


Multidimensional social support and parenting among Black fathers: A profile-oriented approach

Margarett McBride¹  | Shauna M. Cooper¹ |
Qiana Cryer-Coupet² | Marketa Burnett³ | Shedrick Garrett¹ |
Stephen Gibson⁴

¹Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA

²School of Social Work, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

³Department of Psychology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina, USA

⁴Psychology Department, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia, USA

Correspondence

Margarett McBride, Department of Psychology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 208 Davie Hall, Chapel Hill, NC 27510, USA.

Email: marsm@live.unc.edu

Funding information

Conceptual development and preparation of this manuscript were supported by grants from the National Science Foundation, United States (1833349/1150963).

Abstract

Though studies have examined the role of social support in the lives of Black men, less is known about the role and function of multi-domain social support as they navigate fatherhood. This investigation utilizes a profile-oriented approach to identify patterns of general and parenting-specific social support (i.e., family; peers; community) among a sample of 759 Black American fathers. Additionally, this study examines how identified support profiles are associated with Black fathers' parenting outcomes (i.e., stress, satisfaction, self-efficacy, and involvement). Latent class analyses identified 10 distinct social support profiles among Black fathers. Results also indicated that there was some profile variation in levels parenting outcomes. Findings suggest variation in the availability and utilization of general and parenting support among Black fathers.

KEYWORDS

Black fathers, involvement, parenting, social support, stress

1 | INTRODUCTION

Theoretical and empirical studies have revealed the indirect and direct impacts of social and contextual stressors on well-being and parenting (Abidin, 1992; Castillo & Sarver, 2012; Coates & Phares, 2014; Coles, 2009). In the face of stressors, studies indicate that Black men often employ coping strategies that include proximal and extended social support networks (Billingsley, 1992; Ross & Aday, 2006; Utsey et al., 2007). Black men's social support networks

encompass several domains, such as family members, spouses, dating partners, friends, and broader community (Davis et al., 1998; Krause et al., 2001; Niela-Vilén et al., 2014; Tsuchiya et al., 2018). While studies have examined social support as a stress coping strategy among Black men, some have explored how an array of social supports (i.e., extended family, counseling, spiritual support, public assistance, community center or school employees, and internet chat sites) may influence Black fathers' parenting beliefs and behaviors (Coles, 2009; Dallas, 2009; McLeod PhD, MSW & McLeod, 2020; Perry, 2009). Still, less attention has been given to within group variation among Black fathers, specifically, diversity across socio-demographic contexts, levels and types of social support and parenting-related experiences. Utilizing a latent profile analytic approach, the current investigation explores social support heterogeneity among Black American fathers, identifying social support profiles among a socio-demographically diverse sample of Black fathers. Additionally, this investigation examines how identified social support profiles are related to socio-demographic factors, parenting stress, parenting beliefs, and father involvement.

1.1 | Social support and Black fathers' parenting outcomes

Numerous studies have established that social networks are beneficial, indicating that greater social support promotes more positive psychological well-being (Chu et al., 2010; Siedlecki et al., 2014). Though much of the literature has focused on social support in relation to indicators of mental health, research indicates that social support systems also act as a promotive factor for fathers' parenting beliefs and self-assessments (Thompson & Walker, 2004) and are critical for father involvement, especially for more vulnerable and marginalized fathers (Fagan & Lee, 2011; Fagan et al., 2007). Scholars have called for additional studies that examine Black fathers' social support systems, such as co-parenting, parents, kin support (e.g., siblings, extended family), and community, and how support influences father engagement (Cabrera et al., 2011; Morgan et al., 2008; Perry & Lewis, 2016; Perry, 2009). For example, prior studies highlight how Black fathers' fathering beliefs and engagement are shaped by fathers and father figures (Cooper et al., 2019; Perry & Lewis, 2016). Moreover, other research demonstrates that, for Black nonresidential fathers, receiving support from extended family is positively associated with involvement (Perry, 2009). Thus, incorporating various sources of support for Black fathers is essential for understanding how support impacts fathering experiences.

Reconciling the literature, we find that the relationship between support systems and outcomes for Black fathers is equivocal and not always positive. With a sample primarily composed of Black fathers, Anderson and colleagues (2005) found that greater perceptions helpfulness from their support systems (i.e., familial, friends, and professional) were associated with increased depressive symptoms. Explanatory mechanisms could be beneficial by characterizing how social networks may cause or exacerbate stress among Black fathers. For example, research has suggested that fathers may feel guilty for not being able to reciprocate help (Hoard & Anderson, 2004; Stokes et al., 2020; Taylor et al., 1990). One potential reason for the equivocality of existing literature could be a uni-dimensional focus on social support.

1.2 | A multi-domain perspective on Black fathers' social support

Empirical evidence suggests that, compared to Black women, Black men have smaller support networks and are less likely to utilize social support networks (Antonucci & Akiyama, 1987; Goodwill et al., 2018; Haines & Hurlbert, 1992; Toler Woodward et al., 2011). Differences between Black men and woman have been attributed to a number of factors related to help-seeking behaviors, including masculinity role norms (Goodwill et al., 2018; Hudson et al., 2018; Jacoby et al., 2018; Powell et al., 2016; Toler Woodward et al., 2011). Additionally, research indicates that barriers may decrease the likelihood of how men access and utilize their support networks (Cadaret & Speight, 2018; Clement et al., 2015; Corrigan, 2004) and increase their chance of withdrawing from their networks

(Baker, 2001). Studies have found that when Black men do ask for help, it is more likely to be from more proximal sources, such as parents (mothers and fathers), other close relatives (siblings), spouses, and current dating partners (Allen et al., 2013; Goodwill et al., 2018; Plowden et al., 2006; Toler Woodward et al., 2011).

Given the litany of stressors that Black men may be exposed to, including those arising from contextual, racial discrimination and other systemic factors (Goodwill et al., 2018; Johnson, 2019; Rich & Grey, 2005; Thorpe et al., 2020), investigations indicate that one of the most prominent sources of support and coping assets are their close connections with significant others in their lives (Kendrick et al., 2007; Watkins et al., 2007; Toler Woodward et al., 2011). In line with multidimensional models of social support, studies have revealed that there are various sources and domains of support that Black men may access and utilize, particularly in times of stress (Toler Woodward et al., 2011). Some of the research has found that Black men note sources of support that are used to combat family- and parenting-related stressors. Beyond the general function of social support, however, studies indicate that fathers often desire social support to help navigate the day-to-day challenges of fathering (Coles, 2009; Doyle et al., 2014). Largely, the literature has highlighted co-parenting relationships and romantic partnerships (Doyle et al., 2014; Perry et al., 2012). Research has found that both co-parenting and partner support are negatively associated with Black fathers' parenting stress and positively associated with their engagement (Akande & Heath, 2019; Castillo & Sarver, 2012; Roy & Dyson, 2005). Doyle and colleagues' (2014) qualitative analysis of Black fathers and their co-parenting relationships highlight supportive communication as a key domain of support. Literature on co-parenting and partners amplify the importance of close connections as social support sources for Black fathers.

Beginning in adolescence, several investigations point to the critical role of community and neighborhood support for Black boys and men (Mattis et al., 2021; Nebbitt et al., 2014). For instance, Chung et al. (2014) found that a large percentage (42.1%) of Black men in their sample reported religious-related support (i.e., relationship with God, prayer, and church participation) as a source of resiliency. Moreover, pastors also engage in training and practice as counselors, which can be an essential resource for populations that lack access to therapeutic and counseling services (Young et al., 2003). The reliance on community-based supports, like religious support, is also prominent for Black fathers. For example, a recent study by Wilson and colleagues (2021) found that Black fathers, more so than Latino and White fathers, utilize spirituality as a support resource. Additional research that considers the cultural strengths and systemic barriers that Black fathers navigate is vital to gaining insights on the various community-based sources of support they utilize when stressed.

Communities also extend to online spaces. Online communities often can be a more accessible form of support (Barnes & Hollingsworth, 2020; Broadus et al., 2015; Fuqua et al., 2012; Hill, 2018; Rainie, 2013) where individuals can receive or share ideas (Gottfried & Shearer, 2016; Madden et al., 2010). Studies of online social support seeking among parents demonstrate advantages, such as sharing advice, uplifting shared experiences, building self-esteem, providing emotional support, and being convenient/accessible (Doty & Dworkin, 2014; Madge & O'Connor, 2006; McLeod & McLeod, 2020). A recent study on Black fathers' use of social media by McLeod and McLeod (2020) found that many Black fathers use social media as a support system where they can seek advice. In particular, the textual analysis highlighted several areas of advice and support, such as financial, co-parenting, family relationship conflict, family expansion, and raising children/child development. Recent investigations have found that whether virtual or in-person, fathers value receiving peer parenting support (Doyle et al., 2022). However, there is still a need to paint a more comprehensive picture of Black fathers' social support patterns.

An essential extension of the literature is the degree to which support dimensions work together in concert. To date, studies have utilized profile-analysis approaches, which highlight variations in patterns amongst a population (Bergman & Trost, 2006; Magidson & Vermunt, 2004; Williams & Kibowski, 2016), to identify social support profiles among samples of Black parents (Ayón et al., 2015; Caughy et al., 2011; Cooper et al., 2020). Among a sample of over 700 Black fathers, Cooper et al. (2020) identified eight coping patterns, including multi-domain social support. To our knowledge, no known study has identified social support profiles among a diverse sample of Black fathers,

providing a novel opportunity for the study to deepen our understanding of their support systems in a parenting context.

1.3 | Study goals and theoretical framework

The Parenting Stress Model (Abidin, 1992), which provides the theoretical foundation of the current investigation, posits that determinants, such as stressors and roles influence parenting behaviors. Furthermore, the Parenting Stress Model highlights how *parenting resources*, such as social support, is indirectly and directly associated with parenting stress, behaviors, and beliefs. To date, much of the existing literature has utilized a variable-focused approach to examine Black fathers' social support, particularly for more general domains. Thus, how various social support domains operate conjointly are less well known. Utilizing a profile-oriented approach, the current investigation explores various fathers' support sources (i.e., family, partners, friends, and community) and support domains (i.e., general and parenting). Based on prior studies, we expect several social support profiles to emerge among our sample of fathers. Additionally, the current study examines whether the relationship between parenting stress and parenting outcomes varies across social support profiles.

2 | METHOD

2.1 | Participants

Data for the study comes from the Representations of Fatherhood: Roles, Awareness, and Meaning (ReFRAME) study, a multiregional online panel sample of Black American fathers (blinded, author). Participants were a sample of 759 Black American fathers ($M_{age} = 38.99$; $SD = 10.01$), with at least one child between 8 and 17 years old ($M_{age} = 12.06$; $SD = 2.88$). Approximately 56% of fathers reported having a male child. Fathers were in all regions of the United States, including Southeast (38.7%), Northeast (21.3%), Midwest (18.1%), Southwest (11.3%), and West (10.3%). Approximately 44% of fathers were currently married (44.3%), and 85% were biological parents. Seventy-five percent resided with the target child. Fathers in the sample were diverse in their level of educational attainment, including those with less than a high school diploma (5.3%), a high school diploma (33.5%), an associate's/technical degree (27%), and a bachelor's or advanced degree (32.4%). Approximately 75% of fathers reported being currently employed.

2.2 | Procedure

After receiving human subjects approval through the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Internal Review Board (IRB # 19-1156), fathers were recruited via an online Qualtrics panel study. Qualtrics Panels, a platform for recruitment, identifies eligible participants for study participation. Recent studies have highlighted that online panel studies provide robust data comparable to other recruitment methods and increase participation of harder to recruit populations in research studies (Ibarra et al., 2018). Before completing the survey, participants signed a web-based consent form and verified eligibility criteria (African American/Black father with a child between the ages of 8 and 17). Participants reported on several measures, such as father demographics (e.g., age, sexual orientation, education level, marital status, employment status, biological status, and residential status), parenting stress, and parenting beliefs (e.g., parenting satisfaction, parental efficacy). Participants were instructed to report on their experiences with an identified target child to understand parenting beliefs and involvement. Before answering parenting-related questions, fathers reported on the target child's demographics (e.g., age, gender). On average, the

survey took approximately 30–40 min to complete. Attention checks were included in surveys, and quality checks were initially conducted by Qualtrics Panels and again by the research team. Fathers were compensated for participation after study completion. Compensation was determined by Qualtrics Panels (not the principal investigator) based upon the length and difficulty of the survey. After completion, participants had the option of choosing among monetary compensation (less than \$10), airline miles, or another comparable gift.

2.3 | Measures

2.3.1 | Parenting outcomes

2.3.1.1 | Parenting stress

Parenting stress was measured using a one-item indicator, “How stressful has parenting been in the last month?” Participants responded using a 5-point scale (1 = *not stressful*; 5 = *very stressful*).

2.3.1.2 | Fathering beliefs

Fathering beliefs were assessed in two dimensions: parenting satisfaction and efficacy. *Parenting satisfaction* was measured using a 3-item scale ($\alpha = 0.75$; e.g., “How satisfied are you with your relationship with your child?”). Fathers reported their satisfaction with each item on a 5-point scale (1 = *very dissatisfied*; 5 = *very satisfied*). Higher scores indicated greater satisfaction with their parenting experience. *Parenting efficacy* is a 4-item measure, adapted from Johnston and Mash (1989; e.g., “Do you believe that you have all the skills necessary to be a good father to your child?”). Fathers reported their agreement with each item on a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). A mean score was computed, with higher scores indicating more positive parenting efficacy. The reliability for the scale was 0.70.

2.3.1.3 | Father involvement

Father involvement was also assessed using two dimensions, both their home and school involvement. Home involvement encompassed a 3-item scale that assessed their engagement with their child in the home context ($\alpha = 0.69$; e.g., “How often do you talk about different jobs they can have when they grow up?”). Fathers reported the frequency of engagement with each item on a 5-point scale (1 = *never*; 5 = *almost every day*). A 6-item measure of school involvement assessed fathers' involvement in the school environment ($\alpha = 0.85$; e.g., “How often have you met with your child's teacher?”; (1 = *never*; 4 = *many times*). Higher values indicate more frequent home and school involvement.

2.3.2 | Social support domains

2.3.2.4 | General social support

Three general social support domains were examined in the study: 1) family, 2) friends, and 3) community. The Multidimensional Scale of Social Support (MPSS; Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988) was modified to measure participants' perceptions of their social support in their family- (e.g., “I can talk about my problems with my family”; 5-items; $\alpha = 0.93$) and friend-specific domains (e.g., “I get the emotional help and support that I need from my friends”; 5-items; $\alpha = 0.93$). The response scale ranged from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). Previous studies have found the Multidimensional Scale of Social Support scale to be reliable with Black samples, with internal reliability coefficients between 0.85 and 0.94 (Bowleg et al., 2013; Metzger et al., 2017).

2.3.2.5 | Community support

Also, the *Brief Sense of Communication Scale* (Peterson et al., 2008) was utilized to add a third domain of social support from the community (e.g., "I have a good bond with others in my community"; 8-items; $\alpha = 0.93$). Responses were rated on a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). The average of each subscale (i.e., family, friends, and community) was utilized with a higher score indicating a higher level of perceived support. Past investigations have utilized Brief Sense of Communication scale with both Black samples ($\alpha = 0.91$; Gullan et al., 2011) and parent samples ($\alpha = 0.92$; Burcher et al., 2021), highlighting high internal reliability coefficients for both samples.

2.3.2.6 | Parenting support

In addition to general social support, fathers were asked how often they seek or receive parenting information or advice across 5 domains—1) *parents* (mother/mother figure and father/father-figure were separate questions (2 items); $\alpha = 0.69$), 2) *partners* (co-parent; partner (2-items); $\alpha = 0.70$), 3) *siblings and other relatives* (brother, sister, other family (3-items) $\alpha = 0.81$), 4) *friends* (male and female friends (2-items); $\alpha = 0.73$), and 5) *online* (1-item), *counseling* (1-item), and *religious communities* (leaders and members of a religious community (2-items); $\alpha = 0.89$). Participants responded on a 4-point scale (1 = *never*; 4 = *often*) to the parenting support items.

2.3.3 | Socio-demographic variables

Several socio-demographic were examined in the investigation: (a) father's age; (b) biological father status (1 = *biological father*; 2 = *Nonbiological father*; (c) educational level (1 = *less than high school education*; 4 = *4-year college degree and higher*); (d) residential status (1 = *residential full time*; 2 = *residential part time*; 3 = *nonresidential*); (e) employment status (1 = *currently employed*; 2 = *currently unemployed*); and (f) marital status (1 = *married and living together*; 2 = *living together, not married*; 3 = *single*). Child demographic characteristics that were controlled for includes (a) child's age and (b) gender (1 = *female*; 2 = *male*; 3 = *nonbinary*). Demographic frequencies for categorical variables can be seen in Appendix Table A1.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Preliminary analyses

Correlations, means, and standard deviations for the study variables are shown in Appendix Table A2. Overall, fathers of the sample reported moderate levels of parenting stress ($M = 2.50$; $SD = 1.22$) and general stress ($M = 2.75$; $SD = 1.11$). Among the sample, general social support varied from moderate to higher levels across family ($M = 3.93$; $SD = 0.97$), friends ($M = 3.70$; $SD = 0.99$), and community ($M = 3.57$; $SD = 0.87$) domains. Additionally, fathers reported moderate to high levels of parenting support from their own parents ($M = 2.89$; $SD = 0.94$), their co-parents ($M = 3.03$; $SD = 0.93$), and other family members ($M = 2.56$; $SD = 0.93$). Fathers also indicated moderate levels of parenting support from their friends and peer groups ($M = 2.62$; $SD = 0.93$). Fathers, however, indicated lower levels of parenting support from counselors and therapists ($M = 1.97$; $SD = 1.10$), religious ($M = 2.34$; $SD = 1.09$), and online communities ($M = 1.91$; $SD = 1.10$).

For parenting related outcomes, fathers' beliefs and involvement ranged from moderate to higher levels (parenting satisfaction ($M = 4.30$; $SD = 0.84$); parenting efficacy ($M = 3.85$; $SD = 0.76$); home involvement ($M = 3.57$; $SD = 0.82$); school involvement ($M = 2.76$; $SD = 0.78$)). Bivariate analyses indicated associations among fathers' demographic characteristics, stress, general support, parenting support, parenting beliefs, and involvement.

3.2 | Primary data analytic strategy

Using Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, version 8.0), a latent profile analysis (LPA) was conducted to identify social support profiles among Black fathers. The LPA method extends the k-means techniques and allows for more formal criteria for identifying the number of ideal profiles (Magidson & Vermunt, 2004). Across all support dimension variables, missing data ranged from 0.14% to 8.44%. The Bayesian Information criterion (BIC) was used to find the best fitting model and the optimal number of profiles, a technique suggested by Nylund et al. (2007), where lower BIC scores (closer to 0) indicate a more optimal fitting model (Hagenaars & McCutcheon, 2002). Additionally, entropy scores were used to help determine the best model fit, with values closer to 1.00 suggesting a better fit. Once a best fitting profile solution was chosen, chi-square analyses were conducted to examine how profile differences varied by categorical variables (e.g., education level; residential and marital status). Quality of means tests were conducted using the Bolck et al. (2004) 3-Step Approach (BCH) to examine profile differences in continuous outcomes (e.g., parenting beliefs, involvement).

3.3 | What social support profiles exist among Black fathers?

Our latent profile analysis results revealed that a 10-profile solution fit the data most optimally, as shown by the lowest BIC value (18435.27; see Appendix Table A3). Specific profile patterns were as follows: Profile 1 was comprised of 65 fathers (8.56%), Profile 2 had 20 fathers (2.64%), Profile 3 had 58 fathers (7.64%), Profile 4 had 74 fathers (9.75%), Profile 5 had 34 fathers (4.48%), Profile 6 was the second-largest profile with 108 fathers (14.23%), Profile 7 was the largest profile with 171 fathers (22.53%), Profile 8 had 85 fathers (11.20%), Profile 9 had 83 fathers (10.94%), and Profile 10 had 64 fathers (8.43%). To ensure the smaller profiles (less than 5%) were not an artifact of measurement error, the average probabilities of likely profile membership were considered. Average probabilities ranged from 78.7% to 90.1%: (Profile 1–90.0%; Profile 2–87.3%; Profile 3–78.7%; Profile 4–84.0%; Profile 5–86.3%; Profile 6–88.9%; Profile 7–81.2%; Profile 8–83.5%; Profile 9–90.1%; Profile 10–89.2%).

Standardized scores were utilized to interpret patterns within profiles (see Appendix Table A4). Profile 1, labeled as *Low Multi-Domain Support* ($n = 65$), was characterized by lower scores on all general and parenting support dimensions (i.e., scoring 2.63 standard deviations below the mean for general family support). The second profile, *Distal Parenting Support* ($n = 20$), was identified as lower general support, lower parenting support from parents and co-parents, and higher parenting support from online communities and counseling. The third profile was *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support* ($n = 58$), and was described as having average support for general family support and parenting support from their co-parent. Additionally, they had lower support in all other dimensions. The fathers utilized used their closest line of support depending on the context. The fourth profile was labeled *Social Media/Online Support* ($n = 74$) and was characterized by having lower counseling parenting support and higher online parenting support. The fifth profile was *Low Parenting Support* ($n = 34$) and was characterized as having moderate levels of general support but lower support across all parenting support dimensions. The sixth profile, *High Parenting Support* ($n = 108$) had higher scores on all parenting support dimensions and general community support. Profile 7, *Low Community Parenting Support* ($n = 171$), was the largest profile. Fathers in the largest profile had higher general family support and lower scores for the three community parenting support dimensions: religious, online, and counseling. Profile 8, *Proximal Support* ($n = 85$), was characterized by having higher scores in all general support dimensions and parenting support dimensions of people they may see regularly (parents, co-parents, other family, friends, and religious community). Notably, they also have lower scores for utilizing online community and counseling parenting support. The ninth profile, *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support* ($n = 83$), was characterized by their higher utilization of their parents, religious communities, and counseling for parenting support. They also had a lower rate of using online communities. The final profile, *High*

Multi-Domain Overall Support ($n = 64$), was characterized by having higher scores for all general and parenting support dimensions.

3.4 | Socio-demographic variation across profiles

Chi-Square analyses revealed that profiles varied by fathers' level of educational attainment ($\chi^2 = 73.21, p < 0.001$). Fathers with a high school diploma or equivalent were more likely to be in the *Low Multi-Domain Support* profile than *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support*, *Proximal Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* profiles. Additionally, fathers with a high school diploma/equivalent degree were less likely to be in the *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* group than the *Low Multi-Domain Support*, *Preferred Online Support*, *Low Parenting Support*, and *Low Community Parenting Support* profiles. Fathers with a 4-year college degree or greater were less likely to be in the *Low Multi-Domain Support* profile than the *High Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* groups.

Also, profiles varied by marital status ($\chi^2 = 55.03, p < 0.001$). Married fathers were less likely to be in the *Low Multi-Domain Support* and *Distal Parenting Support* profiles than *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support*, *Low Community Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* groups. Fathers who reported living with their partners were more likely to be in *Distal Parenting Support* and *Social Media Support* profiles compared to the *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support* profile. Fathers who were single and not living with any partners were more likely to be in the *Low Multi-Domain Support* profile compared to the *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support* and *Low Community Parenting Support* profiles.

Chi-square analyses revealed that there was some variation in profile membership by residential status ($\chi^2 = 29.92, p < 0.001$). Residential fathers were more likely to be represented in the *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* profile than the *Low Multi-Domain Support* profile; but less likely to be in the *Distal Parenting Support* profile than group *High Parenting Support* and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* as well. Nonresidential fathers were more likely to be in the *Low Multi-Domain Support* profile compared to *High Multi-Domain Overall Support*. Additionally, Nonresidential fathers were more likely to be in the *Distal Parenting Support* profile than the *High Parenting Support* and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support*.

3.5 | Do social support profiles vary by levels of parenting stress, beliefs, and involvement?

3.5.1 | Parenting stress

The following analyses investigated how profiles vary in parenting stress and parenting outcomes (see Appendix Table A5). Wald equality of means test demonstrated that profiles varied by levels of parenting stress ($\chi^2(9) = 43.86, p < 0.001$). *Low Community Parenting Support* and *Proximal Support* fathers reported the lowest levels of parenting stress compared to most of the other identified profiles. Additionally, the *Low Multi-Domain Support*, *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support*, *Preferred Online Support*, *Intergenerational/Intentional Parent Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers reported greater parenting stress compared to *Low Community Parenting Support* and *Proximal Support* fathers. *Distal Parenting Support* fathers reported higher parenting stress compared to *Proximal Support* fathers. Lastly, the *High Parenting Support* fathers had higher parenting stress than the *Low Parenting Support*, *Low Community Parenting Support*, and *Proximal Support* groups.

3.5.2 | Parenting beliefs

Wald equality of means test demonstrated that there was some profile variation in both parenting satisfaction ($\chi^2(9) = 118.45, p < 0.001$) and parenting efficacy ($\chi^2(9) = 113.46, p < 0.001$). For parenting satisfaction, *Low Multi-Domain Support* fathers had lower rates compared to *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support*, *Low Parenting Support*, *High Parenting Support*, *Low Community Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers. Compared to all other profiles, the *Distal Parenting Support* group had the lowest parenting satisfaction rates. *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support*, *High Parenting Support*, *Low Community Parenting Support*, and *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support* profiles reported less parenting satisfaction than *Low Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support*. Lastly, *Social Media Support* fathers had lower parenting satisfaction rates compared to *Low Parenting Support*, *Low Community Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support*. Parenting efficacy demonstrated similar patterns to parenting satisfaction.

For parenting efficacy, *Low Multi-Domain Support* fathers reported less parenting efficacy compared to *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support*, *Low Parenting Support*, *High Parenting Support*, *Low Community Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support*. *Distal Parenting Support* profile experienced the lowest score of parenting efficacy compared to all other profiles. *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support*, *High Parenting Support*, *Low Community Parenting Support*, and *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support* profiles reported less parenting efficacy compared to *Proximal Support* and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* groups. *Social Media Support* profile had less parenting efficacy compared to *Low Parenting Support*, *High Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers. *Low Parenting Support* fathers had more parenting efficacy than *Low Community Parenting Support* and *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support* fathers. Finally, *High Parenting Support* had less parenting efficacy compared to *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers. In summary, for both parenting belief outcomes, *Low Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* groups reported higher, more favorable parenting satisfaction and efficacy rates. In contrast, *Low Multi-Domain Support* and *Distal Parenting Support* fathers said the lowest, more negative beliefs.

3.5.3 | Father involvement

Wald equality of means test demonstrated that profiles vary across both home involvement ($\chi^2(9) = 114.67, p < 0.001$) and school involvement ($\chi^2(9) = 81.771, p < 0.001$) as well. For home involvement, *Low Multi-Domain Support* and *Distal Parenting Support* reported lower scores than *Low Parenting Support*, *High Parenting Support*, *Low Community Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support*, *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers. Profile *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support*, *Preferred Online Support*, and *Low Parenting Support* had less home involvement than *High Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers. *High Parenting Support* fathers had greater home involvement than *Low Community Parenting Support* and *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support* profiles. *High Parenting Support* and *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support* fathers reported more home involvement compared to *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers. *Low Community Parenting Support* fathers experienced more home involvement than *Proximal Support* and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers. *Proximal Support* fathers also reported more home involvement compared to *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support* fathers. In summary, *Low Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* profiles reported higher home involvement, while *Low Multi-Domain Support* and *Distal Parenting Support* fathers were less involved with children at home.

School and home involvement associations were similar. For school involvement, *Low Multi-Domain Support* fathers rated lower compared to *Low Parenting Support*, *High Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers. *Distal Parenting Support* and *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support* fathers were less involved in their child's school context compared to *High Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers. *Social Media Support* and *Low Community Parenting Support* fathers reported less school involvement compared to *Proximal Support*, *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers. Finally, *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers were less involved in the school context compared to *Low Parenting Support*, *High Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, and *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support* fathers. In general, *Low Multi-Domain Support*, *Distal Parenting Support* were lowest in school involvement. In contrast, *High Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* profiles ranked overall highest.

4 | DISCUSSION

Although studies have suggested that social support may be particularly critical for parents as they engage in the day-to-day realities of childrearing, few studies have examined social support among Black fathers. Using a latent profile approach, the investigation sought to identify social support profiles among a diverse sample of Black fathers. Overall, the current study identified ten distinct social support groups of Black fathers. Furthermore, the analysis indicated variation in levels of parenting stress, fathering beliefs, and father involvement by social support profiles.

4.1 | Heterogeneity in Black fathers' general and parenting-specific support

Using a latent profile analysis, the current investigation identified 10 distinct social support profiles. Our analyses contribute to the broader literature highlighting the heterogeneity of Black fathers' experiences (Cooper, Smalls-Glover, Metzger, et al., 2015; 2015; Cooper et al., 2020). Similar to previous studies, the profiles mirrored the spectrum of experiences, from individuals that are isolated/received no support to individuals that are fully integrated in their community and receiving high levels of support from all domains (Caesens et al., 2020; Ciarrochi et al., 2017; Lorenzo-Blanco et al., 2016). In our study, the *Low Multi-Domain Support* and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* profiles had opposite experiences with general and parenting support. Additionally, the *Low Parenting Support* and *High Parenting Support* profiles had contrasting experiences with parenting support.

Several additional support patterns emerged in our profile analysis. For example, the *Low Community Parenting Support* reported higher general family support and lower community-based parenting support. The *Low Community Parenting Support* profile, representing the most considerable portion of the sample (22.5%), is in line with existing studies (Kendrick et al., 2007; Watkins et al., 2007). In particular, prior literature has suggested that Black men often use more proximal support, like their family, and shy away from more external support sources (Toler Woodward et al., 2011). Other profiles that also utilize closer support at higher rates include the *Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support* and *Proximal Support* profiles. Alternatively, the smallest profile (2.6% of the sample) is the *Distal Parenting Support* profile and opposes the previously mentioned literature on Black men's support.

Though research on Black fathers' utilization of social support from community sources is limited, the current investigation highlights the various community-based support sources that Black fathers utilize, such as religious and media support. Several profiles emphasized that religious support is used at higher rates for certain groups of fathers (*High Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support*, *High Multi-Domain Overall Support*). For many of the profiles, religious support may feel more familial, as religious orientation is often a

family-oriented process for Black Americans (Mattis & Jagers, 2001). Research indicates that Black men that do not attend religious services are more likely to come from families that view religion as less important than Black men who attend regularly (Mattis, Eubanks, et al., 2004). Moreover, research demonstrates that Black men' religious participation and beliefs are also related to their volunteerism in community organizations (Mattis et al., 2000; Mattis, Eubanks, et al., 2004) and their optimism (Mattis et al., 2017). Each of which may impact their views on social support. Additionally, many Black fathers in the current study utilized online (*Distal Parenting Support, High Parenting Support High Multi-Domain Overall Support*) and counseling (*Distal Parenting Support, High Parenting Support, Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support, High Multi-Domain Overall Support*) support sources at above-average rates. While there is a dearth of research on sources of support for Black fathers, the current study highlights that community sources are often used and can highlight the lived experiences of Black fathers in future investigations.

Our investigation also suggested that there are some important sociodemographic differences in support. The variation in social support based on educational attainment and potentially economic capital is particularly interesting when considering broader contextual factors that impact all Black fathers and networks' resources across generations, such as economic stability (Lemmons & Johnson, 2019; Roy, 2006). Black father's utilization of community and familial sources of support are vital regardless of financial situation but likely can vary not only in who supports them and how, as the current study demonstrates, but also the quality and amount or type of resources available. For example, support systems from higher-income backgrounds may be more likely to provide financial support. Alternatively, lower-income support systems may be more available for emotional support and would provide as much tangible support, such as childcare, that they can handle with limited resources.

4.2 | Variation across fathering stress, beliefs, and involvement

The analyses also revealed evidence that social support profiles varied across parenting stress, parenting beliefs, and father involvement. For parenting stress, Black fathers in the *Low Community Parenting Support* and *Proximal Support* profiles were generally less stressed about parenting compared to the other profiles. Additionally, the *Low Community Parenting Support* and *Proximal Support* profiles were likely to report greater overall support. Similar to previous studies on Black parents (Cardoso et al., 2010), the results indicate that fathers with higher support tend to report less parenting stress. However, it is important to note that fathers in all of the other profiles experienced moderate levels of parenting stress. Fathers with lower levels of support (i.e., *Low Multi-Domain Support Distal Parenting Support, Moderate General Family/Co-Parent Support, Preferred Online Support, and Low Parenting Support*) appeared to be most vulnerable to parenting stress due to having a less supportive or under-utilized networks. Their reasoning for the lack of utilization is unclear, but an important perspective to capture in future research. Alternatively, the fathers in the profiles with greater multi-dimensional support (i.e., *High Parenting Support, Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support, and High Multi-Domain Overall Support*) are experiencing similar levels of parenting stress. Still, they are receiving higher levels of support in many domains, making them better positioned to alleviate stress compared to the previously mentioned profiles.

For parenting beliefs, our analyses revealed that profiles vary in their levels of parenting satisfaction and efficacy. For both parenting satisfaction and effectiveness, our results had a similar pattern amongst the profiles. *Low Multi-Domain Support* and *Distal Parenting Support* fathers rated themselves as having the lowest parenting satisfaction and efficacy beliefs. The *Low Multi-Domain Support* and *Distal Parenting Support* fathers also had moderate levels of parenting stress, emphasizing that those with higher stress levels and low support are more likely to report decreased satisfaction and lower efficacy in their parenting abilities.

Fathers in the *Low Parenting Support, Proximal Support, and High Multi-Domain Overall Support* profiles had the highest, most positive ratings for parenting satisfaction and efficacy. While the *Low Parenting Support, Proximal Support, and High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers have more positive parenting beliefs, they each represent a

different context. The *Low Parenting Support* fathers, who reported more positive parenting beliefs, experienced moderate parenting stress and reported lower than average parenting-specific support. It is plausible that the *Low Parenting Support* fathers' stress may not deteriorate their beliefs about their parenting abilities. From a transactional perspective, fathers with greater efficacy and satisfaction may need to rely on their social support less than fathers with lower efficacy and satisfaction. Still, given masculinity norms, the association may reflect fathers' attempts to dispel the stereotypical image of Black fatherhood. The *Proximal Support* fathers reported the lowest rates of parenting stress and reported higher rates of support from all dimensions except online and counseling parenting support. The *Proximal Support* fathers appear to be in a more positive context (i.e., low stress and high support), which could contribute to them having more positive parenting beliefs. Finally, the *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers had one of the highest rates of parenting stress and some of the highest parenting beliefs. They receive immense support from all dimensions but are stressed about parenting compared to other profiles. The *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* profile might represent the responsive nature of fathers' social support, in the context of increased stress. The *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers may be experiencing higher parenting stress currently, but are also seeking out more support to combat their stressors. The findings from our latent profile analysis are highly nuanced, suggesting the need to better understand the differences between fathers and how to meet their needs within the context of stress.

Results related to profile differences in involvement paint a more complex story. For home involvement, fathers in the *Low Multi-Domain Support* and *Distal Parenting Support* profiles had the lowest home involvement rates, similar to parenting beliefs. The result is expected as both the *Low Multi-Domain Support* and *Distal Parenting Support* profiles are in a moderately stressful parenting context. Similar to previous research (DeGarmo et al., 2008), those with more stress and less support tend to have lower involvement rates. The *High Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers had the highest rates of home involvement. The result is expected as the *High Parenting Support*, *Proximal Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* profiles have higher levels of support, reflecting literature that demonstrates social support predicts higher rates of involvement (Cabrera et al., 2011; Fagan et al., 2007; Morgan et al., 2008). The *Low Multi-Domain Support*, *Distal Parenting/Low Proximal*, *High Parenting Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers were in a moderately stressful context, demonstrating various outcomes based on social support availability. Though many of the *Low Multi-Domain Support*, *Distal Parenting/Low Proximal*, *High Parenting Support*, and *High Multi-Domain Overall Support* fathers are in a higher stress context compared to the *Proximal Support* profile, it may be easier for the father in the profiles with higher parenting support to be more involved in the home setting. The results for school involvement variation are the same as home involvement except for the *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support* profile. Fathers in the *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support* profile were also in a more stressful context for parenting and had average levels of beliefs and home involvement, but indicated higher school involvement. The *Intergenerational/Institutional Parenting Support* fathers relied heavily on their parents, religious community, and counseling for parenting support. The type of support they receive may be key to navigating involvement and advocating for their children within a school setting (Cooper et al., 2020).

4.3 | Study strengths

There are several strengths of the current investigation. Many studies on Black fathers focus on lower socioeconomic status or Nonresidential experiences (Coates & Phares, 2014; Fagan et al., 2016). However, the study provides a glimpse into the parenting processes among a large, diverse sample of Black fathers. Additionally, the analysis emphasizes Black fathers of adolescents. Many studies of Black fathers focus on those that have young children or infants (Castillo & Sarver, 2012; Fagan et al., 2007). The context of fathering (i.e., stressors, involvement, and beliefs) can vary by child's developmental period, highlighting the importance of having more investigations that can further the literature's understanding of fatherhood processes for those with adolescent-aged children. Another

strength of the study is the focus on various sources of support. As previously mentioned, many studies on social support often aggregate support dimensions (Castillo & Sarver, 2012; Coles, 2009; DeGarmo et al., 2008), making it difficult to understand within-group variation among sources of social support. Utilizing a latent profile approach deepens our understanding of how the various dimensions work together within a real-life context. However, more research is needed to understand if social support profiles exist for other samples of Black fathers and if the profiles vary or are similar to Black mothers' general and parenting social support sources.

4.4 | Limitations and future directions

While the current study has notable strengths, there are some limitations. Though the investigation utilizes two dimension of father involvement (home and school), a more robust measurement that allows Black fathers to report on more developmentally appropriate modes of home involvement (i.e., playing games, talking about youth's interest) would have better reflected the multidimensionality of home involvement for adolescents. Similar sentiments are also true for our indicators of social support, such as including neighbors, mentors, or coworkers as additional community sources of support. Also, some of our measures had lower reliabilities, suggesting the need for additional measurement development with diverse samples of Black fathers. Our findings were based on cross-sectional data, which does not allow us to fully reflect the direction of influence or the dynamic relationship between stress, support, and parenting. Future studies should examine the relationships between stress, support, and parenting longitudinally and explore transactional processes between stress and social support. Additionally, future investigations should consider the role of compounding stressors and the well-being of Black fathers, as well-being is a known predictor of parenting and is impacted by stress (Paulson et al., 2011). Given that the current sample is largely comprised of residential, employed, and heterosexual fathers, future investigations that examine these intricacies among marginalized Black fathers is warranted.

4.5 | Implications and conclusions

Building upon previous literature (Ahmeduzzaman & Roopnarine, 1992; Castillo & Sarver, 2012; Fagan et al., 2007), the current study informs research and interventions on how parenting stress and social support may be associated with parenting beliefs and behaviors for Black fathers. While Black men are thought to have smaller support networks (Antonucci & Akiyama, 1987; Goodwill et al., 2018; Haines & Hurlbert, 1992; Toler Woodward et al., 2011), many Black fathers in the study reported social support sources across general and parenting-specific domains. Importantly, Black fathers' experience with parenting stress and outcomes varies based on the type of social support that they have in their network. Moreover, the study can inform practitioners on which types of Black fathers are most vulnerable and how varying support dimensions can potentially influence their parenting processes. Parenting can be a stressful context for Black fathers and having a strong network is essential for supporting their needs related to parenting beliefs, involvement, and the development of their children.

Importantly, our study helps to challenge the myth of absent Black fathers. Our findings highlight that support structures, generally and specific to parenting, are critical for their involvement and efficacy. These findings have implications for workforce development and policy in settings where Black fathers and families commune and seek support. As practitioners look to engage Black fathers in supportive services, the current findings highlight the fact that Black fathers are not a monolith. As such, formal trainings and policy discussions must begin with reflective processes that help practitioners and policy makers to examine personal and professional biases (Cryer-Coupet et al., 2021) that may negatively impact the development and implementation of effective evidence-based programming for Black fathers. Combined with other studies, this work illuminates the humanity and complexity of Black fatherhood and patterns of social support.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Research data are not shared.

ORCID

Margarett McBride  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8356-5610>

PEER REVIEW

The peer review history for this article is available at <https://publons.com/publon/10.1002/jcop.22972>

REFERENCES

- Abidin, R. R. (1992). The determinants of parenting behavior. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 21(4), 407–412. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp2104_12
- Ahmeduzzaman, M., & Roopnarine, J. L. (1992). Sociodemographic factors, functioning style, social support, and fathers' involvement with preschoolers in African-American families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 699–707. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/353255>
- Akande, K., & Heath, C. (2019). Mediating effects of maternal gatekeeping on nonresident Black fathers' paternal stressors. In S. L. Blair, & R. P. Costa (Eds.), *Transitions into parenthood: Examining the complexities of childrearing (Contemporary perspectives in family research)* (Vol. 15, pp. 103–121). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1530-353520190000015005>
- Allen, J. O., Griffith, D. M., & Gaines, H. C. (2013). "She looks out for the meals, period": African American men's perceptions of how their wives influence their eating behavior and dietary health. *Health Psychology*, 32(4), 447–455. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028361>
- Anderson, E. A., Kohler, J. K., & Letiecq, B. L. (2005). Predictors of depression among low-income, nonresidential fathers. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26, 547–567. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X04272753>
- Antonucci, T. C., & Akiyama, H. (1987). An examination of sex differences in social support among older men and women. *Sex Roles*, 17(11-12), 737–749. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X04272753>
- Ayón, C., Williams, L. R., Marsiglia, F. F., Ayers, S., & Kiehne, E. (2015). A latent profile analysis of Latino parenting: The infusion of cultural values on family conflict. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 96(3), 203–210. <https://doi.org/10.1606/1044-3894.2015.96.25>
- Baker, F. M. (2001). Diagnosing depression in African Americans. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 37(1), 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026540321366>
- Barnes, S. L., & Hollingsworth, C. (2020). Spirituality and social media: The search for support among Black men who have sex with men in Tennessee. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 67(1), 79–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2018.1525945>
- Bergman, L. R., & Trost, K. (2006). The person-oriented versus the variable-oriented approach: Are they complementary, opposites, or exploring different worlds? *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 52, 601–632. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mpq.2006.0023>
- Billingsley, A. (1992). *Climbing Jacob's ladder: The enduring legacy of African-American families*. Simon & Schuster.
- Bolck, A., Croon, M., & Hagenaars, J. (2004). Estimating latent structure models with categorical variables: One-step versus three-step estimators. *Political Analysis*, 12(1), 3–27. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mp001>
- Bowleg, L., Burkholder, G. J., Massie, J. S., Wahome, R., Teti, M., Malebranche, D. J., & Tschann, J. M. (2013). Racial discrimination, social support, and sexual HIV risk among Black heterosexual men. *AIDS and Behavior*, 17(1), 407–418. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-012-0179-0>
- Broaddus, M. R., DiFranceisco, W. J., Kelly, J. A., St. Lawrence, J. S., Amirkhanian, Y. A., & Dickson-Gomez, J. D. (2015). Social media use and high-risk sexual behavior among black men who have sex with men: A three-city study. *AIDS and Behavior*, 19(2), 90–97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-014-0980-z>
- Burcher, S. A., Weiler, L. M., Keyzers, A., & Cavell, T. A. (2021). Neighborhood risk and interpersonal support as predictors of parents' sense of community. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 30(6), 1476–1486. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-021-01957-9>
- Cabrera, N. J., Hofferth, S. L., & Chae, S. (2011). Patterns and predictors of father–infant engagement across race/ethnic groups. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 26(3), 365–375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecresq.2011.01.001>

- Cadaret, M. C., & Speight, S. L. (2018). An exploratory study of attitudes toward psychological help seeking among African American men. *Journal of Black Psychology, 44*(4), 347–370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798418774655>
- Caesens, G., Gillet, N., Morin, A. J. S., Houle, S. A., & Stinglhamber, F. (2020). A person-centred perspective on social support in the workplace. *Applied Psychology, 69*(3), 686–714. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12196>
- Castillo, J. T., & Sarver, C. M. (2012). Nonresident fathers' social networks: The relationship between social support and father involvement. *Personal Relationships, 19*(4), 759–774. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2011.01391.x>
- Caughy, M. O., Nettles, S. M., & Lima, J. (2011). Profiles of racial socialization among African American parents: Correlates, context, and outcome. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 20*(4), 491–502. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-010-9416-1>
- Chu, P. S., Saucier, D. A., & Hafner, E. (2010). Meta-analysis of the relationships between social support and well-being in children and adolescents. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 29*(6), 624–645. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2010.29.6.624>
- Chung, B., Meldrum, M., Jones, F., Brown, A., & Jones, L. (2014). Perceived sources of stress and resilience in men in an African-American community. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action, 8*(4), 441–451. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2014.0053>
- Ciarrochi, J., Morin, A. J. S., Sahdra, B. K., Litalien, D., & Parker, P. D. (2017). A longitudinal person-centered perspective on youth social support: Relations with psychological wellbeing. *Developmental Psychology, 53*(6), 1154–1169. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000315>
- Clement, S., Schauman, O., Graham, T., Maggioni, F., Evans-Lacko, S., Bezborodovs, N., Morgan, C., Rüsch, N., Brown, J. S. L., & Thornicroft, G. (2015). What is the impact of mental health-related stigma on help-seeking? A systematic review of quantitative and qualitative studies. *Psychological Medicine, 45*, 11–27. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291714000129>
- Coates, E. E., & Phares, V. (2014). Predictors of paternal involvement among nonresidential, Black fathers from low-income neighborhoods. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*(2), 138–151. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032790>
- Coles, R. L. (2009). Just doing what they gotta do: Single black custodial fathers coping with the stresses and reaping the rewards of parenting. *Journal of Family Issues, 30*(10), 1311–1338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X09339290>
- Cooper, S. M., Robbins, P. A., Burnett, M., McBride, M., Shaheed, J., & Smith, N. A. (2020). African American fathers' coping patterns: Implications for father-son involvement and race-related discussions. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 70*, 101163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2020.101163>
- Cooper, S. M., Ross, L., Dues, A., Golden, A. R., & Burnett, M. (2019). Intergenerational factors, fatherhood beliefs, and African American fathers' involvement: Building the case for a mediated pathway. *Journal of Family Issues, 40*(15), 2047–2075. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X19849629>
- Cooper, S. M., Smalls-Glover, C., Metzger, I., & Griffin, C. (2015). African American fathers' racial socialization patterns: Associations with racial identity beliefs and discrimination experiences. *Family Relations, 64*(2), 278–290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12115>
- Cooper, S. M., Smalls-Glover, C., Neblett, E. W., & Banks, K. H. (2015). Racial socialization practices among African American fathers: A profile-oriented approach. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 16*(1), 11–22. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035654>
- Corrigan, P. (2004). How stigma interferes with mental health care. *American Psychologist, 59*(7), 614–625. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.7.614>
- Cryer-Coupet, Q. R., Stokes, M. N., Lemmons, B. P., & Dorsey, M. (2021). Engaging nonresident fathers: Exploring collaborative competencies in support of family-centered practice. *Research on Social Work Practice, 31*(8), 880–892. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10497315211022830>
- Dallas, C. M. (2009). Interactions between adolescent fathers and health care professionals during pregnancy, labor, and early postpartum. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing: JOGNN, 38*(3), 290–299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1552-6909.2009.01022.x>
- Davis, M. H., Morris, M. M., & Kraus, L. A. (1998). Relationship-specific and global perceptions of social support: Associations with well-being and attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(2), 468–481. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.2.468>
- DeGarmo, D. S., Patras, J., & Eap, S. (2008). Social support for divorced fathers' parenting: Testing a stress-buffering model. *Family Relations, 57*(1), 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2007.00481.x>
- Doty, J. L., & Dworkin, J. (2014). Online social support for parents: A critical review. *Marriage & Family Review, 50*(2), 174–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2013.834027>
- Doyle, O., Cryer-Coupet, Q. R., & McLeod, B. A. (2022). “All about how you couch it:” African American fathers' visions of interventions for their sons. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 31*, 2699–2713. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-022-02346-6>

- Doyle, O., Goldston, D. B., Dzirasa, E., Fontes, M., Estroff, S., & Burriss, A. (2014). "You gotta have a good help mate": African American fathers' co-parenting experiences. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 15(4), 377–386. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034732>
- Fagan, J., Bernd, E., & Whiteman, V. (2007). Adolescent fathers' parenting stress, social support, and involvement with infants. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 17(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2007.00510.x>
- Fagan, J., & Lee, Y. (2011). Do coparenting and social support have a greater effect on adolescent fathers than adult fathers. *Family Relations*, 60(3), 247–258. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2011.00651.x>
- Fagan, J., Levine, E. C., Kaufman, R., & Hammar, C. (2016). Low-income, nonresident fathers' coparenting with multiple mothers and relatives: Effects on fathering. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 30(6), 665–675. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000231>
- Fuqua, V., Chen, Y. H., Packer, T., Dowling, T., Ick, T. O., Nguyen, B., Colfax, G. N., & Raymond, H. F. (2012). Using social networks to reach Black MSM for HIV testing and linkage to care. *AIDS and Behavior*, 16(2), 256–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-011-9918-x>
- Goodwill, J. R., Watkins, D. C., Johnson, N. C., & Allen, J. O. (2018). An exploratory study of stress and coping among Black college men. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 88(5), 538–549. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000313>
- Gottfried, J., & Shearer, E. (2016). News use across social media platforms. *Pew Research Center's Journalism Project*. Retrieved from <http://www.journalism.org/2016/05/26/newsuse-across-social-media-platforms-2016/>.
- Gullan, R. L., Hoffman, B. N., & Leff, S. S. (2011). "I do but I Don't": the search for identity in urban African American adolescents. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, 8(2), 29–40.
- Hagenaars, J. A., & McCutcheon, A. L. (Eds.). (2002). *Applied latent class analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Haines, V. A., & Hurlbert, J. S. (1992). Network range and health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 33(3), 254–266. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2137355>
- Hill, M. L. (2018). "Thank you, Black Twitter": State violence, digital counterpublics, and pedagogies of resistance. *Urban Education*, 53(2), 286–302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085917747124>
- Hoard, L. R., & Anderson, E. A. (2004). Factors related to depression in rural and urban noncustodial, low-income fathers. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 32(1), 103–119. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.10076>
- Ibarra, J. L., Agas, J. M., Lee, M., Pan, J. L., & Bутtenheim, A. M. (2018). Comparison of online survey recruitment platforms for hard-to-reach pregnant smoking populations: feasibility study. *JMIR Research Protocols*, 7(4), e101. <https://doi.org/10.2196/resprot.8071>
- Jacoby, S. F., Rich, J. A., Webster, J. L., & Richmond, T. S. (2020). 'Sharing things with people that I don't even know': Help-seeking for psychological symptoms in injured Black men in Philadelphia. *Ethnicity & Health*, 25, 777–795. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13557858.2018.1455811>
- Johnson Jr, W. E. (2019). Urban men's health: How urban environments affect Black men's.
- Johnston, C., & Mash, E. J. (1989). A measure of parenting satisfaction and efficacy. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 18(2), 167–175. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp1802_8
- Kendrick, L., Anderson, N. L. R., & Moore, B. (2007). Perceptions of depression among young African American men. *Family & Community Health*, 30(1), 63–73. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44954524>
- Krause, N., Ellison, C. G., Shaw, B. A., Marcum, J. P., & Boardman, J. D. (2001). Church-based social support and religious coping. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 40(4), 637–656. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0021-8294.00082>
- Lemmons, B. P., & Johnson, W. E. (2019). Game changers: A critical race theory analysis of the economic, social, and political factors impacting Black fatherhood and family formation. *Social Work in Public Health*, 34(1), 86–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19371918.2018.1562406>
- Lorenzo-Blanco, E. I., Unger, J. B., Oshri, A., Baezconde-Garbanati, L., & Soto, D. (2016). Profiles of bullying victimization, discrimination, social support, and school safety: Links with Latino/a youth acculturation, gender, depressive symptoms, and cigarette use. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 86(1), 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000113>
- Madge, C., & O'Connor, H. (2006). