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Background and Qualifications

I am the Kathryn Norwood and Claude Fussell Alumni Professorship in the LSU College of Human Sciences and Education and Program Director for Child and Family Studies in Louisiana State University’s School of Social Work. I have taught at LSU since 2002. The present report relates to my examination of research on same-sex parenting. I could and would testify on this topic.

I have published or have in press over 60 articles and/chapters relating to families and family science. I hold a Bachelor of Science in family sciences and a Master of Science in family sciences and human development from Brigham Young University, and a Ph.D. in family studies from the University of Delaware.
In 2008, I was named an LSU Rainmaker (Top 100 LSU Research Faculty), and in 2011-2012, LSU nominated me for the (national) CASE Professor of the Year Award.

I have been called as an expert witness to represent the intellectual standards of my scientific discipline. In this report, I will address the question: Based on available social science that meets established standards, are children with lesbian and gay parents demonstrably faring as well as those in marriage-based families?

For my work in this matter, I am being compensated at a rate of $200 hour. My compensation does not depend on the outcome of the case or the opinion or testimony that I provide. I have previously testified as an expert witness at deposition in *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 704 F. Supp. 2d 291 (N.D. Cal. 2010).

**Introduction**

Over the past few decades, differences have been observed between outcomes of children in marriage-based intact families compared with children in cohabiting, divorced, step, and single-parent families. These differences have been observed in studies based on large, representative samples.\(^1\) Based on four nationally representative longitudinal studies with more than 20,000 total participants, McLanahan and Sandefur concluded:

*Children who grow up in a household with only one biological parent are worse off, on average, than children who grow up in a household with both of their biological parents...regardless of whether the resident parent remarries.*\(^2\)

Differences have recurred in connection with several issues of societal-level concern including: (a) health,\(^3\) mortality,\(^4\) and suicide risks,\(^5\) (b) drug and alcohol abuse,\(^6\)

---

1. See Table B; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994; Wilcox et al., 2005
3. Waite, 1995
(c) criminality and incarceration,\textsuperscript{7} (d) intergenerational poverty,\textsuperscript{8} (e) education and/or labor force contribution,\textsuperscript{9} (f) early sexual activity and early childbearing,\textsuperscript{10} and (g) divorce rates as adults.\textsuperscript{11} These outcomes represent important impact variables that influence the well-being of children and families, as well as the national economy.

By way of comparison, social science research with small, convenience samples has repeatedly reported no significant differences between children from gay/lesbian households and heterosexual households. These recurring findings of no significant differences have led some researchers and professional organizations to formalize related claims. Perhaps none of these claims has been more influential than the following from the 2005 American Psychological Association (APA) Brief on “Lesbian and Gay Parenting.”\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{4} Gaudino et al., 1999; Siegel et al., 1996
\item \textsuperscript{5} Wilcox et al., 2005, p. 28; Cutler et al., 2000
\item \textsuperscript{6} Bachman et al. 1997; Flewelling & Bauman, 1990; Horwitz et al., 1996; Johnson et al., 1996; Simon, 2002; Waite & Gallagher, 2000; Weitsof et al., 2003; Wilcox et al., 2005
\item \textsuperscript{7} Blackman et al., 2005; Harper & McLanahan, 2004; Kamark & Galston, 1990, pp. 14-15; Manning & Lamb, 2003; Margolin, 1992, p. 546
\item \textsuperscript{8} Akerlof, 1998; Blackmon et al., 2005; Brown, 2004; Oliver & Shapiro, 1997; Rank & Hirschl, 1999
\item \textsuperscript{9} Amato, 2005; Battle, 1998; Cherlin et al., 1998; Heiss, 1996; Lansford, 2009; Manning & Lamb, 2003; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994; Phillips & Asbury, 1993; Teachman et al., 1998
\item \textsuperscript{10} Amato, 2005; Amato & Booth, 2000; Ellis et al., 2003; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994
\item \textsuperscript{11} Cherlin et al., 1995; Wolfinger, 2005
\item \textsuperscript{12} The APA Brief’s stated objective was primarily to influence family law. The preface states that “the focus of the publication…[is] to serve the needs of psychologists, lawyers, and parties in family law cases…. Although comprehensive, the research summary is focused on those issues that often arise in family law cases involving lesbian mothers or gay fathers” (APA Brief, 2005, p. 3). Redding (2008) reports that “leading professional organizations including the American Psychological Association” have issued statements and that “advocates have used these research conclusions to bolster support for lesbigay parenting and marriage rights, and the research is now frequently cited in public policy debates and judicial opinions” (p. 136).
\end{itemize}
Not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to be disadvantaged in any significant respect relative to children of heterosexual parents.\(^{13}\)

Are we witnessing the emergence of a family form that provides a context for children that is equivalent to the traditional marriage-based family? Many proponents of same-sex marriage contend that the answer is yes. Others are skeptical and wonder—given that other departures from the intact, marriage-based family form have been correlated with more negative long-term child outcomes—do children in same-sex families demonstrably avoid being “disadvantaged in any significant respect relative to children of heterosexual parents” as the APA Brief asserts? This is a question with important implications, particularly since the 2005 APA Brief on “Lesbian and Gay Parenting” has been repeatedly invoked in the current same-sex marriage debate.\(^{14}\)

**Statement of Purpose**

Central questions of this report include: *Are the conclusions presented in the 2005 APA Brief on “Lesbian and Gay Parenting” valid and precise, based on the cited scientific evidence?*\(^{15}\) *More specifically, are children with lesbian and gay parents demonstrably faring as well as those in marriage-based families?* In the present report,

---

\(^{13}\) Patterson, p. 15 (from APA Brief, 2005)

\(^{14}\) As outlined in footnote 12.

\(^{15}\) Kuhn (1970/1996) has stated that there is an “insufficiency of methodological directives, by themselves, to dictate a unique substantive conclusion to many sorts of scientific questions” (p. 3). To draw substantive conclusions, a socially and historically influenced paradigm is needed. Research is then “directed to the articulation of those phenomena and theories that the paradigm already supplies” (p. 24). Indeed, paradigmatic biases, and other influences, can make us vulnerable to “discrepancies between warranted and stated conclusions in the social sciences” (Glenn, 1989, p. 119; see also Glenn, 1997).
six questions relating to the cited scientific evidence are posed, examined, and addressed.\textsuperscript{16}

Two portions of the APA Brief are of particular concern to us in connection with these questions: (a) the “Summary of Research Findings” (pp. 5–22), and (b) the first and largest section of the annotated bibliography, entitled “Empirical Studies Specifically Related to Lesbian and Gay Parents and Their Children” (pp. 23–45). In the latter section (pp. 23–45), the APA references 67 manuscripts. Eight of these studies are “unpublished dissertations.”\textsuperscript{17} The 59 published studies are listed in Table A of this paper, providing clear parameters from which to formulate responses to the six outlined questions, next.

