic values as well as church attendance are both associated with higher likelihood of transportation help, and as Blacks have more altruistic values and attend church more often than Whites (see Table 2), they

are also more likely to help their extended kin with transportation. The full model coefficients for the extended family composition model indicate that having living parents, coresiding with more adults, and living in close proximity to extended kin all increase the likelihood of giving help with transportation. As Blacks coreside with more adults and live closer to extended kin on average than Whites, they are therefore more likely to help kin with transportation.

Interestingly, controlling for socioeconomic variables further increases the racial gap in transportation. That is, Black men's socioeconomic position (specifically, their education levels and car ownership) somewhat dampens their participation in giving transportation help – if they would have the same socioeconomic characteristics as White men, they would be even more likely to give transportation help then they currently are. This dampening effect of socioeconomic standing, however, is fully compensated by the effects of the differences in cultural values and extended family structure. Therefore, despite their lower SES, Blacks are more likely than Whites to provide transportation help due to more altruistic values, more frequent church attendance, more coresident adults, and more geographically proximate extended kin.

DECOMPOSING RACIAL SIMILARITIES

Next, I turn to explaining the surprising level of similarity in Black and White kin support. In this part of the analysis I focus on the overall kin support measure. The bivariate data indicated that Blacks and Whites do not differ in their rates of participation in giving kin support overall, despite all the differences in socioeconomic characteristics, cultural values, and family composition. I utilize regression decomposition in order to better understand the processes underlying such similarity.

(TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE)

Table 4 displays the results of regression decomposition. First two columns of this table

present the means of independent variables by race (these data were already presented in Table 2). Next two columns present the logistic regression coefficients and their statistical significance for the separate models of kin support for Blacks and Whites. Next column displays the amount of White-Black differential (percentage of Whites involved in kin support minus percentage of Blacks involved in kin support) that can be attributed to the race difference in means of independent variables. A positive number indicates that the race difference in means results in a higher level of kin support involvement for Whites than Blacks and therefore brings about an increase in White-Black differential. A negative number indicates that the mean difference results in a higher level of kin support involvement for Blacks than for Whites and therefore brings about a decrease in White-Black differential (which simultaneously means an increase in Black-White differential). The significance test displayed in this column represents statistical significance of the mean differences. This column combines the information on race differences in independent variables and the effects of these variables on kin support, therefore providing me with the information most crucial to understanding the nature of racial similarity in kin support involvement. Finally, the last column displays the amount of White-Black differential that can be attributed to the different responses of Whites and Blacks to the same socioeconomic, cultural, or family composition factors. The significance test represents statistical significance of the difference in regression coefficients by race. It is impossible to explain, however, why Whites and Blacks would respond differently to the same cultural, socioeconomic, or family composition characteristics. Therefore, this component of decomposition analysis is usually less of interest than the previous one (i.e., compositional effects).

Thus, focusing on the compositional effects presented in Column 5 (i.e., the amount of racial difference due to a difference in means of independent variables), we find that the differences in

cultural values appear to increase the kin support involvement of Blacks more than that of Whites. Specifically, more familistic and altruistic values of Blacks and their more frequent church attendance result in their higher levels of kin support involvement. As the subtotal indicates, the cultural values generate a race gap in kin support involvement of 2.39% favoring Blacks. Moreover, Blacks' and Whites' differential response to frequent church assistance (it increases kin support involvement for Blacks more than for Whites) further increases Black-White kin support differential: The culture subtotal for Column 6 indicates that the different effects of cultural values for Blacks and Whites generate a race gap of 6.87% favoring Blacks.

The differences in socioeconomic characteristics, in contrast, produce higher levels of kin support involvement for Whites than for Blacks. Whites have higher levels of income, wealth, education, home ownership and vehicle ownership than Blacks. As these characteristics increase the likelihood of kin support involvement, these mean differences by race increase the White-Black kin support differential. As the subtotal for socioeconomic characteristics indicates, race differences in socioeconomic characteristics generate a race gap in kin support involvement of 9.8% favoring Whites. Race differences in coefficients of socioeconomic variables (see Column 6) do not produce much impact on race difference in kin support: education and car ownership have more of an effect on White kin support than on Black kin support, and therefore increase White-Black differential, and income, employment, and home ownership have more effect on Black kin support than on White kin support, and therefore decrease White-Black differential. Further, only one of these racial differences in effects of socioeconomic characteristics is statistically significant – the difference in effects of employment, but employment itself does not exhibit a statistically significant relationship to kin support for either Blacks or Whites. Taken together, the differences in effects of socioeconomic characteristics generate a race gap of less than

1% (favoring Blacks).

Next, the differences in nuclear family structure have much less impact on White-Black kin support differential than other groups of variables. Even though Black men are much more likely to be unpartnered, that only generates a race gap in kin support of 0.46% favoring Blacks. The somewhat higher propensity of Black men to have teenage children in the household contributed further 0.20% in the same direction (i.e., favoring Blacks). The small gap generated by these two characteristics is further diminished by the race gap in kin support of 0.18% favoring Whites that can be attributed to the higher likelihood of Black men to be nonresident parents. Thus, as the subtotal indicates, race differences in nuclear family structure only contribute 0.65% of race gap favoring Blacks. The differences in coefficients for nuclear family structure variables offer a larger contribution to the race gap in kin support: as the subtotal for nuclear family characteristics in Column 6 indicates, these differences generate a race gap of 3.45% favoring Blacks. None of the differences in coefficients for nuclear family characteristics is statistically significant, however.

The differences in extended family structure generate a substantial race gap in kin support favoring Black men. Black men have more siblings, more adults coresiding with them, and more kin living within two miles from them than White men. All these characteristics tend to increase kin support involvement. Therefore, they generate a race gap favoring Blacks: as the subtotal indicates, extended family composition increases Black-White differential in kin support by almost 4% (or, alternatively, decreases White-Black differential by that amount). The difference due to the differential effects of family structure on Blacks and Whites operates in the opposite direction, however, increasing White-Black differential in kin support involvement by 11.23%. The difference in coefficients for the presence of adult children is the most important one here: Whereas White men are more likely to give kin support if they have adult children, Black men

who have adult children are less likely to give kin support (this relationship is not statistically significant for Black men, however).

Finally, among controls, the race difference in age (with Black men being younger on average than White men) generated a race differential in kin support of 1.47% favoring Blacks, as age is negatively related to kin support involvement. Thus, the subtotal indicates than controls contribute another 1.44% increase in Black-White differential in kin support involvement. Further, as column 6 indicates, there are no significant differences in effects of age or health by race, but they do contribute additional 1.56% towards the Black-White differential in giving kin support.

Taken together, these findings (especially the findings regarding the compositional effects) suggest that the paradoxical similarity of Black and White men in kin support involvement is mostly due to the fact that the effects of socioeconomic standing, cultural values, and extended kin proximity cancel each other out as far as race differences are concerned. Although Black men have lower socioeconomic standing than White men that discourages kin support, they have higher levels of extended familistic and altruistic values that are positively related to kin support. Blacks also have more siblings on average, are more likely to coreside with and to live in close proximity to their extended kin, which facilitates giving kin support. Thus, whereas the differences in socioeconomic standing increase White-Black kin support involvement differential, the joint operation of the race differences in cultural values, nuclear and extended family structure, and age decrease that White-Black difference, making it insignificant and hence producing the similarity in kin support involvement that I observed in my bivariate analysis. All in all, as can be seen in the last row in the table that indicated the race difference adjusted for means, the race difference remaining after we account for all cultural, socioeconomic, and family composition factors is the miniscule 0.25% in favor of White men.

