

Men's and Women's Reports of Nonbiological Children within the Household: Data from the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth

Jo Jones, PhD
National Center for Health Statistics

Brittany McGill, MPP
National Center for Health Statistics

Rosalind Berkowitz King, PhD
National Institute for Child Health and Human Development

Penelope Maza, PhD
Children's Bureau

Introduction

The traditional view of the parent-child relationship assumes both social and biological connections. However, as is well-known, over the past few decades the prevalence of adults living with children to whom they lack a parent-child biological relationship has increased. The mechanisms behind this increase include remarriage and cohabitation, intergenerational households, and relative and non-relative fostering, as well as conventional adoption. While adoption is a formal legalized relationship, other types of arrangements are incompletely institutionalized. For example, step parents may feel ambiguous about participating in parental efforts to discipline a step child because of the lack of legal ties binding them (Ganong, et al., 1998). The indeterminate aspects of these relationships – in terms of “the exercise of authority, the allocation of resources, the bonding of members, routines and rituals” (Cherlin and Furstenberg 1994) – are associated with negative consequences for children (e.g., Manning and Smock 2000; Marsiglio 1991). Thus, women's and men's caring for nonbiological children is a matter of public and research interest.

In this paper, we provide a portrait of the women and men who engage in these caring practices, based on nationally representative data from the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG). We examine the prevalence of adults caring for nonbiological children and some characteristics of those relationships (e.g., existence of legal or blood tie), and we look for

variation along the lines of race and ethnicity (e.g., McDaniel and Morgan 1996), marital status, education, parity, religion, and infertility status. The use of NSFG household roster data, which are not publicly available, and the inclusion of men's reports as well as women's make this analysis a particularly useful contribution to extant research.

Literature Review

The findings reported in this paper will be interpreted within the context of what is already known about the care of nonbiological children within the household by adult men and women, some of which has already been referenced. The in-depth literature review will focus specifically on the various forms this takes including adoptions by relatives and non-relatives, step parenting, care of a non-marital partner's children, guardians, foster parenting, and relative caretakers.

We expect that the most information will be available on step parenting, adoption, and relative care. These populations have been described in recent reports from the U.S. Census Bureau and the Current Population Survey. These reports focus on children and produce estimates of children living in households where the household head is the child's biological, adoptive or step parent (Fields, 2001; Kreider and Fields, 2005; Lugaila and Overturf, 2004) whereas we examine adults caring for nonbiological children of all relationship types. We will include discussion of recent estimates of adoption and demand for adoption from the 2002 NSFG. Additional information about the incidence of adoption has been reported by the National Center for State Court, the National Adoption Information Clearinghouse, and the National Council for Adoption, the latter of which has also used NSFG data (Jones, forthcoming 2006). Information on children adopted from the public foster care system is available from reports generated from the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System. This data system also contains some limited information on foster parents which will be examined.

If available, other national data on these populations will be reviewed. However, we expect that there is very little, if any, national data available on guardianships or caretakers of non-marital partner's children. We will also search for smaller studies which may have been done on these populations that can provide context to our analyses here.

Data and Methods:

The National Survey of Family Growth is a nationally representative household survey conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics and designed to provide reliable national data on fertility, marriage, divorce, contraception, infertility, adoption, and the health of women in the United States. The data used in this analysis come from the most recent cycle of the NSFG, Cycle 6, which was conducted in 2002 and included men in its sample for the first time as well. The data thus constitute a nationally representative sample of women and men 15-44 years of age. The female interview averaged about 80 minutes in length, while the male interview averaged about 60 minutes. Interviews were conducted in the respondents' homes using laptop computers, and the overall response rate for the 2002 NSFG was 79 percent. This is the first time that national data on men regarding their experience with parenting nonbiological children has been collected.

Because caring for nonbiological children is rare among men and women 15-17 years of age, this paper focuses on the experiences of adults 18-44 years of age. As such, the analytic sample here consists of 6,969 women and 4,295 men. All results are weighted to produce national estimates of the prevalence and characteristics of women and men caring for nonbiological children.

This analysis will further focus on men and women with nonbiological children *currently* living in the household who are less than 18 years of age. Household roster data classifies each person in the household by his or her relationship to the respondent. The relationship categories used to create nonbiological children are: step child, adopted child, legal ward, foster

child, partner's child, grandchild, and niece or nephew. Because our analysis focuses on nonbiological children under the care and responsibility of the respondent, we eliminated cases where this was in doubt. For instance, if the respondent reported a grandchild *and* a child, we assumed that the respondent's child was the grandchild's parent and, therefore, responsible for the care of the grandchild. Nephews or nieces were not classified as under the care and responsibility of the respondent if the respondent also reported a parent, a legal guardian, or a sibling present in the household. This yields a conservative estimate of the number of nonbiological children in these groups.

If the respondent is married or cohabiting, information on the relationship of each household member aged 18 or younger to the respondent's current spouse or partner in the household is also collected. The relationship categories of the child to the spouse or partner are not identical to those offered in the household roster; the categories are: biological parent, step parent, adoptive parent, other relation, and not related. In cases in which a household member under 18 years of age was not reported as a child by the respondent, we used this variable to infer the relationship of the household member to the respondent, provided this was the household member's usual residence. For example, if a married respondent reports the child as a nonrelative in the household roster yet as a biological child of his or her spouse, we reclassified the child to be the respondent's step child.

We combined the 8 categories of relationship type listed above into 3 groups:

- 1) step children—all step children, including those adopted by the respondent;
- 2) other related children—a cohabiting partner's children, grandchildren, nephews, and nieces; and
- 3) non-related children— legal wards, foster children, and adopted children who are not related to the respondent or spouse,

These groups are conceptually different: the legal status of the nonbiological parent vis-à-vis the child differs, and they represent different pathways by which a child comes under the care of a nonbiological parent.

The independent variables we examine include age; marital or cohabiting status; parity or fatherhood status; the presence of a biological child in the household; ever use of infertility services by the respondent, spouse, or partner; fecundity or sterility status; current religious affiliation; education; percent of poverty level income; and Hispanic origin and race.

This paper first presents descriptive statistics to show the prevalence of and differentials in men's and women's caring for nonbiological children. We are currently developing multivariate regression models using SAS and SUDAAN statistical software, the results of which will be included in the final paper. These models will pool male and female data to predict the characteristics of who cares for nonbiological children in their household, and, if sample size permits, predict the type of relationship to nonbiological children currently in the household.

Results

Table 1 demonstrates that almost three times more adult men than adult women are currently caring for a minor, nonbiological child in their household: 11.1 percent of men aged 18-44 compared with 3.8 percent of women reported a child under 18 years of age living in their households. This would be expected since step children are the most likely group of children to be present and women are more likely to bring children into new marriages. Table 1 also shows that the presence of nonbiological children varies similarly by age, marital status, current religion, and educational attainment for both men and women. Larger percentages of persons who are older, married or cohabiting, Fundamentalist Protestant, and with a high school diploma or GED report caring for nonbiological children in their households compared with persons of other characteristics. Fundamentalist Protestant men report the highest level of nonbiological child rearing compared to men of other religious affiliations. Fundamentalist women, too, are

most likely to have nonbiological children they are caring for, but the difference is not as dramatic.

Other independent variables indicate different relationships for men and women. For example, almost 3 times as many men who have fathered a child report caring for a nonbiological child than men who have not fathered a child—15.9 percent compared with 6.0 percent, respectively. Over 3 times as many women who are surgically sterile or who have impaired fecundity report a nonbiological child in the household compared to women who are fecund. In subsequent analyses, we will test for the significance of these and other differences displayed in Table 1.

Table 2 presents similar information as Table 1, restricted to persons who have ever been married. Although never married persons may care for nonbiological children, the percentage actually doing so is small—1 percent or fewer of never married women and men are currently caring for a nonbiological child (Table 1). By limiting analysis to ever-married persons, most of the patterns shown in Table 1 remain the same. There are, however, a few exceptions. For example, looking at the relationship between fatherhood status and the caring for a nonbiological child, Table 1 shows that 6 percent of all men who have not fathered a child are currently caring for a nonbiological child, compared with 16 percent of men who have fathered a child. By restricting the analysis to ever married men, table 2 shows an 11 percentage point increase (to 17 percent) of men who have not fathered a child currently caring for a nonbiological child and virtually no change in the percentage of men who have fathered a child caring for a nonbiological child.

Tables 3 and 4 disaggregate nonbiological children into the three types of relationships described above for all women and men. Since these are not mutually exclusive categories, a respondent could be caring for nonbiological children of different relationship types. Therefore, the sum of the specific relationship type percentages may not equal the percentage presented for any nonbiological child.

The most common type of nonbiological child men and women report caring for are step children. For women, there is no difference between the percentage reporting they are caring for non-related and those caring for other related children. A larger percentage of men report caring for a child who is related in some other way (3.1 percent) than for a non-related child (0.7 percent). Higher percentages of currently cohabiting women and men report caring for other related children than do persons who are not cohabiting. These are likely to be their partner's children. Women who have used or whose spouse or partner has used infertility services are more likely to be caring for a non-related child than women who have not¹. Finally, a higher percentage of women who have less than a high school education report caring for a child to whom they are related, but not a step parent, than women who have completed more years of education.

In the final paper, Table 5 will show results from logistic regression predicting the characteristics of women and men who currently care for a nonbiological child in their household. Pending the feasibility of modeling the type of relationship to nonbiological children given our limited sample size, a sixth table will be added showing these results.

Discussion

This paper presents data on nonbiological parenting by women and men. We found that more men than women report they are currently caring for a nonbiological child. It also shows that step parenting is the most usual form of nonbiological parenting, but not for persons who are currently cohabiting or for women who have used infertility services. Differences in propensity to be caring for a nonbiological child are evident by age, marital status and religious affiliation for both men and women.

¹ Statements regarding significant differences have not been verified. Testing of differences will be done prior to the final paper submission and the text will be revised accordingly.

This paper provides information on all forms of nonbiological childrearing, details the characteristics of men and women who are rearing nonbiological children, and produces national estimates of the prevalence and characteristics of all types of relationships with nonbiological children being cared for in U.S. homes today. These findings show that a substantial proportion of men and women—over 6.1 million men and 2.1 million women—report currently caring for a nonbiological child in their household, and the types of relationships to those children vary widely. With the increasing diversity in methods of family formation and the research that shows differential wellbeing of children across these types of relationships, it is critical to understand the prevalence and characteristics of relationships of nonbiological children in households on a national level. As such, this analysis provides a key contribution to the extant literature on care of nonbiological children and to the policies and programs addressing child wellbeing.

References

- Cherlin, Andrew J. and Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr. 2000. "Stepfamilies in the United States: A Reconsideration." *Annual Review of Sociology* 20:359-381.
- Fields, Jason. 2001. "Living Arrangements of Children: 1996." *Current Population Reports*, P70-74, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.
- Ganong, Lawrence, Marilyn Coleman, Mark Fine, and Annette Kusgen McDaniel. 1998. "Issues Considered in Contemplating Stepchild Adoption." *Family Relations* 47:63-71.
- Jones, Jo. Forthcoming 2006. Adoption and Demand to Adopt by Women from the 2002 NSFG. *Adoption Factbook IV*. National Council for Adoption.
- Kreider, Rose M. and Jason Fields. 2005. "Living Arrangements of Children: 2001." *Current Population Reports*, P70-104, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.
- Lugalia, Terry and Julia Overturf. 2004. "Children and the Households They Live In." *Census 2000 Special Reports*, CENSR-14, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.
- Manning, Wendy D. and Pamela J. Smock. 2000. "Swapping Families: Serial Parenting and Economic Support for Children." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:111-122.
- Marsiglio, William. 1991. "Paternal Engagement Activities with Minor Children." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53: 973-986.
- McDaniel, Antonio and S. Philip Morgan. 1996. "Racial Differences in Mother-Child Coresidence in the Past." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 58: 1011-1017.
- Tucker, David J., Lorna F. Hurl, and Harry Ford. 1994. "Applying Organizational Ecology to the Family: The Case of Who Persists in Providing Foster Care." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56: 1005-1018.

Table 1. Number of women and men 18-44 years of age, and percent who currently care for a nonbiological child in their household, by selected characteristics: United States, 2002.

| Characteristic | All women | | All men | |
|---|---------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|
| | Number in thousands | Percent | Number in thousands | Percent |
| Total 1/ | 55,742 | 3.8 | 55,399 | 11.1 |
| Age | | | | |
| 18-24 years | 13,855 | 1.2 | 14,343 | 3.1 |
| 25-29 years | 9,249 | 2.7 | 9,226 | 9.8 |
| 30-34 years | 10,272 | 4.8 | 10,138 | 14.3 |
| 35-39 years | 10,853 | 5.0 | 10,557 | 16.1 |
| 40-44 years | 11,512 | 5.7 | 11,135 | 14.9 |
| Marital or cohabiting status | | | | |
| Currently married | 28,323 | 5.2 | 25,795 | 16.4 |
| First marriage | 23,078 | 3.7 | 21,396 | 11.4 |
| Second or later marriage | 5,245 | 11.7 | 4,399 | 40.4 |
| Currently cohabiting | 5,453 | 5.7 | 5,614 | 26.9 |
| Formerly married | 6,096 | 2.5 | 4,265 | 6.1 |
| Never married | 15,871 | 1.0 | 19,725 | 0.8 |
| Parity/Fatherhood status | | | | |
| Has not had a birth/Has not fathered a child | 19,993 | 2.9 | 26,869 | 6.0 |
| Has had a birth/Has fathered a child | 35,749 | 4.3 | 28,530 | 15.9 |
| Biological child in the household | | | | |
| Yes | 31,756 | 4.1 | 22,028 | 15.7 |
| No | 23,986 | 3.3 | 33,371 | 8.1 |
| Respondent, spouse or partner ever used infertility services 2/ | | | | |
| Yes | 7,306 | 7.7 | 4,008 | 14.9 |
| No | 48,436 | 3.2 | 47,435 | 11.7 |
| Fecundity/sterility status | | | | |
| Surgically sterile | 14,439 | 6.2 | 3,851 | 17.8 |
| Impaired fecundity (women only) | 7,063 | 7.5 | ... | ... |
| Nonsurgically sterile (men only) | ... | ... | 1,825 | 16.6 |
| Fecund/Not sterile | 34,240 | 2.0 | 49,723 | 10.4 |
| Current religion | | | | |
| None | 7,911 | 2.8 | 10,401 | 10.3 |
| Fundamentalist Protestant | 3,336 | 6.6 | 2,688 | 22.0 |
| Other Protestant | 25,240 | 4.0 | 21,293 | 13.0 |
| Catholic | 16,053 | 3.3 | 15,834 | 8.2 |
| Other religion | 3,202 | 3.4 | 5,183 | 8.1 |

| Importance of religion | | | | |
|--|--------|-----|--------|------|
| Very important | 28,096 | 3.9 | 21,555 | 12.5 |
| Somewhat important | 16,843 | 3.6 | 17,692 | 11.2 |
| Not important | 10,700 | 3.7 | 16,077 | 9.3 |
| Education 3/ | | | | |
| No high school diploma or GED | 5,627 | 4.7 | 6,355 | 12.4 |
| High school diploma or GED | 14,264 | 6.2 | 15,659 | 19.1 |
| Some college, no bachelor's degree | 14,279 | 3.6 | 13,104 | 10.5 |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 13,551 | 2.7 | 11,901 | 7.1 |
| Percent of poverty level 4/ | | | | |
| 0-149 percent | 14,582 | 4.8 | 11,032 | 17.1 |
| 150-299 percent | 14,502 | 4.6 | 14,451 | 13.8 |
| 300 percent or higher | 22,643 | 3.2 | 25,457 | 8.8 |
| Hispanic origin and race | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 8,194 | 3.9 | 9,336 | 9.9 |
| Not Hispanic or Latino: | | | | |
| White, single race | 35,936 | 3.6 | 35,154 | 10.8 |
| Black or African American, single race | 7,399 | 4.2 | 6,127 | 15.6 |

1/ Includes persons of other or multiple race and origin groups and persons with missing information on importance of religion, not shown separately.

2/ Limited to persons who have had sexual intercourse.

3/ Limited to persons 22-44 years of age at time of interview. GED is General Educational Development diploma.

4/ Limited to persons 20-44 years of age at time of interview.

... Category not applicable.

Table 2. Number of ever-married women and men 18-44 years of age, and percent who currently care for a nonbiological child in their household, by selected characteristics: United States, 2002.

| Characteristic | Ever-married women | | Ever-married men | |
|---|---------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|
| | Number in thousands | Percent | Number in thousands | Percent |
| Total 1/ | 35,845 | 4.8 | 30,950 | 15.9 |
| Age | | | | |
| 18-24 years | 2,922 | 2.1 | 1,705 | 7.3 |
| 25-29 years | 5,566 | 3.2 | 4,590 | 13.3 |
| 30-34 years | 7,971 | 5.1 | 7,105 | 16.4 |
| 35-39 years | 9,041 | 5.2 | 8,260 | 17.7 |
| 40-44 years | 10,345 | 5.8 | 9,290 | 16.7 |
| Marital status | | | | |
| Currently married | 28,323 | 5.2 | 25,795 | 16.4 |
| First marriage | 23,078 | 3.7 | 21,396 | 11.4 |
| Second or later marriage | 5,245 | 11.7 | 4,399 | 40.4 |
| Formerly married, currently cohabiting | 1,426 | 6.4 | 890 | 48.8 |
| Formerly married, not cohabiting | 6,096 | 2.5 | 4,265 | 6.1 |
| Parity/Fatherhood status | | | | |
| Has not had a birth/Has not fathered a child | 6,347 | 5.4 | 6,607 | 17.0 |
| Has had a birth/Has fathered a child | 29,498 | 4.7 | 24,343 | 15.6 |
| Biological child in the household | | | | |
| Yes | 26,154 | 4.5 | 11,240 | 18.2 |
| No | 9,691 | 5.5 | 19,710 | 14.6 |
| Respondent, spouse or partner ever used infertility services 2/ | | | | |
| Yes | 6,563 | 8.0 | 3,856 | 15.5 |
| No | 29,282 | 4.1 | 27,094 | 15.9 |
| Fecundity/sterility status | | | | |
| Surgically sterile | 12,933 | 6.2 | 3,750 | 18.2 |
| Impaired fecundity (women only) | 5,269 | 8.7 | ... | ... |
| Nonsurgically sterile (men only) | ... | ... | 951 | 25.9 |
| Fecund/Not sterile | 17,642 | 2.6 | 26,249 | 15.2 |
| Current religion | | | | |
| None | 4,348 | 4.0 | 4,472 | 15.2 |
| Fundamentalist Protestant | 2,337 | 8.3 | 1,850 | 30.2 |
| Other Protestant | 16,612 | 4.9 | 13,031 | 18.9 |
| Catholic | 10,527 | 4.3 | 8,789 | 10.6 |
| Other religion | 2,021 | 3.7 | 2,810 | 10.1 |

| | | | | |
|--|--------|-----|--------|------|
| Importance of religion | | | | |
| Very important | 19,396 | 4.6 | 13,761 | 16.1 |
| Somewhat important | 10,566 | 4.7 | 9,769 | 16.8 |
| Not important | 5,800 | 5.4 | 7,367 | 14.3 |
| Education 3/ | | | | |
| No high school diploma or GED | 3,816 | 4.8 | 4,037 | 12.6 |
| High school diploma or GED | 10,691 | 7.1 | 10,793 | 22.6 |
| Some college, no bachelor's degree | 10,728 | 3.9 | 7,696 | 14.9 |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 9,728 | 3.3 | 8,131 | 9.3 |
| Percent of poverty level 4/ | | | | |
| 0-149 percent | 8,719 | 6.3 | 6,086 | 24.1 |
| 150-299 percent | 10,356 | 5.3 | 8,842 | 17.6 |
| 300 percent or higher | 16,537 | 3.7 | 15,975 | 11.8 |
| Hispanic origin and race | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 5,265 | 4.4 | 5,064 | 10.8 |
| Not Hispanic or Latino: | | | | |
| White, single race | 24,817 | 4.6 | 20,589 | 16.0 |
| Black or African American, single race | 3,242 | 5.6 | 2,894 | 25.8 |

1/ Includes persons of other or multiple race and origin groups, not shown separately.

2/ Limited to men who have had sex.

3/ Limited to persons 22-44 years of age at time of interview. GED is General Educational Development diploma.

4/ Limited to persons 20-44 years of age at time of interview.

* Figure does not meet standard of reliability or precision.

... Category not applicable.

Table 3. Number of women 18-44 years of age and percent who currently live with and care for a child to whom they did not give birth, by the child's relationship to the woman and selected characteristics: United States, 2002

| Characteristic | Number in thousands | Any nonbiological child | Percent | | |
|---|---------------------|-------------------------|------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Step child | Related in some other way | Unrelated in any way |
| Total 1/ | 55,742 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Age | | | | | |
| 18-24 years | 13,855 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.7 | * |
| 25-29 years | 9,249 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 1.2 | * |
| 30-34 years | 10,272 | 4.8 | 2.6 | 1.5 | 0.8 |
| 35-39 years | 10,853 | 5.0 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 1.8 |
| 40-44 years | 11,512 | 5.7 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 2.2 |
| Marital or cohabiting status | | | | | |
| Currently married | 28,323 | 5.2 | 3.2 | 0.5 | 1.6 |
| First marriage | 23,078 | 3.7 | 2.0 | 0.4 | 1.4 |
| Second or later marriage | 5,245 | 11.7 | 8.9 | * | 2.7 |
| Currently cohabiting | 5,453 | 5.7 | 1.0 | 4.7 | — |
| Formerly married, not cohabiting | 6,096 | 2.5 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 0.6 |
| Never married, not cohabiting | 15,871 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Parity status | | | | | |
| Has not had a birth | 19,993 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.0 |
| Has had a birth | 35,749 | 4.3 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| Biological child in the household | | | | | |
| Yes | 31,756 | 4.1 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.9 |
| No | 23,986 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 1.2 |
| Respondent, spouse or partner ever used infertility services 2/ | | | | | |
| Yes | 7,306 | 7.7 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 4.6 |
| No | 48,436 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| Fecundity status | | | | | |
| Surgically sterile | 14,439 | 6.2 | 3.1 | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| Impaired fecundity | 7,063 | 7.5 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 2.6 |
| Fecund | 34,240 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| Current religion | | | | | |
| None | 7,911 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 0.3 |
| Fundamentalist Protestant | 3,336 | 6.6 | 4.4 | * | * |
| Other Protestant | 25,240 | 4.0 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| Catholic | 16,053 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Other religion | 3,202 | 3.4 | * | 1.5 | * |
| Importance of religion | | | | | |
| Very important | 28,096 | 3.9 | 1.8 | 0.9 | 1.2 |
| Somewhat important | 16,843 | 3.6 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.0 |
| Not important | 10,700 | 3.7 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 0.3 |
| Education 3/ | | | | | |
| No high school diploma or GED | 5,627 | 4.7 | 1.2 | 2.8 | * |
| High school diploma or GED | 14,264 | 6.2 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| Some college, no bachelor's degree | 14,279 | 3.6 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 1.0 |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 13,551 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.9 |
| Percent of poverty level 4/ | | | | | |
| 0-149 percent | 14,582 | 4.8 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 0.6 |
| 150-299 percent | 14,502 | 4.6 | 2.7 | 0.7 | 1.2 |
| 300 percent or higher | 22,643 | 3.2 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 1.3 |
| Hispanic origin and race | | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latina | 8,194 | 3.9 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 0.4 |
| Not Hispanic or Latina: | | | | | |
| White, single race | 35,936 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 1.3 |
| Black or African American, single race | 7,399 | 4.2 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 0.6 |

1/ Includes men of other or multiple race and origin groups and men with missing information on importance of religion, not shown separately.

2/ Limited to women who have had sexual intercourse.

3/ Limited to women 22-44 years of age at time of interview. GED is General Educational Development diploma.

4/ Limited to women 20-44 years of age at time of interview.

Notes: See text for an explanation of the relationship type categories. Percentages by relationship type may not add to "Any nonbiological child" percentage because some women are living with and caring for more than 1 non-biological child, not necessarily with the same relationship.

* Figure does not meet standard of reliability or precision.

– Quantity zero.

Table 4. Number of men 18-44 years of age and percent who currently live with and care for a child they did not father, by the child's relationship to the man and selected characteristics: United States, 2002

| Characteristic | Number in thousands | Any nonbiological child | Percent | | | Unrelated in any way |
|---|---------------------|-------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-----|----------------------|
| | | | Step child | Related in some other way | | |
| Total 1/ | 55,399 | 11.1 | 7.4 | 3.1 | 0.7 | |
| Age | | | | | | |
| 18-24 years | 14,343 | 3.1 | 1.2 | 1.7 | * | |
| 25-29 years | 9,226 | 9.8 | 6.8 | 2.9 | * | |
| 30-34 years | 10,138 | 14.3 | 10.2 | 4.1 | * | |
| 35-39 years | 10,557 | 16.1 | 10.8 | 3.9 | 1.8 | |
| 40-44 years | 11,135 | 14.9 | 9.8 | 3.5 | 1.7 | |
| Marital or cohabiting status | | | | | | |
| Currently married | 25,795 | 16.4 | 13.8 | 1.3 | 1.3 | |
| First marriage | 21,396 | 11.4 | 8.8 | 1.2 | 1.4 | |
| Second or later marriage | 4,399 | 40.4 | * | 2.0 | * | |
| Currently cohabiting | 5,614 | 26.9 | 7.9 | 18.8 | * | |
| Formerly married, not cohabiting | 4,265 | 6.1 | 0.9 | 5.1 | * | |
| Never married, not cohabiting | 19,725 | 0.8 | * | 0.6 | * | |
| Fatherhood status | | | | | | |
| Has not fathered a child | 26,869 | 6.0 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 0.8 | |
| Has fathered a child | 28,530 | 15.9 | 11.6 | 3.8 | 0.6 | |
| Biological child in the household | | | | | | |
| Yes | 22,028 | 15.7 | 4.4 | 3.0 | 0.8 | |
| No | 33,371 | 8.1 | 11.8 | 3.4 | 0.6 | |
| Respondent, spouse or partner ever used infertility services 2/ | | | | | | |
| Yes | 4,008 | 14.9 | 8.1 | * | 6.2 | |
| No | 47,435 | 11.7 | 7.9 | 3.6 | 0.3 | |
| Sterility status | | | | | | |
| Surgically sterile | 3,851 | 17.8 | 15.2 | 2.1 | 0.5 | |
| Nonsurgically sterile | 1,825 | 16.6 | 12.0 | 3.7 | * | |
| Not sterile | 49,723 | 10.4 | 6.6 | 3.2 | 0.7 | |
| Current religion | | | | | | |
| None | 10,401 | 10.3 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 0.9 | |
| Fundamentalist Protestant | 2,688 | 22.0 | 13.2 | 8.0 | * | |
| Other Protestant | 21,293 | 13.0 | 10.6 | 1.8 | 0.7 | |
| Catholic | 15,834 | 8.2 | 4.6 | 3.1 | 0.8 | |
| Other religion | 5,183 | 8.1 | 4.4 | 3.7 | * | |

| Importance of religion | | | | | |
|--|--------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Very important | 21,555 | 12.5 | 8.9 | 2.9 | 0.9 |
| Somewhat important | 17,692 | 11.2 | 7.9 | 2.6 | 0.7 |
| Not important | 16,077 | 9.3 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 0.6 |
| Education 3/ | | | | | |
| No high school diploma or GED | 6,355 | 12.4 | 5.9 | 5.9 | * |
| High school diploma or GED | 15,659 | 19.1 | 14.6 | 4.3 | 0.2 |
| Some college, no bachelor's degree | 13,104 | 10.5 | 7.6 | 2.6 | 0.5 |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 11,901 | 7.1 | 3.4 | 1.6 | 2.2 |
| Percent of poverty level 4/ | | | | | |
| 0-149 percent | 11,032 | 17.1 | 12.8 | 4.0 | 0.7 |
| 150-299 percent | 14,451 | 13.8 | 9.3 | 3.9 | 0.6 |
| 300 percent or higher | 25,457 | 8.8 | 5.2 | 2.8 | 0.9 |
| Hispanic origin and race | | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 9,336 | 9.9 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 0.8 |
| Not Hispanic or Latino: | | | | | |
| White, single race | 35,154 | 10.8 | 7.5 | 2.5 | 0.9 |
| Black or African American, single race | 6,127 | 15.6 | 11.3 | 4.2 | * |

1/ Includes men of other or multiple race and origin groups and men with missing information on importance of religion, not shown separately.

2/ Limited to men who have had sexual intercourse.

3/ Limited to men 22-44 years of age at time of interview. GED is General Educational Development diploma.

4/ Limited to men 20-44 years of age at time of interview.

Notes: See text for an explanation of the relationship type categories. Percentages by relationship type may not add to "Any nonbiological child" percentage because some men are living with and caring for more than 1 non-biological child, not necessarily with the same relationship.

* Figure does not meet standard of reliability or precision.