\textbf{Question 1: How representative and culturally, ethnically, and economically diverse were the gay/lesbian households in the published literature behind the APA brief?}

In response to question 1, more than three-fourths (77\%) of the studies cited by the APA brief are based on small, non-representative, convenience samples of fewer than 100 participants. Many of the non-representative, “miniscule samples”\textsuperscript{18} contain far fewer than 100 participants, including one study with five participants (Wright, 1998; see Table A). As Strasser (2008) notes:

\begin{quote}
Members of the LGBT community…vary greatly in their attitudes and practices. For this reason, it would be misleading to cite a study of gay men in urban southern California as if they would represent gay men nationally (p. 37).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{16} Kuhn (1970/1996) has noted that “when scientists disagree about whether the fundamental problems of their field have been solved, the search for rules gains a function that it does not ordinarily possess” (p. 48).

\textsuperscript{17} These unpublished dissertations include: Hand, 1991; McPherson, 1993; Osterweil, 1991; Paul, 1986; Puryear, 1983; Rees, 1979; Sbordone, 1993; Steckel, 1985. An adapted portion of one of these dissertations (Steckel, 1985) was eventually published (Steckel, 1987) and is included in the present examination; the other unpublished work is not included in Table A of this paper.

\textsuperscript{18} Stacey & Biblarz, 2001, p. p. 168, footnote 9
By extension, it seems reasonable and scientific that influential claims by national organizations should be based, at least partly, on research that is nationally representative.

Lack of representativeness often entails lack of diversity as well. A closer examination of the APA-cited literature from the “Empirical Studies” (pp. 23–45) section of the APA Brief reveals a tendency towards not only non-representative but racially homogeneous samples. For example:

1. “All of [the fathers in the sample] were Caucasian” (Bozett, 1980, p. 173).
2. “Sixty parents, all of whom were White” comprised the sample (Flaks et al., 1995, p. 107).
3. “[All 40] mothers…were white” (Hoeffler, 1981, p. 537).
4. “All the children, mothers, and fathers in the sample were Caucasian” (Huggins, 1989, p. 126).
5. “The twenty-five women were all white” (Rand et al., 1982, p. 29).
6. “All of the women…[were] Caucasian” (Siegenthaler & Bigner, 2000, p. 82).
7. “All of the birth mothers and co-mothers were white” (Tasker & Golombok, 1998, p. 52).
8. “All [48] parents were Caucasian” (Vanfraussen et al., 2003, p. 81).

19 Of the 59 published “Empirical Studies Specifically Related to Lesbian and Gay Parents and Their Children,” no studies mention African-American, Hispanic, or Asian-American families in either their titles or subtitles. The reference list in the APA Brief’s “Summary of Research Findings” (pp. 15–22) is also void of any studies focusing on African-American, Hispanic, or Asian-American families. None of the “Empirical Studies Specifically Related to Lesbian and Gay Parents and Their Children” (pp. 23–45) holds, as its focus, any of these minorities. (Note: Three years after the 2005 APA Brief, Moore (2008) published a small but pioneering study on African-American lesbians.)
Many of the other studies do not explicitly acknowledge all-White samples, but also do not mention or identify a single minority participant—while a dozen others report almost all-white samples.\textsuperscript{20} For example, same-sex family researchers Lott-Whitehead and Tully (1993) urged restraint in the discussion of their APA Brief-cited study by warning:

\begin{quote}
Results from this study must be interpreted cautiously due to several factors. First, the study sample was small (N=45) and biased toward well-educated, white women with high incomes. These factors have plagued other [same-sex parenting] studies, and remain a concern of researchers in this field (p. 275).
\end{quote}

In connection with these same racial, educational, and economic biases, Patterson (1992), who would later serve as sole author of the 2005 APA Brief’s “Summary of Research Findings on Lesbian and Gay Families,” reported:

\begin{quote}
Despite the diversity of gay and lesbian communities, both in the United States and abroad, samples of children [and parents] have been relatively homogeneous…. Samples for which demographic information was reported have been described as predominantly Caucasian, well-educated, and middle to upper class.\textsuperscript{21}
\end{quote}

In spite of the privileged and homogeneous nature of the non-representative, convenience samples employed in the studies at that time, Patterson (1992) concluded:

\begin{quote}
Despite shortcomings [in the studies], however, results of existing research comparing children of gay or lesbian parents with those of heterosexual parents are extraordinarily clear…. There is no evidence to suggest that psychosocial development among children of gay men or lesbians is compromised in any respect relative to that among offspring of heterosexual parents.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{quote}

Patterson’s conclusion in a 2000 review was essentially the same:

\begin{quote}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{20} Examples of explicitly or implicitly all-White (or nearly all-White) samples include, but are not limited to: Bigner & Jacobsen, 1989a, 1989b; Bozett, 1980; Flaks et al., 1995; Green, 1978; Green et al., 1986; Hoeffer, 1981; Huggins, 1989; Koepke et al., 1992; Rand et al., 1982; Siegenthaler & Bigner, 2000; Tasker & Golombok, 1995, 1998; Vanfraussen et al., 2003
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{21} Patterson, 1992, p. 1029
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{22} Patterson, 1992, p. 1036 (emphasis added)
\end{quote}
Central results of existing research on lesbian and gay couples and families with children are exceptionally clear. The home environments provided by lesbian and gay parents are just as likely as those provided by heterosexual parents to enable psychosocial growth among family members.\footnote{Patterson, 2000, p. 1064 (emphasis added)}

Although eight years had passed, in this second review, Patterson (2000) again reported the uncorrected tendency of same-sex parenting researchers to select privileged lesbian samples. Specifically, she summarized, “Much of the research [still] involved small samples that are predominantly White, well-educated [and] middle-class” (p. 1064).\footnote{Patterson, 2000, p. 1064}

Given the privileged, homogeneous, and non-representative samples of lesbian mothers employed in “much of the research,” it seems warranted to propose that Patterson was empirically premature to conclude that comparisons between “gay or lesbian parents” and “heterosexual parents” were “extraordinarily clear”\footnote{Patterson, 1992, p. 1036} or “exceptionally clear.”\footnote{Patterson, 2000, p. 1064}

There is an additional point that requires attention here. In Patterson’s statements above, there are recurring references to research on children of gay men/parents. In 2000, Demo and Cox reported that “children living with gay fathers” were a “rarely studied household configuration.”\footnote{Demo & Cox, 2000, p. 890} In 2005, how many of the 59 published studies cited in the APA’s list of “Empirical Studies Specifically Related to Lesbian and Gay Parents and Their Children” (pp. 23–45) specifically addressed the outcomes of children from gay fathers? A close examination reveals that only eight studies did so.\footnote{Bailey et al., 1995; Barrett & Tasker, 2001; Bigner & Jacobsen, 1989a, 1989b; Bozett, 1980; Harris & Turner, 1986; Miller, 1979; Sarantakos, 1996} Of these eight

\[\text{footnotes continued on the next page}\]
studies, four did not include a heterosexual comparison group. In three of the four remaining studies (with heterosexual comparison groups), the outcomes studied were:

1. “the value of children to…fathers” (Bigner & Jacobsen, 1989a, p. 163).

The two Bigner and Jacobsen (1989a, 1989b) studies focused on fathers’ reports of fathers’ values and behaviors, not on children’s outcomes—illustrating a recurring tendency in the same-sex parenting literature to focus on the parent rather than the child. Harris and Turner (1986) addressed parent-child relationships, but their study’s male heterosexual comparison group was composed of only two single fathers.

Although several studies have examined myriad aspects of gay fathers’ lives, none of the studies comparing gay fathers and heterosexual comparison groups referenced in the APA Brief (pp. 23–45) appear to have specifically focused on children’s developmental outcomes, with the exception of Sarantakos (1996), a study to which we will later return.

In summary response to Question 1 (“How representative and culturally, ethnically, and economically diverse were the gay/lesbian households in the published literature behind the APA Brief?”), we see that in addition to relying primarily on small, non-representative, convenience samples, many studies do not include any minority individuals or families. Further, comparison studies on children’s outcomes associated with gay fathering are almost non-existent in the 2005 Brief. By their own reports, social researchers examining same-sex parenting have repeatedly selected small, non-representative, homogeneous samples of privileged lesbian mothers to represent all same-

29 Bailey et al., 1995; Barrett & Tasker, 2001; Bozett, 1980; Miller, 1979
sex parents. This pattern across three decades of research raises significant questions regarding lack of representativeness and diversity in the same-sex parenting studies.

**Question 2: How many studies of gay/lesbian parents had no heterosexual comparison group?**

Of the 59 publications cited by the APA in the annotated bibliography section entitled “Empirical Studies Specifically Related to Lesbian and Gay Parents and Their Children” (pp. 23–45), 33 included a heterosexual comparison group. In direct response to Question 2, 26 of the studies (44.1%) on same-sex parenting did not include a heterosexual comparison group of any kind. In well-conducted social science, it is important to have a clearly defined comparison group before drawing conclusions regarding differences or the apparent lack thereof. We see that nearly half of the “Empirical Studies Specifically Related to Lesbian and Gay Parents and Their Children” referenced in the APA Brief allowed no basis for comparison between these two groups (see Table A). To proceed with precision, this fact does not negate the APA claim. It does, however, dilute it considerably as we are left with not 59, but 33, studies that include heterosexual comparison groups.

**Question 3: When heterosexual comparison groups were used, what were the more specific characteristics of those groups?**

We now turn to a question regarding the nature of comparison samples. Of the 33 published “Empirical Studies Specifically Related to Lesbian and Gay Parents and Their Children” (APA Brief, pp. 23–45) that did include a heterosexual comparison group, what were the specific characteristics of the groups that were compared? The earlier examination and response related to Question 1 documented that, by Patterson’s reports,
“Despite the diversity of gay and lesbian communities…in the United States,” the repeatedly selected representatives of same-sex parents have been “small samples [of lesbians] that are predominantly White, well-educated [and] middle-class” (p. 1064).

In spite of repeated homogeneous sampling, there is considerable diversity among gay and lesbian parents. Considerable diversity exists among heterosexual parents as well. Indeed, the opening paragraph of the present report noted recurring differences in several outcomes of societal concern for children from intact, marriage-based families compared with children in cohabiting, divorced, step, and single-parent families. Many of the cited findings are based on probability samples of thousands (see Table B).

Because children in intact, marriage-based families have historically fared significantly better than children in cohabiting, divorced, step, or single-parent families on several outcomes of societal concern, the question of what “groups” researchers selected to represent heterosexual parents in the same-sex parenting studies becomes critical. A closer examination of the 33 published same-sex parenting studies (APA Brief, pp. 23–45) with comparison groups, listed chronologically, reveals that:

1. Pagelow (1980) used “single mothers” as a comparison group (p. 198).

Patterson, 1992, p. 1029
Patterson, 2000, p. 1064
See footnotes 2-11 for documentation.
7. Green et al. (1986) used “solo parent heterosexual mothers” (p. 175).

8. Harris and Turner (1986) used two “male single parents” and 14 “female single parents” (p. 105).


Thus we see that in selecting heterosexual comparison groups for their studies, many same-sex parenting researchers have not used intact, marriage-based families as heterosexual representatives, but have instead used single mothers (see Table A). Further, Bigner and Jacobsen used 90.9 percent single-father samples in two other studies (1989a, 1989b).

In total, in at least 13 of the 33 comparison studies listed in the APA Brief’s list of “Empirical Studies” (pp. 23–45) that include heterosexual comparison groups, the researchers explicitly sampled “single parents” as representatives for heterosexual parents. The repeated (and perhaps even modal) selection of single-parent families as a comparison heterosexual-parent group is noteworthy, given McClanahan and Sandefur’s finding that

*Children who grow up in a household with only one biological parent are worse off, on average, than children who grow up in a household with both of their biological parents...* \(^{34}\) (see also Amato, 2001).\(^{35}\)

\(^{33}\) “4 of the 16 [divorced] heterosexual mothers were either remarried or currently living with a heterosexual lover” (p. 127).

\(^{34}\) McClanahan & Sandefur, 1994, p. 1 (emphasis in original)

\(^{35}\) In a 67 study meta-analysis of the average differences in outcomes between children with “divorced and continuously married parents,” Amato (2001) reported an average weighted effect size of between -0.12 and -0.22 (a -0.17 average) with an advantage in all five domains considered to children of continuously married parents (p. 360).
Given that at least 13 of the 33 comparison studies listed in the APA Brief’s list of “Empirical Studies” (pp. 23–45) used single-parent families as heterosexual comparison groups, what group(s) did the remaining 20 studies use as heterosexual representatives?

In closely examining the 20 remaining published comparison group studies, it is difficult to formulate precise reports of the comparison group characteristics, because in many of these studies, the heterosexual comparison groups are referred to as “mothers” or “couples” without appropriate specificity (see Table A). Were these mothers continuously married—or were they single, divorced, remarried, or cohabiting? When couples were used, were they continuously married—or remarried or cohabiting? These failures to explicitly and precisely report sample characteristics are significant in light of Brown’s (2004) finding based on her analysis of a data set of 35,938 U.S. children and their parents, that “regardless of economic and parental resources, the outcomes of adolescents (12–17 years old) in cohabiting families…are worse…than those…in two-biological-parent married families.”36 Because of the disparities noted by Brown and others, scientific precision requires that we know whether researchers used: (a) single mothers, (b) cohabiting mothers and couples, (c) remarried mothers, or (d) continuously married mothers and couples as heterosexual comparison groups.

Due to the ambiguity of the characteristics of the heterosexual comparison group samples in many same-sex parenting studies, let us frame a question that permits a less vague response, namely: How many of the studies in the APA Brief’s “Empirical Studies” section (pp. 23–45) explicitly compare the outcomes of children from intact, marriage-based families with those from same-sex families? In an American Psychologist

36 Brown, 2004, p. 364 (emphasis added)
article published the year after the APA Brief, Herek (2006) referred to a previously referenced large, national study by McLanahan and Sandefur (1994) “comparing the children of intact heterosexual families with children being raised by a single parent.”

Herek then emphasized that this large scale “research literature does not include studies comparing children raised by two-parent same-sex couples with children raised by two-parent heterosexual couples.”37 This is correct. A few exceptions exist with small samples38 but even in these cases the “heterosexual couples” are rarely identified as intact, marriage-based couples.39

Given what we have seen regarding heterosexual comparison group selection, let us revisit three related claims. First, in 1992, Patterson posited that:

[N]ot a single study has found children of gay and lesbian parents to be disadvantaged in any respect relative to children of heterosexual parents.40

Patterson’s (2000) claim was similar:

[C]entral results of existing research on lesbian and gay couples and families with children are exceptionally clear…. [The] home environments provided by lesbian and gay parents are just as likely as those provided by heterosexual parents to enable psychosocial growth among family members.41

Lastly, and most significantly, we turn to the APA Brief’s “Summary of Research Findings on Lesbian and Gay Parenting,” also single-authored by Patterson (see p. 5):

Not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to be disadvantaged in any significant respect relative to children of heterosexual parents.42

37 Herek, 2006, p. 612
38 For sake of clarity, “small” sample as used here means less than 300 (see Table A for documentation).
39 Two exceptions will be discussed in connection with Questions 4 and 5 (Sarantakos, 1996, 2000).
40 Patterson, 1992, p. 1036 (emphasis added)
41 Patterson, 2000, p. 1064 (emphasis added)
42 Patterson, p. 15 (from APA Brief, 2005), (emphasis added)
In all three of these claims (including the latter claim from the 2005 APA Brief), Patterson uses the broad term “heterosexual parents,” a term that includes intact, marriage-based families. The above broad claims (1992, 2000, 2005) are not closely and carefully nuanced by the information that, with rare exceptions, the research does not include studies comparing children raised by two-parent, same-sex couples with children raised by marriage-based, heterosexual couples. Further, no mention is made that in at least 13 of the 33 extant comparison studies referenced in the Brief (pp. 23–45), the groups selected to represent “heterosexual parents” were composed largely, if not solely, of single heterosexual parents. We now move to another related examination of the APA Brief’s claims.

**Question 4: Does a scientifically-viable study exist to contradict the conclusion that “not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to be disadvantaged”?**

Yes. There were exceptions to the APA’s claim that “Not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to be disadvantaged in any significant respect relative to children of heterosexual parents.” The present report will address two exceptional studies in some depth—one now and one in connection with Question 5.

In the “Summary of Findings” section, the APA Brief references a study by Sarantakos (1996), but does so in a footnote that critiques the study (p. 6, footnote 1).

---

43 Patterson, p. 15 (from APA Brief, 2005)
44 Among the diverse types of gay/lesbian parents there are at least two major categories that warrant scholarly precision: (a) two lesbian or gay parents raising an adopted or DI (donor insemination) child from infancy with these and only these two parents; and (b) two lesbian or gay parents raising a child who is the biological offspring of one of the parents, following a separation or divorce from a heterosexual partner. The Sarantakos sample is of the latter (b) type. In terms of scholarly precision, it is important to differentiate and not draw strong implications from ‘a’ to ‘b’ or ‘b’ to ‘a.’ Indeed, the author would posit that adopted versus DI children may also warrant separate
On page 40 of the APA Brief’s annotated bibliography, a reference to the Sarantakos (1996) article is again offered, but there is no summary of the study’s findings, only a note reading “No abstract available.”

Upon closer examination, we find that the Sarantakos (1996) study is a comparative analysis of 58 children of heterosexual married parents, 58 children of heterosexual cohabiting couples, and 58 children living with homosexual couples. The children in the study were all “matched according to socially significant criteria (e.g., age, number of children [in the family], education, occupation, and socio-economic status).”

The combined sample size (174) is the seventh-largest sample size of the 59 published studies listed in the APA Brief’s “Summary of Research Findings on Lesbian and Gay Parenting” (Table A). However, the six studies with larger sample sizes were all adult self-report studies, making the Sarantakos combined sample the largest study (APA Brief, pp. 23–45) that examined children’s developmental outcomes.

Key findings of the Sarantakos (1996) study are summarized below. To contextualize these data, the presented mean scores are based on a teacher rating-scale of performance “ranging from 1 (very low performance), through 5 (moderate performance) consideration. The core issue is that precision is essential and overextension of findings should be avoided. This same issue is of serious concern in connection with the tendency to overextend findings regarding lesbian mothers to apply to gay fathers.

Sarantakos, 1996, p. 23

In order, these six studies include: (1) Morris et al., 2002 (N=2,431), who addressed adults’ reports of “coming out”; (2) Johnson and Connor, 2002 (N=415), who addressed adults’ reports of parenting beliefs, division of labor, etc.; (3) Crawford et al., 1999 (N=388), who addressed psychologists’ self-reports of gay adoption; (4) King and Black, 1999 (N=338), who addressed college students’ perceptions of gay parents; (5) Bos et al., 2003 (N=200), who addressed parental motives and desires; and (6) Bos et al., 2004 (N=200), who addressed parental reports of couple relations. These foci are not children’s outcomes.
Based on teacher (not parent) reports, Sarantakos (1996) found several significant differences between intact, marriage-based families and homosexual families.\(^{48}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Marital State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Achievement</td>
<td>Married 7.7, Cohabiting 6.8, Homosexual 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Achievement</td>
<td>Married 7.9, Cohabiting 7.0, Homosexual 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Achievement</td>
<td>Married 7.3, Cohabiting 7.0, Homosexual 7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Interest/Involvement</td>
<td>Married 8.9, Cohabiting 8.3, Homosexual 5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability/Popularity</td>
<td>Married 7.5, Cohabiting 6.5, Homosexual 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Learning Attitude</td>
<td>Married 7.5, Cohabiting 6.8, Homosexual 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-School Relationships</td>
<td>Married 7.5, Cohabiting 6.0, Homosexual 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with Homework</td>
<td>Married 7.0, Cohabiting 6.5, Homosexual 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Aspirations</td>
<td>Married 8.1, Cohabiting 7.4, Homosexual 6.5 (^{49})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sarantakos concluded, “Overall, the study has shown that children of married couples are more likely to do well at school in academic and social terms,\(^{50}\) than children of cohabiting and homosexual couples.”\(^{51}\)

The APA’s decision to de-emphasize the Sarantakos (1996) study was based, in part, on the criticism that “nearly all indicators of the children’s functioning were based on subjective reports by teachers.”\(^{52}\) The Sarantakos (1996) study was partially based on teacher reports. However, teacher reports included “tests” and “normal school assessment” (p. 24). Subsequently, it may be argued that Sarantakos’ decision not to rely solely or extensively on parent reports, as is done in most same-sex parenting studies, is a pronounced strength, given parents’ tendencies towards “positive” bias when reporting

---

\(^{47}\) Sarantakos, 1996, p. 24

\(^{48}\) Social Studies Achievement is significant at the p=.008 level; the eight other differences are significant at the p=.000 level.

\(^{49}\) Sarantakos, 1996, pp. 24–27

\(^{50}\) As noted in the table, however, children of same-sex couples scored slightly higher in social studies.

\(^{51}\) Sarantakos, 1996, p. 30

\(^{52}\) APA Brief (2005), footnote 1, p. 6 (emphasis added)
on their own children. Sarantakos (1996) also drew data from school aptitude tests and observations, thereby modeling a research ideal of triangulation of sources. In fact, the study integrated not only three data sources to triangulate; it featured at least four (i.e., teachers, tests, observations, and child reports). Further, the study controlled for “education, occupation, and socio-economic status” and then, based on teacher reports, compared marriage-based families with gay/lesbian families and found nine significant differences—with children from marriage-based families rating higher in eight areas. By objective standards, compared with the studies cited by the APA Brief, the 1996 Sarantakos study was:

a) The largest comparison study to examine children’s outcomes,

b) One of the most comparative (only about five other studies used three comparison groups of 30 or more), and

c) One of the most comprehensively triangulated study (four data sources) conducted on same-sex parenting.

---

53 It is well replicated that individuals tend to rate the group with which they most identify more positively than they do other groups. This positive bias includes within-family ratings (Roese & Olson, 2007).

54 “Triangulation is a means of checking the integrity of the inferences one draws. It can involve the use of multiple data sources, …multiple theoretical perspectives, multiple methods, or all of these” (Schwandt, 2001, p. 257). In effect, the standard of triangulation is advocacy for checks and balances.

55 Six of the 59 studies listed in the 2005 APA Brief (pp. 23–45) had larger samples, but, as discussed earlier, they all focused on adult reports of adult perceptions and outcomes.

56 For example, Brewaeys et al., 1997; Golombok et al., 2003; Golomobok et al., 1997; MacCallum & Golombok, 2004; Tasker & Golombok, 1998

57 In spite of the strong design with respect to triangulation, the Sarantakos study does not appear to be based on a true probability sample, nor is it or a large sample (although it is a subsample of a 900-plus study). The study is rigorous by comparison to other same-sex parenting studies, but is limited compared with most of the nationally representative studies on intact families listed in Table B.
Accordingly, this study deserves the attention of scientists interested in the question of homosexual and heterosexual parenting, rather than the footnote it received. Indeed, additional examination reveals that Sarantakos is the author of several research methods textbooks (2005, 2007b) and the author/editor of a four-volume, 1672-page work in Sage Publications’ *Benchmarks in Social Research Series* (2007a). This sheds light on the comparatively exemplary rigor of the study.\(^{58}\)

As we conclude the examination of Question 4, let us review a portion of APA’s published negation of Sarantakos’ (1996) study:

*Children Australia*, the journal where the article was published] cannot be considered a source upon which one should rely for understanding the state of scientific knowledge in this field, particularly when the results contradict those that have been repeatedly replicated in studies published in better known scientific journals.\(^{59}\)

For other scientists, however, the salient points behind the Sarantakos findings were that more rigorous methods and the novel heterosexual comparison group of intact, marriage-based families introduced significant differences in children’s outcomes (as opposed to the recurring “no difference” finding with single-mother and “couple” samples). We now turn to the fifth question.

**Question 5: What types of outcomes have been investigated?**

With respect to the APA Brief’s claim that “not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to [have] disadvantaged [outcomes],” what *types* of outcomes have been examined and investigated? Specifically, how many of the same-sex parenting

---

\(^{58}\) In spite of the relatively strong design, the Sarantakos study does not appear to be based on a true probability sample, nor is it or a *large* sample (although it is a subsample of a 900-plus study). The study is rigorous by comparison to other same-sex parenting studies, but is limited compared with most of the nationally representative studies on intact families listed in Table B.

\(^{59}\) Patterson (2005) in APA Brief, p. 7, footnote 1
studies in Table A address the critical societal concerns of intergenerational poverty, collegiate education and/or labor force contribution, serious criminality, incarceration, early childbearing, drug/alcohol abuse, suicide, or subsequent divorce that are frequently the foci of national studies on children, adolescents, and young adults, as discussed at the outset of this report?

Anderssen and colleagues cataloged the foci of same-sex parenting studies in a 2002 review and reported:

Emotional functioning was the most often studied outcome (12 studies), followed by sexual preference (nine studies), gender role behavior (eight studies), behavioral adjustment (seven studies), gender identity (six studies), and cognitive functioning (three studies).  

Follow-up examination of the articles cited in the 2005 APA Brief on Lesbian and Gay Parenting (pp. 23-45) yields a list of studied outcomes that are quite consistent with Anderssen’s summary, including: “sexual orientation”61; “behavioral adjustment, self-concepts, and sex-role identity”62; “sexual identity”63; “sex-role behavior”64; “self-esteem”65; “psychosexual and psychiatric appraisal”66; “socioemotional development”67; and “maternal mental health and child adjustment.”68

With these focal outcomes identified, it is noteworthy that the aforementioned outcomes of societal-level concern are absent from the list of “most often studied

---

60 Anderssen et al., 2002, p. 343  
61 Bailey et al., 1995; Golombok & Tasker, 1996  
62 Patterson, 1994  
63 Green, 1978  
64 Hoeffer, 1981; Kweskin & Cook, 1982  
65 Huggins, 1989  
66 Golombok et al., 1983  
67 Golombok et al., 1997  
68 Patterson, 2001
outcome(s)” as identified by Anderssen et al.\textsuperscript{69} In response to the present report’s Question 5 (what types of outcomes have been investigated for children of gay/lesbian families?), it may be concluded: In the same-sex parenting research that undergirded the 2005 APA Brief, it appears that gender-related outcomes were the dominant research concern. To be more precise, Table A lists several categories of information regarding the 59 published empirical studies; one of these categories is the “outcome studied.” More than 20 studies examined gender-related outcomes, but there was a dearth of peer-reviewed journal articles from which to form science-based conclusions in any of the seven identified areas of societal concern.\textsuperscript{70} Therefore, when the APA Brief asserted that “Not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to be disadvantaged in any significant respect relative to children of heterosexual parents,”\textsuperscript{71} the summary might have instead read “There are almost no studies with samples larger than 100 that examine whether disadvantages exist between children’s outcomes of same-sex and heterosexual parents with respect to many critical societal concerns.”

One book-length empirical study entitled \textit{Same-Sex Couples} (Sarantakos, 2000; Harvard Press) \textit{did} examine not only one but several outcomes of critical societal concern. However, this extensive study is not cited in the APA Brief. In connection with the questions raised in the present report, the Sarantakos (2000) study:

1) includes a diverse sample of lesbian \textit{and} gay parents instead of focusing on privileged lesbian mothers (Question 1);

\textsuperscript{69} Anderssen et al., 2002, p. 343
\textsuperscript{70} Including: intergenerational poverty, criminality, college education and/or labor force contribution, drug/alcohol abuse, suicide, sexual activity and early childbearing, and divorce as adults.
\textsuperscript{71} Patterson, p. 15 (from APA Brief, 2005)
2) uses not only one but two heterosexual comparison samples; one married parent sample and one cohabitating parent sample (Questions 2 and 3);  
3) examines several outcomes of societal concern (Question 5); and  
4) is unique in presenting long-term (post-18 years old) outcomes of children with lesbian and gay parents (Question 6, addressed later).

The Sarantakos (2000) study’s conclusion regarding outcomes of young adult children of gay and lesbian parents reads, in part:

If we perceive deviance in a general sense, to include excessive drinking, drug use, truancy, sexual deviance, and criminal offenses, and if we rely on the statements made by adult children (over 18 years of age)...[then] children of homosexual parents report deviance in higher proportions than children of (married or cohabiting) heterosexual couples (Sarantakos, 2000, p. 131).

The Sarantakos (2000) study also includes the report that “the number of children who were labeled by their parents as gay, or identified themselves as gay, is much higher than the generally expected proportion” (p. 133). However, the study also notes areas of no significant heterosexual-homosexual differences (i.e., “Physical and emotional well-being,” p. 130), consistent with the 2005 APA Brief’s claims. All of these findings warranted attention, but Sarantakos’ (2000) groundbreaking, book-length study was not even referenced in the 2005 APA Brief. Again, we are led to more closely examine the claim that “Not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to be disadvantaged in any significant respect relative to children of heterosexual parents” (p. 15).

To summarily conclude the examination of Question 5 (“What types of outcomes have investigated?”), we see that different aspects of gender and childhood emotional/behavioral development have been focal but that many concerns of critical
societal importance were repeatedly overlooked in the APA-cited studies on same-sex parenting. By contrast, Sarantakos (2000; overlooked in the APA Brief) examined four concerns of critical societal importance, including: (a) drug and alcohol abuse, (b) education (truancy), (c) sexual activity, and (d) criminality—and noted significant differences in all of these areas of concern.

In any less-developed domain of empirical inquiry it takes time, often several decades, before many of the central and most relevant questions begin to be adequately addressed. This seems to be the case with same-sex parenting outcomes, as several issues of societal concern were almost entirely unaddressed in the studies cited in the 2005 APA Brief.

**Question 6: What do we know about the long-term outcomes of children of lesbian and gay parents?**

In the preceding response to Question 5, the salient outcomes of intergenerational poverty, criminality, college education and/or labor force contribution, drug/alcohol abuse, suicide, early sexual activity, early childbearing, and eventual divorce as adults were mentioned. Close consideration reveals that the majority of these outcomes are not “child” outcomes, per se. Indeed, most of these outcomes are not optimally observable until (at the earliest) mid-late adolescence or early adulthood (and in the case of divorce, not until middle adulthood at the earliest). As discussed in Question 5, virtually none of the peer-reviewed, same-sex parenting comparison studies addressed these outcomes.\(^\text{72}\)

---

\(^{72}\) Gartrell and colleagues (1999, 2000, 2005) have commenced to do so with a small, selected convenience sample (N=74), but in 2005 they were reporting on children who were only 10 years old, with no heterosexual comparison group.
Additionally, of the 59 published studies cited by the APA 2005 Brief (pp. 23–45), it is difficult to find comparison studies that examine late adolescent outcomes of any kind. The few that utilize comparison groups have comparison groups of 44 or fewer.\textsuperscript{73} Let us further explore the importance of a lack of data centered on adolescents and young adults.

Table B identifies 15 of the hundreds of available studies on outcomes of children from intact families (as contrasted with comparison groups such as cohabiting couples and single parents). One of these studies included a data set of 35,938 children—one of “the largest…nationally representative survey[s] of U.S. children and their parents.”\textsuperscript{74} Based on analysis of this nationally representative sample, Susan Brown emphasized, “The findings of this study…demonstrate the importance of separately examining children and adolescents.” She then explained:

Although the outcomes of children (6–11 years old) in cohabiting families…are worse…than those of children in two-biological-parent married families, much of this difference…is economic…. In contrast, regardless of economic and parental resources, the outcomes of adolescents (12–17 years old) in cohabiting families…are worse…than those…in two-biological-parent married families.\textsuperscript{75}

The salient point is that in the case of cohabiting families and “two-biological-parent married families” the differences in children’s outcomes increase in significance as the children grow older. The likelihood of significant differences arising between children from same-sex and married families may also increase across time—not just into adolescence but into early and middle adulthood. For example, research indicates that “daughters raised outside of intact marriages are…more likely to end up young, unwed

\textsuperscript{73} i.e., Wainwright Russell, & Patterson, 2004
\textsuperscript{74} Brown, 2004, p. 355
\textsuperscript{75} Brown, 2004, p. 364
mothers than are children whose parents married and stayed married,” and that “parental divorce increases the odds that adult children will also divorce.”

Longitudinal studies that follow children across time and into adulthood to examine such outcomes are comparatively rare and valuable. We briefly turn to a key finding from one such study that followed children of divorce into middle adulthood. Based on a 25-year longitudinal study, Wallerstein and colleagues (2001) state:

Contrary to what we have long thought, the major impact of divorce does not occur during childhood or adolescence. Rather, it rises in adulthood as serious romantic relationships move center stage. When it comes time to choose a life mate and build a new family, the effects of divorce crescendo (p. xxix).

Wallerstein’s research, like nearly all of the studies in the same-sex parenting literature, is based on a small, non-representative sample that should not be generalized or overextended. Her longitudinal work does, however, indicate that the impact of divorce seemed to “crescendo” in adulthood for those in her study.

Did any published same-sex parenting study cited by the 2005 APA Brief (pp. 23–45) track the societally significant long-term outcomes into adulthood? No. Is it possible that “the major impact” of same-sex parenting might “not occur during childhood or adolescence…[but that it will rise] in adulthood as serious romantic relationships move center stage”? Is it also possible that “when it comes time to choose a life mate and build a new family” that the effects of same-sex parenting will similarly “crescendo” as they did in Wallerstein’s study of divorce effects? In response to this or any question regarding the long-term, adult outcomes of lesbian and gay parenting we

---

76 Wilcox et al. 2011, p.11
77 As stated previously, Gartrell and colleagues (1999, 2000, 2005) have commenced to do so with a small, selected convenience sample (N=74), but in 2005 they were reporting on children who were only 10 years old, with no heterosexual comparison group.
have almost no empirical basis for responding. An exception is provided by the findings from self-reports of adult “children” (18+ years of age) of same-sex parents in Sarantakos’ (2000) book-length study, but those results not encouraging. This is a single study however—a study that (like those cited by the APA Brief) lacks the rigor of the large, random, representative samples used in marriage-based family studies (see Table B).

Summary

In review, let us revisit the six specific questions asked in this paper, along with summative responses based on the examinations of the 59 published studies cited in the APA Brief:

**Question 1:** How representative and culturally, ethnically, and economically diverse were the gay/lesbian households in the published literature behind the APA brief? By their own reports, social researchers examining same-sex parenting have repeatedly selected small, non-representative, homogeneous samples of privileged, White lesbian mothers to represent “same-sex parents” while gay fathers and racial minorities have rarely been included in same-sex parenting studies.

**Question 2:** How many studies of gay/lesbian parents had no heterosexual comparison group? Of the 59 publications cited by the APA (pp. 23–45), 26 of the studies (44.1 %) on same-sex parenting did not include a heterosexual comparison group of any kind.

**Question 3:** When heterosexual comparison groups were used, what were the more specific characteristics of those groups? In selecting heterosexual comparison groups for their studies, same-sex parenting researchers have rarely selected marriage-
based, intact families, but have repeatedly used single mothers to represent “heterosexual parents” (see Table A).

**Question 4: Does a scientifically-viable study exist to contradict the conclusion that “not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to be disadvantaged”?** Yes, such studies do and did exist but were either minimized (e.g., Sarantakos, 1996) or overlooked (e.g., Sarantakos, 2000) in the 2005 APA Brief.

**Question 5: What types of outcomes have been investigated?** More than 20 of the 59 studies (APA Brief, pp. 23-45) examined gender-related outcomes, but the critical societal concerns of intergenerational poverty, collegiate education and/or labor force contribution, serious criminality, incarceration, early childbearing, drug/alcohol abuse, suicide, and subsequent divorce as adults went largely unexamined.  

**Question 6: What do we know about the long-term outcomes of children of lesbian and gay parents?** Virtually no comparison studies examine the critical societal outcomes during late adolescence or early adulthood. One exception, Sarantakos (2000), did examine critical societal outcomes and found several differences favoring (adult) children from intact, marriage-based families—but like the studies cited by the APA Brief, this study is small, limited, non-representative, and not generalizable.

**Conclusion**

---

78 Table B lists 15 studies that contrast children’s outcomes in intact families compared with other family forms using large, probability samples and comparison groups. The focal topics of these studies are not “sexual preference, gender role behavior…[and] gender identity”78 (Anderssen et al., 2002, p. 343), but outcomes such as “educational attainment,” “labor force attachment,” and “early childbearing” (McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994, pp. 20-21), as recommended in the earlier examination of Question 5. Further, all but three of the 15 studies employ longitudinal designs.
Are children with lesbian and gay parents demonstrably faring as well as those in marriage-based families? Even after reviewing the 59 same-sex parenting studies cited by the 2005 APA Brief (pp. 23-45) the author of the present report cannot offer a high confidence, data-based “yes” or “no” response to this question as a scientist. Empirical truth is often expensive and, as collective discipline of social scientists, we have not generated the price required to make truth claims related to this domain.

To restate, not one of the 59 studies referenced in the 2005 APA Brief (pp. 23-45; see Table A) compares a large, random, representative sample of lesbian or gay parents and their children with a large, random, representative sample of married parents and their children. The available data, which are drawn primarily from small convenience samples, are insufficient to support a strong generalizable claim either way. Such a statement would not be grounded in science. To make a valid, generalizable claim, representative, large-sample studies are needed (e.g., Table B).

Some opponents of same-sex parenting have made “egregious overstatements” disparaging gay and lesbian parents. Conversely, some same-sex parenting researchers seem to have contended for an “exceptionally clear” verdict of “no difference” between same-sex and heterosexual parents since 1992. However, a closer examination leads to the conclusion that strong, generalized assertions, including those made by the APA Brief, were not empirically warranted. As noted by Shiller (2007) in American Psychologist, “the line between science and advocacy appears blurred” (p. 712).

---

79 This reality has been disapprovingly documented by Shiller (2007).
80 Patterson, 1992
81 In 2006, the year following APA’s release of the brief on Lesbian and Gay Parenting, “former APA president Nicholas Cummings argued that there has been significant erosion” of the APA’s established principle (Shiller, 2007, p. 712)…that “when we speak
The scientific conclusions in this domain will increase in validity as researchers:

(a) move from small convenience samples towards larger, more representative samples;
(b) increasingly examine critical societal and economic concerns that emerge during adolescence and adulthood; (c) include more diverse same-sex families (e.g., gay fathers, racial minorities, and those without middle-high socioeconomic status); (d) include intact, marriage-based heterosexual families as comparison groups; and (e) constructively respond to criticisms\textsuperscript{82} from methodological experts.\textsuperscript{83} Taking these steps will help produce more methodologically rigorous and scientifically informed responses to significant questions affecting families and children.
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as psychologists we speak from research evidence and clinical experience and expertise” (Cummings, 2006, p. 2).

\textsuperscript{82} Nock concluded, “All of the [same-sex parenting] articles I reviewed contained at least one fatal flaw of design or execution. Not a single one was conducted according to generally accepted standards of scientific research…. [I]n my opinion, the only acceptable conclusion at this point is that the literature on this topic does not constitute a solid body of scientific evidence” (Nock, 2001, pp. 39, 47). More specifically, Nock identified: (a) several flaws related to sampling (including biased sampling, non-probability sampling, convenience sampling, etc.); (b) poorly operationalized definitions; (c) researcher bias; (d) lack of longitudinal studies; (e) failure to report reliability; (f) low response rates; and (g) lack of statistical power (pp. 39-40). Only three of these seven flaws are addressed in the present report. Although some of these flaws are briefly mentioned in the 2005 APA Summary of Research Findings on Lesbian and Gay Parenting, many of the significant concerns raised by Nock or Lerner and Nagai are not substantively addressed. Indeed, the Lerner and Nagai volume and the Nock report are neither mentioned nor referenced.

\textsuperscript{83} For other methodological critiques of the same-sex parenting literature preceding the 2005 APA brief (in addition to Nock, 2001), see Lerner & Nagai, 2001; Schumm, 2004; Stacey & Biblarz, 2001; Wardle, 1997; and Williams, 2000. For methodological critiques post-dating the 2005 APA brief, see Byrd, 2008; Schumm, 2010a, 2010b, 2011; and Redding, 2008 (p. 138).
Table A: Publications Cited in APA Brief on Lesbian and Gay Parenting (pp. 23-45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Year</th>
<th>Gayles N</th>
<th>Hetero N</th>
<th>Outcome Studied</th>
<th>Hetero Compar Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bailey et al., 1995</td>
<td>55par;82chl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett &amp; Tasker, 2001</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Child Responses to a Gay Parent</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigner &amp; Jacobsen, 1989a</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Parents Reports of Values of Children</td>
<td>Fathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigner &amp; Jacobsen, 1989b</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Parent Reports of Parent Behavior</td>
<td>Fathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos et al. 2003</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Parental Motives and Desires</td>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos et al., 2004</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Parent Reports of Couple Relations</td>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozett, 1980</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Father Disclosure of Homosexuality</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewaeys et al., 1997</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Emotional/Gender Development</td>
<td>DI/Non-DI Couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan, Brooks, et al., 1998</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Division of Labor/Child Adjustment</td>
<td>DI Couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan, Raboy, et al., 1998</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Psychosocial Adjustment</td>
<td>DI Couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciano-Boyce &amp; Shelley-Sireci, 2002</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Division of Child Care</td>
<td>Adoptive Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford et al., 1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>388 Psychologists’ Attitudes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaks et al., 1995</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cognitive/Behavioral/Parenting</td>
<td>Married Couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulcher et al., 2002</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>DI/Adult-Child Relationships</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gartrell et al., 1996</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Prospective Parent Reports</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gartrell et al., 1999</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reports on Parenting Issues</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gartrell et al., 2000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reports on Parenting Issues</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gartrell et al., 2005</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Health, School/Education</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gershon et al., 1999</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Adolescent coping</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golombok et al., 1983</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Psychosexual Development</td>
<td>Single Mother Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golombok et al., 2003</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Socioemotional Dev./Relations</td>
<td>Couples &amp; Singles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golombok &amp; Rust, 1993</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reliability Testing of a Pre-School Gender Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golombok &amp; Tasker, 1996</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Children of Single Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golombok et al., 1997</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Parent-Child Interactions</td>
<td>Couples &amp; Singles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, 1978</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sexual Identity</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green et al., 1986</td>
<td>50par;56chl</td>
<td>40par;48chl</td>
<td>Sexual Identity/Social Relations</td>
<td>Single Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris &amp; Turner, 1986</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sex Roles/Relationship with Child</td>
<td>Single Moth. &amp; Fath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoeffner, 1981</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sex-role Behavior</td>
<td>Single Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huggins, 1989</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Self-Esteem of Adolescent Children</td>
<td>Divorced Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; O’Connor, 2002</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Parenting Beliefs/Division of Labor/</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Black, 1999</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>338 College Students’ Perceptions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkpatrick et al., 1981</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Gender Development</td>
<td>Single Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koepke et al., 1992</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Relationship quality</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kweskin &amp; Cook, 1982</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sex-Role Behavior</td>
<td>Single Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, 1980</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Child Response to M. Disclosure</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lott-Whitehead &amp; Tully, 1993</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Adult Reports of Impacts on Children</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, 1983</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Adult Self-Reports</td>
<td>Divorced Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod et al., 1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151 College Student Reports</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, 1979</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Father Behavior &amp; F-Child Bond</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller et al., 1981</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Mother Role/Home Environment</td>
<td>Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris et al., 2002</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Adult Reports on &quot;Coming Out&quot;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucklow &amp; Phelan, 1979</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Behavior and Self-Concept</td>
<td>Married Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connell, 1993</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Social and Sexual Identity</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagelow, 1980</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Problems and Coping</td>
<td>Single Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson, 1994</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Social/Behavioral/Sexual Identity</td>
<td>Available Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson, 1995</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Division of Labor/Child Adjustment</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson, 2001</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Maternal Mental Health/Child Adjustment</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson et al., 1998</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Contact w/Grandparents &amp; Adults</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rand, Graham, &amp; Rawlings, 1982</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mothers' Psychological Health</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarantakos, 1996</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Children's Educational/Social Outcomes</td>
<td>Married/Non-married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegenthaler &amp; Bigner, 2000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mothers' Value of Children</td>
<td>Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steckel, 1987</td>
<td>(Review)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Psychosocial Development of Children</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, 1996</td>
<td>34 couples</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Division of Labor</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasker &amp; Golombok, 1995</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Psychosocial/Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Single Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasker &amp; Golombok, 1997</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Psychological Outcomes/Family Rel.</td>
<td>Single Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasker &amp; Golombok, 1998</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Work and Family Life</td>
<td>D &amp; NC Couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanfraussen et al., 2003</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Donor Insemination/Family Func.</td>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainwright et al., 2004</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Psychosocial/School/Romantic</td>
<td>Couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, 1998</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Family Issues/Processes/Meaning</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B: Brief Overview of 15 Intact/Divorce/Step/Single Family Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Comp Grp</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amato, 1991</td>
<td>9,643</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilino, 1994</td>
<td>4,516</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, 2004</td>
<td>35,938</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase-Lansdale et al., 1995</td>
<td>17,414</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherlin et al., 1998</td>
<td>11,759</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis et al., 2003</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetherington &amp; Kelly, 2002</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jekielek, 1998</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichter et al., 2003</td>
<td>7,665</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning &amp; Lamb, 2003</td>
<td>13,231</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLanahan &amp; Sandefur, 1994 (based on 4 data sets):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSID</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLSY</td>
<td>5,246</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSBS</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSFH</td>
<td>13,017</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell et al., 2009</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nock, 1998</td>
<td>3,604</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page &amp; Stevens, 2005</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>148,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

84 National Survey of America’s Families (NSAF)
85 United Kingdom study and sample
86 United Kingdom study and sample
87 National Longitudinal Survey of Young Men and Women (NLSY)
88 Virginia Longitudinal Study (VLS)
89 National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG)
90 Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)
91 National Longitudinal Survey of Young Men and Women (NLSY)
92 The High School and Beyond Study (HSBS)
93 National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)
94 This is the total original sample. The sub-sample is unlisted but is likely smaller.
95 National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health)
96 National Longitudinal Survey of Young Men and Women (NLSY)
97 Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)
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