DISCUSSION

THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

My analysis suggests that neither the superorganization nor the disorganization theorists accurately capture the racial distinctions in men's kin support involvement. First, the disorganization theories that postulate that Black men are especially isolated due to crime, poverty, or discrimination, and that they have, as a result, shown a particular propensity to abandon their familial roles (Anderson 1990; Wilson 1987) are refuted by the data. But the proposition of the superorganization theorists, stating in a largely gender-unspecific way that Blacks are more involved in kin support, is also refuted when it comes to men. In fact, Black men are quite similar to White men in their kin support involvement: When all types of kin support are taken together, Black men are as likely to give kin support as White men.

This does not mean that Black men are just "being men" when it comes to kin support, however: The picture is more complicated than that. First, in terms of specific kin support types, I identified two differences, operating in opposite directions: in terms of the higher prevalence of financial help among Whites and the higher prevalence of transportation help among Blacks. Thus, Black men's familial involvement is organized in some ways differently and in others similarly to White men's. I emphasize, however, that while different modes of organization exist, Black families are neither more nor less organized than White families. Rather, they possess different patterns of organization, and the differences in these patterns should be analyzed and researched rather than judged.

Asserting that, I should note that those scholars who escape the dilemma of superorganized versus disorganized minority families usually end up portraying these families as an "alternative" type of family in a pluralist society (Hays and Mindel 1973; Sudarkasa 1988). This also holds

dangers, since it effectively removes inequality from the equation. Assuming a pluralist society, such an approach neglects the fact that Black families exist in a society where certain family forms have different value judgments attached to them; some are disadvantaged relative to others due to structural arrangements and cultural assumptions that surround them (Baca Zinn and Wells 2000). I would like to distinguish my approach from the pluralist approach, first, by acknowledging that some might view particular kinds of kin support, specifically those more prevalent among Whites (i.e. large-scale financial assistance) as more valuable and important than those more prevalent among Blacks, such as help with transportation. Scholars need to explicitly acknowledge such devaluation and attempt to study the actual experiences of family life and the actual utility of specific family patterns in particular social contexts. Second, I distinguish my approach from the pluralist one by emphasizing the diversity of familial involvement patterns within racial groups. I find that substantial within-group diversity exists among both White and Black men. Whereas the data show that Blacks and Whites have somewhat different patterns of kin support involvement, these differences are not due to race in some simple dichotomous way. It is within-group diversity in structural position, cultural values, and family composition that matters the most. Therefore, blanket statements about the relative levels of familial involvement are misleading, and have to be supplemented with exploration of such diversity.

My findings suggest that men's socioeconomic status, cultural values, and extended family composition explain the race differences in kin support. The lower prevalence of financial help among Blacks can be fully explained by their socioeconomic position. It is clear that Black men are more likely to be poor and of low socioeconomic standing, and therefore they do not have the resources to give, especially given the potential bias of the question towards transfer large sums of money. The higher prevalence of transportation help among Black men, in contrast, can be

explained by either cultural variables, as Black men have more altruistic values and attend church more often, or extended family structure, as they live in closer proximity to extended kin. As with financial help, Black men's socioeconomic position somewhat dampens their participation in giving transportation help, but cultural values and extended family structure more than compensate for this dampening effect.

Further, my analysis decomposing the overall racial similarity of kin support also suggests that the paradoxical similarity of Black and White men in kin support involvement is due to the fact that the effects of socioeconomic standing, cultural values, and extended kin proximity cancel each other out as far as race differences in kin support are concerned. Although Black men have lower socioeconomic standing than White men that discourages kin support, they have higher levels of extended familistic and altruistic values, more siblings, and more often live with or near extended kin, all of which boost their kin support involvement. Importantly, this phenomenon of socioeconomic characteristics and culture and family composition operating in opposite directions can be observed in separate decomposition analyses for each type of kin support where I observed a similarity of kin support involvement (data available from the author). The racial differences in financial help and transportation help, on the other hand, emerged because one group of factors among these appeared dominant in shaping kin support. For financial help, socioeconomic characteristics appeared to be the dominant explanatory variables, whereas for transportation help, extended family structure is the most important. The effect of race differences in socioeconomic characteristics and extended family structure on financial and transportation help, respectively, is too large to be fully compensated by the race differences in other groups of factors.

Notably, both in explaining the differences and similarities I find that nuclear family structure variables are largely unrelated to kin support. They definitely contribute the least to

understanding either the racial differences in kin support or the overall racial similarity.

Taken together, my findings suggest that while Black men's economic disadvantage hinders their kin support, their cultural values and extended family structures tend to bring their involvement with kin to the levels of the more economically advantaged White men. Thus, the data support the argument of structural destruction theorists that socioeconomic disadvantage translates into disadvantage in familial involvement for Blacks. But these data also support the argument of cultural resiliency theorists that Blacks' cultural values and traditional family forms boost their kin support participation. They do refute, however, the propositions of structural resiliency theorists, who argue poverty increases the familial integration, and more specifically, the prevalence of kin support, as well as the propositions of the cultural deficiency theorists, who claim that deviant Black cultural values reduce their familial integration.

Both structure and culture are important in understanding Black men's familial involvement: Whatever advantages Black men have over White men in terms of kin support come from their cultural values and extended family structure; whatever disadvantages they have stem from their disadvantageous socioeconomic position. Therefore, my data gives support to the arguments of those theorists who criticize the general either/or terms of Black family discussions -- Black families are either "better" or "worse" organized, and it is either culture or structure that shapes family organization (Baca Zinn 1994; Billingsley 1992; Collins 2000; Roschelle 1997; Sewell 1992; Sudarkasa 1988; Taylor 2000). Like these scholars, my data argues for the need for a synthetic rather than dichotomous approach to discussing Black families.

STUDY LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study has at least five other limitations. First, this research does not allow us to address changes over time. Therefore I cannot argue that the networks of support did not deteriorate

among Black men as structural disorganization proponents claim. However, the little literature that does make comparisons over time among Black men casts doubt on that claim. Taylor, Chatters, and Jackson (Taylor, Chatters, and Jackson 1997) use a variety of measures of family integration, including kin support, and show no drastic changes in family integration.[7] Furthermore, as my data indicate, even if some more drastic decline among Blacks or a drastic increase among Whites did occur, it did not make Blacks less involved in these networks than Whites.[8]

Second, it is important to build contextual models examining racial segregation, socioeconomic composition, and other characteristics of communities along with respondents' own race and socioeconomic standing. Contextual analyses would also allow testing of other structural disorganization propositions, such as ones that concern racially and economically segregated "underclass" families having less kin support involvement (Wilson 1987).

Third, while in this paper I focused on kin support across households, in other analyses, not presented here, I have examined support transfers between respondents and their coresident and non-coresident adult children. For both Black and White respondents, kin support involvement is even more prevalent with their coresident adult children than with their non-coresident adult children included here in the definition of kin. Since my analysis also indicated that Black men are significantly more likely to live with their relatives, including adult children, the analyses presented here likely understate the greater involvement of Blacks in many types of kin support.

Fourth, unfortunately, from the data it is not possible to distinguish those people that the

[7] Unfortunately, this study presents no comparable data for White families.

[8] In addition, my preliminary longitudinal analyses utilizing wave I (1987-8) and wave II (1992-4) of NSFH data also demonstrate absence of the decline in kin support among Blacks, either in an absolute terms or relative to Whites' kin support.

respondents consider fictive kin; that is, people who are not related to the respondent by blood, marriage, or formal adoption but are nevertheless viewed as kin by the respondent. It is impossible to find out whether such people were placed into category "other relatives" or into category "non-relatives". Therefore, it is only possible to focus on kin using traditional definition (or respondents' self-definition) of this term. Since, according to the literature, Blacks are more likely than Whites to have fictive kin in their kin networks (Johnson 2000), this measurement problem might lead especially to an underestimate of kin support among Blacks.

Fifth, kin support is only one aspect of family integration; other processes, structures, and outcomes of family life should be examined as well. I focus on kin support as an indicator of family integration, since it recently became the most controversial one, producing the most empirical disagreement for the disorganization versus superorganization debate. However, even though most involved in this debate focus on the prevalence of kin support and assume that kin support is a good indicator of family integration, that issue is far from resolved. While most view extended kin support as a valuable resource benefiting individuals and communities, others find potential problems with it, especially among minorities. They argue that kin support can be physically and psychologically burdensome (Bookwala, Yee, and Schulz 2000; Haley et al. 1995; Marks 1998; Martire and Schulz 2001; Schulz et al. 1995; White, Townsend, and Parris Stephens 2000), can drain already scarce resources (Hicks-Bartlett 2000; Roschelle 1997; Stack 1974), can hinder the development of nonkin networks (Haley et al. 1995; Pashup-Graham 1997), and can connect better-off minority population to their more disadvantaged kin who provide undesirable opportunities and role models (Pattillo-McCoy 1999). To fully resolve superorganization versus disorganization debate, further research is necessary to determine the effects of various aspects of family integration, including kin support, on various aspects of individuals' well-being.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

My research suggests the need to transcend the binary approach to Black families that is implicit in the disorganization versus superorganization debate, both because such an approach misrepresents the reality of family life and because it does so in politically dangerous ways. Both disorganization and superorganization approaches produce an overall (and often a priori) judgment of Black families as either positive, ensuring economic survival and preserving cultural traditions, or negative, hindering economic success or reducing available support and resources. Both of these alternatives are quite dangerous in their political implications. Superorganization theorists are critical of the view of Black families as disorganized and pathological and therefore emphasize only the positive aspects of family life. This may create a romanticized portrayal of Black families as fully protected by familial support safety nets, in need of neither assistance nor structural changes. Disorganization theorists, on the other hand, are critical of the appearance of Black families as having all the support they need. They, therefore, emphasize the social ills of poor Black families, which often easily leads to a portrayal of the Black family as villainous, blamed for poverty, crime, and all other social ills plaguing Black communities (Baca Zinn 1989) and hence deemed undeserving of governmental aid. Thus, because policymakers often misinterpret or misuse social science, the disorganization-superorganization dichotomy contributes to a lose-lose policy situation for Black families.

Furthermore, focusing on comparisons between Blacks and Whites, both camps neglect what I consider much more important. Namely, it is not the relative amount of social support among Blacks and Whites that should be the primary concern. Rather, social policy should be concerned with adequacy of that support to the particular needs of different populations. For example, Hogan, Hao, and Parish (1990) showed that despite the higher access of Black (as compared to

White) young mothers to free kin-provided child care, they were more likely to indicate that they have inadequate access to child care, and that they would look for jobs, work more hours, or go to school or receive job training if only child care were available. Similarly, Cox (1993) showed that Black caregivers of elderly receive more support from their families than White caregivers, yet Blacks also express a greater need for additional help. Having greater support from kin often will not even come close to compensating for the disadvantages of being poor, or minority, or both. Neither researchers nor policy makers pay adequate attention to the differential needs of various populations for supports and services. They also often forget that the basic rule of reciprocity, "what goes around, comes around," can also be reversed to read: "what comes around, goes around." (For an early formulation of this argument, see Stack 1974.) Many people do not receive kin support without reciprocating, which often means further stretching one's limited resources.

REFERENCES

Ahmeduzzaman, Mohammad and Roopnarine, Jaipaul L. 1992. "Sociodemographic Factors, Functioning Style, Social Support, and Fathers' Involvement With Preschoolers in African-American Families." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54(3):699-707.

Albeck, Shulamith and Kaydar, Dania. 2002. "Divorced Mothers: Their Network of Friends Pre- and Post-Divorce." *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage* 36:111-38.

Aldous, Joan. 1969. "Wives' Employment Status and Lower-Class Men As Husband-Fathers: Support for the Moynihan Thesis." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 31:469-76.

Allen, Walter R. 1979. "Class, Culture and Family Organization: The Effects of Class and Race on Family Structure in Urban America." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 10:301-13.

Amato, Paul R. 1993. "Urban-Rural Differences in Helping Friends and Family Members." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 56:249-62.

Ambert, Anne Marie. 1992. *The Effect of Children on Parents*. New York: Hawthorne.

Anderson, Elijah. 1990. *Streetwise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Anderson, Elijah and Massey, Douglas S Ed. 2001. *Problem of the Century: Racial Stratification in the United States*. ix+470pp, New York: Russell Sage.

Aschenbrenner, Joyce. 1973. "Extended Families Among Black Americans." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 4:257-68.

Aschenbrenner, Joyce. 1975. *Lifelines: Black Families in Chicago*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Baca Zinn, Maxine. 1989. "Family, Race, and Poverty in the Eighties." *Signs* 14:856-74.

Baca Zinn, Maxine. 1994. "Feminist Rethinking From Racial-Ethnic Families." Pp. 303-14 in

Women of color in US society, edited by M. Baca Zinn and B. Thornton Dill. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Baca Zinn, Maxine and Barbara Wells. 2000. "Diversity Within Latino Families: New Lessons for Family Social Science." Pp. 252-73 in *Handbook of Family Diversity*, edited by David H. Demo, Katherine R. Allen, and Mark A. Fine. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barker, Judith C., Morrow, Joelle, and Mitteness, Linda S. 12-2-1998. "Gender, Informal Social Support Networks, and Elderly Urban African Americans." *Journal of Aging Studies* 12(2):199-222.

Barrett, Michele. 1980. T*he Anti-Social Family*. London: Verso.

Benin, Mary and Keith, Verna M. 1995. "The Social Support of Employed Black and Anglo Mothers." *Journal of Family Issues* 16:275-97.

Bernard, Jessie. 1966. *Marriage and Family Among Negroes*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Billingsley, Andrew. 1968. *Black Families in White America*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Billingsley, Andrew. 1992. *Climbing Jacob's Ladder: The Enduring Legacy of Black Families*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Bookwala, Jamila, Jennifer Yee, and Richard Schulz. 2000. "Caregiving and Detrimental Mental and Physical Health Outcomes." Pp. 93-131 in *Physical illness and depression in older adults: A handbook of theory, research, and practice*, edited by G. Williamson, D. Shafer, and P. Parmelee. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Bowman, Phillip J. 1993. "The Impact of Economic Marginality Among African American Husbands and Fathers." Pp. 120-140 in *Family ethnicity: Strength in diversity*, edited by

Harriette Pipes McAdoo. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Bowman, Phillip J. and Tyrone A. Forman. 1997. "Instrumental and Expressive Family Roles Among African American Fathers." Pp. 216-47 in *family life in black america*, edited by Robert Joseph Jackson James Taylor. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Browning, Sandra Lee, Miller, R. Robin, and Spruance, Lisa M. 6-1-2001. "Criminal Incarceration Dividing the Ties That Bind: Black Men and Their Families." *Journal of African American Men* 6(1):87-102.

Campbell, Karen E. and Lee, Barrett A. 1992. "Sources of Personal Neighbor Networks: Social Integration, Need, or Time?" *Social Forces* 70:1077-100.

Cancian, Francesca and Oliker, Stacey. 1999. *Caring and Gender*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Carson, Emmett. 1989. "The Evolution of Black Philanthropy." Pp. 92-102 in *Philanthropic Giving: Studies in Varieties and Goals*, edited by R. Magat. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cochran, Donna L. 1997. "African American Fathers: A Decade Review of the Literature." *Families in Society* 78(4):340-351.

Coley, Rebekah Levine. 1998. "Children's Socialization Experiences and Functioning in Single-Mother Households: The Importance of Fathers and Other Men." *Child Development* 69(1):219-30.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1989. "A Comparison of Two Works on Black Family Life." *Signs* 14:875-84.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment, 2nd Edition* . New York: Routledge.

Cooney, Teresa M. and Uhlenberg, Peter. 1992. "Support From Parents Over the Life Course: The Adult Child's Perspective." *Social Forces* 71:63-84.

Coser, Lewis and Coser, Rose. 1974. *Greedy Institutions*. New York: Free Press.

Coward, Raymond T., Lee, Gary R., Netzer, Julie K., Cutler, Stephen J., and Danigelis, Nicholas L. 1996. "Racial Differences in the Household Composition of Elders by Age, Gender, and Area of Residence." *International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 42(3):-227.

Cox, Carole B. 1993. "Service Needs and Interests: A Comparison of Black and White Caregivers Seeking Alzheimer's Assistance." *American Journal of Alzheimer's Care and Related Disorders & Research* 8:33-40.

Dwyer, Jeffrey W., Lee, Gary R., and Jankowski, T. W. 1994. "Reciprocity, Elder Satisfaction, and Caregiving Stress and Burden." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56:35-43.

Eggebeen, David J. 1992. "Family Structure and Intergenerational Exchange." *Research on Aging* 14:427-47.

Eggebeen, David J. 2002. "The Changing Course of Fatherhood: Men's Experiences With Children in Demographic Perspective." *Journal of Family Issues* 23(4):486-506.

Eggebeen, David J., Snyder, A. R., and Manning, Wendy. 1996. "Children in Single-Father Families in Demographic Perspective." *Journal of Family Issues* 17:441-65.

Fagan, Jay. 1998. "Correlates of Low-Income African American and Puerto Rican Fathers' Involvement With Their Children." *The Journal of Black Psychology* 24(3):351-67.

Fairlie, Robert W. An Extension of the Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition Technique to Logit and Probit Models. Center Discussion Paper #873. http://www.econ.yale.edu/~egcenter/ . 2003. Economic Growth Center, Yale University.

Fischer, Claude S. 1982. *to Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks in City and Town*.

Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fischer, Claude S. and Oliker, Stacey J. 1983. “A Research Note on Friendship, Gender, and the Life Cycle." *Social Forces* 62(1):124-33.

Frazier, E Franklin. 1932. *The Negro Family in Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Frazier, E Franklin. 1939. *The Negro Family in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Frazier, E Franklin. 1949. “The Negro Family in America." Pp. 142-58 in *The Family: Its Function and Destiny*, edited by R. N. Anschen. New York: Harper & Row.

Furstenberg, Frank F. 2001. “The Fading Dream: Prospects for Marriage in the Inner City." Pp. 224-46 in *problem of the century: racial stratification in the united states*, edited by Elijah & Massey Douglas Anderson. New York: Russell Sage.

Gallagher, Sally and Gerstel, Naomi. 2001. "Connections and Constraints: The Effects of Children on Caregiving." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63:265-75.

Garfinkel, Irwin, McLanahan, and Sarah. 1986. *Single Mothers and Their Children: A New American Dilemma*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.

Gerstel, Naomi. 1988. "Divorce, Gender, and Social Integration." *Gender and Society* 2:343-63.

Gilder, George. 1981. *Wealth and Poverty*. New York: Basic Books.

Glick, Jennifer E and Van Hook, J. 2002. "Parents' Coresidence With Adult Children: Can Immigration Explain Racial and Ethnic Variation?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 64:240-253.

Glick, Jennifer E., Bean, Frank D., and Van Hook, Jennifer V. W. 1997. "Immigration and Changing Patterns of Extended Family Household Structure in the United States: 1970-1990."

Journal of Marriage and the Family 59(1):177-91.

Goldscheider, Frances K. and Bures, Regina M. 2003. "The Racial Crossover in Family Complexity in the United States." *Demography* 40(3):569-87.

Graham, John W. and Beller, Andrea H. 1996. "Child Support in Black and White: Racial Differentials in the Award and Receipt of Child Support During the 1980s." *Social Science Quarterly* 77(3):528-42.

Haley, William E., West, Constance AC, Wadley, Virginia G., Ford, Greg R., White, Faye A., Barrett, John J., Harrell, Lindy E., and Roth, David L. 1995. "Psychological, Social, and Health Impact of Caregiving: A Comparison of Black and White Dementia Family Caregivers and Noncaregivers." *Psychology and Aging* 10:540-552.

Hamer, Jennifer F. 1998. "What African-American Noncustodial Fathers Say Inhibits and Enhances Their Involvement With Children." *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 22(2):117-27.

Harris, Kathleen Mullan, Furstenberg, Frank F., and Marmer, Jeremy K. 1998. "Paternal Involvement With Adolescents in Intact Families: The Influence of Fathers Over the Life Course." *Demography* 35:201-16.

Hatch, Laurie Russell. 1991. "Informal Support Patterns of Older Black-American and White Women: Examining Effects of Family, Paid Work, and Religious Participation." *Research on Aging* 13:144-70.

Hays, William C. and Mindel, Charles H. 1973. "Extended Kinship Relations in Black and White Families." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 35:51-57.

Heaton, Tim B., Chadwick, Bruce A., and Jacobson, Cradell K. 2000. *Statistical Handbook on Racial Groups in the United States*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.

Hicks-Bartlett, Sharon. 2000. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: The Labyrinth of Working and Parenting in a Poor Community." Pp. 27-51 in *Coping with Poverty: The Social Contexts of Neighborhood, Work, and Family in the Black Community*, edited by S. Danziger and A. Chih Lin. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Hill, Robert B. 1972. T*he Strengths of Black Families*. New York: Emerson Hall.

Hill, Robert B. 1999. *The Strengths of Black Families: Twenty-Five Years Later*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Hofferth, Sandra L. 2003. "Race/Ethnic Differences in Father Involvement in Two-Parent Families: Culture, Context, or Economy?" *Journal of Family Issues* 24(2):185-216.

Hogan, Dennis P., Eggebeen, David J., and Clogg, Clifford C. 1993. "TheStructure of Intergenerational Exchanges in American Families." *American Journal of Sociology* 98:1428-58.

Hogan, Dennis P., Hao, Ling-Xin, and Parish, William L. 1990. "Race, Kin Networks, and Assistance to Mother-Headed Families." *Social Forces* 68:797-812.

Hossain, Ziarat and Roopnarine, Jaipaul L. 1993. "Division of Household Labor and Child Care in Dual-Earner African-American Families With Infants." *Sex Roles* 29(9-10):571-83.

Hossain, Ziarat and Roopnarine, Jaipaul L. 1994. "African-American Fathers' Involvement With Infants: Relationship to Their Functioning Style, Support, Education, and Income." *Infant Behavior and Development* 17(2):175-84.

Hudspeth, Clark D. 2003. "Does Class Matter in Father-Child Interaction?" Ph.D. Dissertation. Mississippi State University.

Hunter, Andrea G. 1997. "Living Arrangements of African American Adults: Variations by Age, Gender, and Family Status." Pp. 262-76 in *Family Life in Black America*, edited by Robert

Joseph Jackson James Taylor. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jayakody, Rukmalie. 1998. "Race Differences in Intergenerational Financial Assistance: The Needs of Children and the Resources of Parents." *Journal of Family Issues* 19:508-33.

Jayakody, Rukmalie, Chatters, Linda M., and Taylor, Robert J. 1993. "Family Support to Single and Married Black Mothers: The Provision of Financial, Emotional, and Child Care Assistance." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55:261-76.

Jewell, Sue K. 1988. *Survival of the Black Family: The Institutional Impact of Us Social Policy*. New York: Praeger.

Johnson, Colleen L. 1999. "Family Life of Older Black Men." *Journal of Aging Studies* 13(2):145-60.

Johnson, Colleen L. 2000. "Perspectives on American Kinship in the Later 1990s." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:623-39.

Johnson, David R. and Elliott, Lisa A. 1998. "Sampling Design Effects: Do They Affect the Analyses of Data From the National Survey of Families and Households?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60:993-1001.

Johnson, Michael P. and Leslie, Leigh A. 1982. "Couple Involvement and Network Size: A Test of the Dyadic Withdrawal Hypothesis." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 45:34-43.

Julian, Teresa W., McKenry, Patrick C., and McKelvey, Mary W. 1994. "Cultural Variations in Parenting: Perceptions of Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, and Asian-American Parents." *Family Relations* 43(1):30-37.

Kaplan, Elaine Bell. 1997. *Not My Kind of Girl: Unraveling the Myths of Black Teenage Motherhood*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Kelly, Joan Berlin. 1986. "Divorce: The Adult Perspective." Pp. 304-8 in *Family in Transition*,

edited by A. Skolnick and J. Skolnick. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Kivett, V. R. 1991. "Centrality of the Grandfather Role Among Older Rural Black and White Men." *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences* 46:S250-S258.

Laditka, James N. and Laditka, Sarah B. 2001. "Adult Children Helping Older Parents: Variations in the Likelihood and Hours by Gender, Race, and Family Role." *Research on Aging* 23:429-56.

Ladner, Joyce. 1972. *Tomorrow's Tomorrow: The Black Woman*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Landale, Nancy S. and Oropesa, R. S. 2001. "Father Involvement in the Lives of Mainland Puerto Rican Children: Contributions of Nonresident, Cohabiting and Married Fathers." *Social Forces* 79(3):945-68.

Lawton, Leora, Silverstein, Merril, and Bengston, Vern. 1994. "Affection, Social Contact and Geographic Distance Between Adult Children and Their Parents." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56:57-68.

Lee, Yean Ju and Aytac, Isik A. 1998. "Intergenerational Financial Support Among Whites, Blacks, and Latinos." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60:426-41.

Lempert, Lora Bex. 1999. "Other Fathers: an Alternative Perspective on Black Community Caring." Pp. 189-201 in *The Black Family: Essays and Studies*, edited by R. Staples. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lerman, Robert I. 1986. "Who Are the Young Absent Fathers?" *Youth and Society* 18(1):3-27.

Lewis, Jane. 2001. "Is Marriage the Answer to the Problems of Family Change?" *Political Quarterly* 72:437-45.

Littlejohn-Blake, Sheila M. and Darling, Carol Anderson. 1993. "Understanding the Strengths of Black Families." *Journal of Black Studies* 23:460-471.

Marks, Nadine F. 1996. "Caregiving Across the Lifespan: National Prevalence and Predictors." *Family Relations* 45:27-36.

Marks, Nadine F. 1998. "Does It Hurt to Care? Caregiving, Work-Family Conflict, and Midlife Well-Being." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60:951-66.

Marsiglio, William. 1991. "Paternal Engagement Activities With Minor Children." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53(4):973-86.

Marsiglio, William. 1995. "Young Nonresident Biological Fathers." *Marriage and Family Review* 20(3-4):-348.

Martire, Lynn and Richard Schulz. 2001. "Informal Caregiving to Older Adults: Health Effects of Providing and Receiving Care." Pp. 477-94 in *Handbook of Health Psychology*, edited by A. Baum Mahwah. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McCray, Carrie A. 1980. "The Black Woman and Family Roles." Pp. 67-87 in *The Black Woman*, edited by L. F. Rodgers-Rose. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

McDonald, Katrina Bell and Armstrong, Elizabeth M. 2001. "De-Romanticizing Black Intergenerational Support: The Questionable Expectations of Welfare Reform." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 63:213-23.

McLoyd, Vonnie C., Cauce, Ana Mari, Takeuchi, David, and Wilson, Leon. 2000. "Marital Processes and Parental Socialization in Families of Color: A Decade Review of Research." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62(4):1070-1093.

Milardo, Robert M. 1987. "Changes in Social Networks of Women and Men Following Divorce." *Journal of Family Issues* 8:78-96.

Moore, Gwen. 1990. "Structural Determinants of Men's and Women's Personal Networks." *American Sociological Review* 55:726-35.

Mott, Frank L. 1990. "When Is a Father Really Gone? Paternal-Child Conduct in Father-Absent Homes." *Demography* 27(4):499-517.

Moynihan, Daniel P. 1965. *The Negro Family: A Case for National Action*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Munch, Allison, McPherson, J. Miller, and Smith-Lovin, Lynn. 1997. "Gender, Children and Social Contact." *American Sociological Review* 62:509-20.

Murray, Charles. 1984. *Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950-1980*. New York: Basic Books.

Musick, Marc A., Wilson, John, and Bynum, William B. J. 2000. "Race and Formal Volunteering: The Differential Effects of Class and Religion." *Social Forces* 78:1539-71.

Mutran, Elizabeth. 1985. "Intergenerational Support Among Blacks and Whites: Response to Culture or to Socio-Economic Differences." *Journal of Gerontology* 40:382-89.

Newman, Katherine. 2001. "Local Caring: Social Capital and Social Responsibility in New York's Minority Neighborhoods." Pp. 157-77 in *Caring and Doing for Others: Social Responsibility in the Domains of Family, Work, and Community*, edited by Alice S. Rossi. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Newman, Katherine S. 1999. *No Shame in My Game: The Working Poor in the Inner City*. New York: Alfred A Knopf, Inc and Russell Sage Foundation.

Nobles, Wade W. 1978. "Toward an Empirical and Theoretical Framework for Defining Black Families." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 40:679-90.

Nunnally, Jum C. 1978. *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oliker, Stacey J. 2000. "Examining Care at Welfare's End." Pp. 167-85 in *Care Work: Gender, Labor, and Welfare State*, edited by Madonna Harrington Meyer. London: Routledge.

Oliver, Melvin L. and Shapiro, Thomas M. 1997. *Black Wealth/ White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. New York: Routledge.

Parish, William L., Hao, Lingxin, and Hogan, Dennis P. 1991. "Family Support Networks, Welfare, and Work Among Young Mothers." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53:203-15.

Pashup-Graham, Jennifer. 1997. *The Importance of Family and Its Effects on Social Organization in a Mexican, Immigrant Community.* American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.

Patterson, Orlando. 1998. *Rituals of Blood: Consequences of Slavery in Two American Centuries*. Washington, DC: Civitas/Counterpoint.

Pattillo-McCoy, Mary. 1999. *Black Picket Fences: Privilege and Peril Among the Black Middle Class*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Peterson, Debra F. 1996. "The Effect of Race on Kinship Support: A Meta-Analysis." Ph.D. Dissertation. Department of Sociology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE.

Peterson, Robert A. 1994. "A Meta-Analysis of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha." *Journal of Consumer Research* 21:381-91.

Rainwater, Lee. 1970. *Behind Ghetto Walls: Black Families in a Federal Slum*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

Raley, R. Kelly. 1995. "Black-White Differences in Kin Contact and Exchange Among Never-Married Adults." *Journal of Family Issues* 16:77-103.

Rawlins, William K. 1992. *Friendship Matters*. New York: Aldine deGruyter.

Roberts, Dorothy. 1998. "The Absent Black Father." Pp. 145-61 in *Lost Fathers: The Politics of Fatherlessness in America*, edited by Cynthia R Daniels. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Robinson, John P. and Godbey, Geoffrey. 1997. *Time for Life: the Surprising Ways Americans*

Use Their Time. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Roschelle, Anne R. 1997. *No More Kin: Exploring Race, Class, and Gender in Family Networks*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rossi, Alice S. and Rossi, Peter H. 1990. *Of Human Bonding: Parent-Child Relations Across the Life Course*. New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Samuel, Javiette VaShann. 2002. "Breaking the Cycle of Absent Fathers: Highly Involved African-American Nonresidential Fathers Describe Their Roles and Responsibilities Beyond Biological Paternity." Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Tennessee.

Sanderson, Susan and Thompson, Vetta L. S. 2002. "Factors Associated With Perceived Paternal Involvement in Childrearing." *Sex Roles* 46(3-4):99-111.

Sarkisian, Natalia and Gerstel, Naomi. 2004. "Explaining the Gender Gap in Help to Parents: The Importance of Employment." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 66:430-450.

Scanzoni, John. 1977. *The Black Family in Modern Society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Schulz, Richard, O'Brien, Alison, Bookwala, Jamila, and Fleissner, Kathy. 1995. "Psychiatric and Physical Morbidity Effects of Dementia Caregiving: Prevalence, Correlates, and Causes." *The Gerontologist* 35:771-91.

Scott, Joseph W. and Albert Black. 1999. "Deep Structures of Black Family Life: Female and Male Kin Networks." Pp. 232-40 in *The Black Family: Essays and Studies*, edited by Robert Staples. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

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

Seltzer, Judith A. and Bianchi, Suzanne M. 1988. "Children's Contact With Absent Parents."

Journal of Marriage and the Family 50(3):663-77.

Seltzer, Judith A., Schaeffer, Nora Cate, and Charng, Hong wen. 1989. "Family Ties After Divorce: The Relationship Between Visiting and Paying Child Support." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51(4):1013-31.

Sewell, William H. J. 1992. “A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98:1-29.

Silverstein, Merril and Waite, Linda J. 1993. "Are Blacks More Likely Than Whites to Receive and Provide Social Support in Middle and Old Age? Yes, No, and Maybe So." *Journal of Gerontology* 48:212-22.

Smock, Pamela J. and Manning, Wendy D. 1997. "Nonresident Parents' Characteristics and Child Support." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 59(4):798-808.

Spitze, Glenna and Miner, Sonia. 1992. "Gender Differences in Adult Child Contact Among Black Elderly Parents." *The Gerontologist* 32(2):213-18.

Stack, Carol B. 1974. *All My Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Harper & Row.

Stack, Carol B. 1981. "Sex Roles and Survival Strategies in an Urban Black Community." Pp. 349-67 in *The Black Women Cross-Culturally*, edited by Filomena Steady Chioma. Cambridge, MA: Schenkmann.

Staples, Robert. 1973. *The Black Woman in America*. Chicago, IL: Neilson-Hall.

Staples, Robert. 1981. “The Myth of the Black Matriarchy." Pp. 335-48 in *The Black Women Cross-Culturally*, edited by Filomena Steady Chioma. Cambridge, MA: Schenkmann.

Staples, Robert. 1988. “The Black American Family." Pp. 303-23 in *Ethnic Families in America: Patterns and Variations (3rd ed)*, edited by Charles H. Mindel, R. Beberstein, and R. Jr

Wright. New York: Elsevier.

Staples, Robert E. 1985. "Changes in Black Family Structure: The Conflict Between Family Ideology and Structural Conditions." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 47(4):1005-13.

Stier, Haya and Marta Tienda. 1993. "Are Men Marginal to Their Families?" Pp. 23-44 in *Men, Work, and Family*, edited by Jane C. Hood. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication.

Stoll, Michael A. 2001. "Race, Neighborhood Poverty, and Participation in Voluntary Associations." *Sociological Forum* 16:529-57.

Sudarkasa, Niara. 1988. "Interpreting the Black Heritage in Afro-American Family Organization." Pp. 27-43 in *Black Families (2nd ed)*, edited by Harriette Pipes McAdoo. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Sweet, James A and Larry L Bumpass. 1996. The National Survey of Families and Households - Waves 1 and 2: Data Description and Documentation. http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/nsfh/home.htm Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Center for Demography and Ecology.

Sweet, James A, Larry L Bumpass, and V Call. 1988. The Design and Content of the National Survey of Families and Households" (NSFH Working Paper No 1). http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/cde/nsfhwp/nsfh1.pdf . Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, Center for Demography and Ecology.

Taylor, Robert J., Linda M. Chatters, and James S. Jackson. 1997. "Changes Over Time in Support Network Involvement Among Black Americans." Pp. 293-316 in *Family Life in Black America*, edited by Robert J. Taylor, James S. Jackson, and Linda M. Chatters. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Taylor, Robert J., Cheryl Burns Hardison, and Linda M. Chatters. 1996. "Kin and Nonkin As

Sources of Informal Assistance." Pp. 130-145 in *Mental Health in Black America*, edited by H. W. Neighbors and James S. Jackson. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Taylor, Robert J., Belinda M. Tucker, Linda M. Chatters, and Rukmalie Jayakody. 1997a. "Recent Demographic Trends in Black Family Structure." Pp. 14-62 in *Family Life in Black America*, edited by Robert J. Taylor, James S. Jackson, and Linda M. Chatters. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Taylor, Robert Joseph. 1988. "Structural Determinants of Religious Participation Among Black Americans." *Review of Religious Research* 30:114-25.

Taylor, Robert Joseph, Chatters, Linda M., Tucker, M. Belinda, and Lewis, Edith. 1990. "Developments in Research on Black Families: A Decade Review." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52(4):993-1014.

Taylor, Robert Joseph, M. Belinda Tucker, Linda M. Chatters, and Rukmalie Jayakody. 1997b. "Recent Demographic Trends in African American Family Structure." Pp. 14-62 in *family life in black america*, edited by Robert Joseph Jackson James Taylor. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Taylor, Ronald L. 2000. "Diversity Within Black Families." Pp. 232-51 in *Handbook of Family Diversity*, edited by David H. Demo, Katherine R. Allen, and Mark A. Fine. New York: Oxford University Press.

Thompson, Aaron and Lawson, Erma J. 4-1-1999. "African American Men and Fatherhood: A Look From Divorced Fathers." *Journal of African American Men* 4(1):37-51.

Tolnay, Stewart E. 1999. T*he Bottom Rung: Black Family Life on Southern Farms*. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Toth, John F. and Xu, Xiaohe. 1999. "Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Fathers' Involvement: A Racial /Ethnic Comparison of African American, Hispanic, and White Fathers." *Youth and*

Society 31(1):76-99.

Tucker, Belinda M. and Claudia Mitchell-Kernan. 1995. "Trends in Black Family Formation: A Theoretical and Statistical Overview." Pp. 3-26 in *The Decline of Marriage among Blacks: Causes, Consequences, and Policy Implications*, edited by Belinda M. Tucker and Claudia Mitchell-Kernan. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Turner, R. Jay and Marino, Franco. 1994. "Social Support and Social Structure: A Descriptive Epidemiology." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 35:193-212.

Wade, Jay C. 1994. "African American Fathers and Sons: Social, Historical, and Psychological Considerations." *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services* 75(9):561-70.

Waite, Linda J. and Harrison, Scott C. 1992. "Keeping in Touch: How Women in Mid-Life Allocate Social Contacts Among Kith and Kin." *Social Forces* 70:637-55.

Walker, Alexis. 2001. "Conceptual Perspectives on Gender and Family Caregiving." Pp. 34-48 in *Gender, Families and Elder Care*, edited by J. W. Dwyer and R. Coward. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Wallerstein, Judith S. and Kelly, Joan Berlin. 1980. *Surviving the Breakup*. New York: Basic Books.

White, Tracela M., Townsend, Aloen L., and Parris Stephens, Mary Ann. 2000. "Comparisons of Black and White Women in the Parent Care Role." *The Gerontologist* 40:718-28.

Whitmore, Gerald. 1999. "African American Father Figures and Children's Achievement." *Journal of African American Men* 4(1):25-35.

Wilcox, W. Bradford. 2002. "Religion, Convention, and Paternal Involvement." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 64(3):780-792.

Wilson, John and Musick, Marc A. 1997. "Who Cares? Toward an Integrated Theory of Volunteer Work." *American Sociological Review* 62:694-713.

Wilson, William J. 1987. *the Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Yeung, W. Jean, Sandberg, John F., Davis-Kean, Pamela E., and Hofferth, Sandra L. 2001. "Children's Time With Fathers in Intact Families." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 63(1):136-54.

Table 1. Percentage of Men Giving Support to Extended Kin, by Race

Variables	Whites	Blacks
Kin Support by Type:		
Financial Help	33.06	20.88***
Emotional Care	65.60	63.67
Personal Care	16.06	13.92
Transportation Help	36.70	42.34*
Household Maintenance Help	38.07	40.97
Child Care Help	27.80	29.13
Any Kin Support	80.79	79.20

Table 2. Means of Kin Support Predictors, by Race

Variables	Whites (N=2983)	Blacks (N=590)
Culture:		
Value of marriage	0.06	-0.10***
Value of children	0.10	0.06
Nonmaternal care attitudes	-0.17	0.12***
Extended familism	0.02	0.20***
Altruism	-0.14	0.04***
Moderate church attendance	0.40	0.50***
Frequent church attendance	0.30	0.32
Socioeconomic characteristics:		
Income	0.83	0.58***
Wealth	7.53	2.42***
Education	13.44	11.53***
Employment	0.73	0.68
Vehicle ownership	0.93	0.77***
Home ownership	0.72	0.48***
Nuclear family structure:		
Unpartnered	0.22	0.42***
Children under 13 y.o.	0.27	0.25
Children 13-18 y.o.	0.15	0.19*
Nonresident parent	0.10	0.23***
Extended family structure:		
Adult children	0.48	0.47
Grandchildren	0.34	0.37
Parents	0.67	0.67
Number of siblings	4.77	6.10***
Coresident adults	2.44	3.44***
Kin within 2 miles	0.36	0.50***
Kin in 2-25 miles	0.37	0.34
Controls:		
Age	0.27	-2.81***
Age squared	2.59	2.33
Health	0.08	0.05

Table 3. Explaining the Race Differences in Kin Support

Variables	Financial Help (N=3555)	Transportation Help (N=3453)
Race only model		
Black	0.65***	1.27*
Pseudo R^2	0.003	0.001
Culture model		
Black	0.63***	1.16
Pseudo R^2	0.013	0.007
Socioeconomic model		
Black	1.09	1.41**
Pseudo R^2	0.066	0.011
Nuclear family model		
Black	0.69***	1.28*
Pseudo R^2	0.023	0.015
Extended family model		
Black	0.70**	0.98
Pseudo R^2	0.056	0.051
Full model		
Black	0.94	1.00
Pseudo R^2	0.136	0.08
Culture:		
Value of marriage	0.86*	1.00
Value of children	1.11	1.03
Nonmaternal care attitudes	0.82**	1.07
Extended familism	1.20**	1.12
Altruism	1.12	1.29**
Moderate church attendance	1.26	1.31**
Frequent church attendance	1.41*	1.32
Socioeconomic characteristics:		
Income	1.92***	1.10
Wealth	1.03***	1.01
Education	1.10***	1.04*
Employment	1.61**	0.89
Vehicle ownership	1.33	2.04***
Home ownership	1.17	0.81
Nuclear family structure:		
Unpartnered	1.18	0.99
Children under 13 y.o.	0.85	0.87
Children 13-18 y.o.	0.81	1.59***
Nonresident parent	1.88***	0.82
Extended family structure:		
Adult children	4.18***	0.93
Grandchildren	0.86	1.19
Parents	1.07	1.61***
Number of siblings	1.02	1.02
Coresident adults	0.99	1.12***
Kin within 2 miles	1.44**	3.17***
Kin in 2-25 miles	1.13	1.95***
Controls:		
Age	1.00	0.99
Age squared	1.01	0.94***
Health	0.97	0.88*

Table 4. Decomposition of White-Black Differential in Giving Kin Support

Variables	Observed Means		Observed Coefficients		Amount of Racial Difference Due to a Difference in	
	White	Black	White	Black	Means	Coefficients
Culture:						
Value of marriage	0.06	-0.10	0.17 *	-0.16	0.01***	-0.12
Value of children	0.10	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.01
Nonmaternal care attitudes	-0.17	0.12	0.14	-0.15	0.04***	-0.13
Extended familism	0.02	0.20	0.10	0.13	-0.33***	-0.05
Altruism	-0.14	0.04	0.15	0.52 *	-0.91***	0.29
Moderate church attendance	0.40	0.50	0.42 **	0.76 *	-0.89***	-2.45
Frequent church attendance	0.30	0.32	0.30	1.19 **	-0.33	-4.42 *
Subtotal					-2.39	-6.87
Socioeconomic characteristics:						
Income	0.83	0.58	0.54 **	0.62	2.38***	-0.93
Wealth	7.53	2.42	0.03 **	0.03	2.46***	-0.16
Education	13.44	11.53	0.13 ***	0.09 **	3.45***	7.43
Employment	0.73	0.68	-0.14	0.64	0.20	-8.82 *
Vehicle ownership	0.93	0.77	0.55 *	0.16	0.87***	5.24
Home ownership	0.72	0.48	-0.07	0.31	0.45***	-3.65
Subtotal					9.80	-0.90
Nuclear family structure:						
Unpartnered	0.22	0.42	-0.17	0.47	-0.46***	-3.31
Children under 13 y.o.	0.27	0.25	-0.47 **	-0.58	-0.16	0.43
Children 13-18 y.o.	0.15	0.19	0.17	0.51	-0.20*	-0.92
Nonresident parent	0.10	0.23	-0.02	-0.15	0.18***	0.35
Subtotal					-0.65	-3.45
Extended family structure:						
Adult children	0.48	0.47	0.8 ***	-0.71	0.01	11.49 **
Grandchildren	0.34	0.37	0.10	0.81 *	-0.24	-4.05
Parents	0.67	0.67	0.18	0.55	0.02	-3.96
Number of siblings	4.77	6.10	0.05 **	0.03	-0.86***	2.07
Coresident adults	2.44	3.44	0.11 **	0.02	-1.09***	4.32
Kin within 2 miles	0.36	0.50	0.93 ***	0.79 *	-2.02***	1.02
Kin in 2-25 miles	0.37	0.34	0.64 ***	0.58	0.21	0.34
Subtotal					-3.98	11.23
Controls:						
Age	0.27	-2.81	-0.04 ***	-0.02	-1.47***	0.41
Age squared	2.59	2.33	-0.01	0.05	0.10	-2.27
Health	0.08	0.05	-0.01	-0.31 *	-0.08	0.30
Subtotal					-1.44	-1.56
Total					1.34	-1.55
Observed involvement rates	White	80.79				
	Black	79.20				
Observed race difference		1.59				
Race difference adjusted for means		0.25				

Appendix A. Independent variables: Description, Means, Standard Deviations (in parentheses), and Significant Differences by Race.

Variable	Operationalization	White (N=2983)	Black (N=590)
Culture:			
Value of marriage	A scale (alpha=.82) formed using factor analysis of ten self-administered questionnaire variables measured on a scale 1 to 5 where 1 is strongly agree and 5 is strongly disagree and including the following statements: (1) A man can have a fully satisfying life without getting married; (2) A woman can have a fully satisfying life without getting married; (3) Marriage is a lifetime relationship and should never be ended except under extreme circumstances; (4) It is all right for a man to have a child without being married; (5) It is all right for a couple with an unhappy marriage to get a divorce when their youngest child is under age 5; (6) It is all right for an unmarried couple to live together even if they have no interest in marriage; (7) It is all right for unmarried 18 year olds to have sexual relations if they have strong affection for each other; (8) It is all right for a woman to have a child without being married; (9) When a marriage is troubled and unhappy, it is generally better for the children if the couple stays together; (10) It is all right for an unmarried couple to live together as long as they have plans to marry. Missing cases on individual indicators are imputed with the average value non-missing indicators whenever possible and using multiple regression imputation otherwise.	0.06 (1.05)	-0.10 *** (1.00)
Value of children	A scale (alpha=.80) formed using factor analysis of two self-administered questionnaire variables measured on a scale 1 to 5 where 1 is strongly agree and 5 is strongly disagree and including the following statements: (1) A woman can have a fully satisfying life without having children; (2) A man can have a fully satisfying life without having children. Missing cases on individual indicators are imputed with the average value non-missing indicators whenever possible and using multiple regression imputation otherwise.	0.10 (0.94)	0.06 (0.78)
Nonmaternal care attitudes	A scale (alpha=.70) formed using factor analysis of three self-administered questionnaire variables measured on a scale 1 to 5 where 1 is strongly agree and 5 is strongly disagree and including the following statements: (1) It is all right for children under three years old to be cared for all day in a day care center; (2) Preschool children are likely to suffer if their mother is employed; (3) It is all right for mothers to work full-time when their youngest child is under age 5. Missing cases on individual indicators are imputed with the average value non-missing indicators whenever possible and using multiple regression imputation otherwise.	-0.17 (0.96)	0.12 *** (0.75)
Extended familism	A scale (alpha=0.62) formed using factor analysis of five self-administered questionnaire variables measured on a scale 1 to 5 where 1 is strongly agree and 5 is strongly disagree and including the following statements: (1) Parents ought to provide financial help to their adult children when the children are having financial difficulty; (2) Parents ought to let their adult children live with them when the children are having problems; (3) Children ought to provide financial help to aging parents when their parents are having financial difficulty; (4)Children ought to let aging parents live with them when the parents can no longer live by themselves.; (5) Parents ought to help their children with college expenses. Missing cases on individual indicators are imputed with the average value non-missing indicators whenever possible and using multiple regression imputation otherwise.	0.02 (0.93)	0.20 *** (0.92)

Appendix A, Continued.

Variable	Operationalization	White (N=2983)	Black (N=590)
Altruism	A scale (alpha=0.50) formed using factor analysis of two self-administered questionnaire variables measured on a scale 1 to 5 or 1 to 6 where 1 is strongly agree and 6 (or 5) is strongly disagree and include the following statements: (1) People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others; (2) I feel I should give as much time or money as I can to help others. Missing cases on individual indicators are imputed with the value of the second indicator whenever possible and using multiple regression imputation otherwise.	-0.14 (0.71)	0.04 *** (0.54)
Moderate church attendance	1=Respondent attends religious services but less often than once a week (between 1 and 49 times a year). Based on the question "How often do you attend religious services?" where respondents reported number of times they attended either per year, month, week, or day; all responses then were recoded into yearly, and two dichotomous variables were generated. Omitted category: Does not attend religious services.	0.40 (0.54)	0.50 *** (0.52)
Frequent church attendance	1=Respondent attends religious services once a week or more (50 times a year or more). The second dichotomous variable based on the question "How often do you attend religious services?"	0.30 (0.50)	0.32 (0.46)
Socioeconomic characteristics:			
Income	Natural logarithm of total per adult income of all members of the household (relatives and non-relatives) in the past year measured in $10000s; based on NSFH II constructed measure of total household income, as well as number of adults in the household. Missing cases (households where the respondent is not a householder, N= 482) were imputed using multiple regression imputation on the basis of respondent's income, socioeconomic standing and household structure.	0.83 (0.55)	0.58 *** (0.46)
Wealth	Wealth per person is calculated as total assets minus total debts of respondent and spouse or partner measured in $10000s and divided by two if a spouse/partner is present. It is truncated on the bottom at -$15000 (debt) and on the top at $500000 (assets); includes value of and debt on home, other real estate, vehicle, and business or farm, total value of savings and investments, and total amount owed on credit cards, installment loans, educational loans, bank loans or mortgage, loans from friends or relatives, home improvement loans, other bills outstanding for more than 2 months, and other debts (missing values on individual indicators were imputed using multiple regression imputation).	7.53 (10.47)	2.42 *** (6.22)
Education	Years of completed education; based on NSFH II constructed measure of education; missing cases (N=19) imputed using multiple regression imputation.	13.44 (3.42)	11.53 *** (3.34)
Employment	Respondent's employment status is a dichotomy indicating whether or not the respondent currently works for pay; constructed from a series of questions on employment history and hours.	0.73 (0.55)	0.68 (0.55)
Vehicle ownership	1 = Respondent or spouse own motor vehicles, including cars, trucks, campers, boats, and other recreational vehicles; missing values (N=29) imputed using multiple regression imputation of the vehicle monetary value.	0.93 (0.38)	0.77 *** (0.46)
Home ownership	1 = Respondent or spouse own or are buying their home; missing values (N=55) are imputed using multiple regression imputation of the home monetary value.	0.72 (0.52)	0.48 *** (0.57)

Appendix A, Continued.

Variable	Operationalization	White (N=2983)	Black (N=590)
Nuclear family structure:			
Unpartnered	1 = Currently not married; missing cases (N=3) imputed suing NSFH I relationship status data.	0.22 (0.49)	0.42 *** (0.53)
Children under 13 y.o.	1 = Respondent has own or spouse/partner's children (biological, adopted, foster) 0 to 12 years of age in the household	0.27 (0.52)	0.25 (0.42)
Children 13-18 y.o.	1 = Respondent has own or spouse/partner's children (biological, adopted, foster) 13 to 18 years of age in the household	0.15 (0.39)	0.19 * (0.42)
Nonresident parent	1 = Respondent has own children (biological, adopted, foster) living outside of the household	0.10 (0.26)	0.23 *** (0.44)
Extended family structure:			
Adult children	1=Respondent has children over 18 years of age, residing in or out of the household.	0.48 (0.58)	0.47 (0.56)
Grandchildren	1 = Respondent's children or spouse/partner's children have children (or stepchildren); missing data (N=83) imputed with zero (assuming no grandchildren).	0.34 (0.55)	0.37 (0.51)
Parents	1=Respondent's mother and/or father are still living; missing data (N=43) imputed with zero (assuming no living parents).	0.67 (0.48)	0.67 (0.50)
Number of siblings	Number of respondent's full siblings, half-siblings, stepsiblings, and siblings-in-law (spouse's or partner's full, half, and step siblings), truncated at 10; missing data (N=20) imputed using regression imputation.	4.77 (3.63)	6.10 *** (3.14)
Coresident adults	Total number of adults (19 years of age or older) in the household that are not the respondent or respondent's spouse.	2.44 (2.34)	3.44 *** (2.61)
Kin within 2 miles	1 = The closest (at least one) non-coresident first-degree extended kin (includes parents, parents-in-law, adult children, and siblings) lives within 2 miles from the respondent (if the data were missing for a specific relative, the data of other relatives were given priority). These categories are based on the frequency distribution as well as Roschelle's (1997) categories.	0.36 (0.53)	0.50 *** (0.51)
Kin in 3-25 miles	1 = The closest (at least one) non-coresident first-degree extended kin (includes parents, parents-in-law, adult children, and siblings) lives between 3 and 25 miles from the respondent.	0.37 (0.50)	0.34 (0.46)
Controls:			
Age	Age in years (based on NSFH I and II age and birth date data) with the weighted mean of age (48.19579) subtracted	0.27 (20.35)	-2.81 *** (16.95)
Age squared	Age in years with the weighted mean of age (48.19579) subtracted and then squared and divided by 100 for convenience of coefficient presentation.	2.59 (4.82)	2.33 (2.81)
Health	Respondent's health is a scale (alpha =.61) based on three sets of questions: (1) Compared to other people your age, how would you describe your health? (on a scale from *1 = very poor* to *5 = excellent)*; (2) How satisfied are you with your health? (on a scale from 1 = *very dissatisfied* to 7 = *very satisfied*); and (3) A set of questions asking "How much do physical or mental conditions limit your ability to.." do seven different everyday tasks (on a scale from 1 = *doesn't limit at all* to 3 = *limits a lot*).	0.08 (1.03)	0.05 (0.88)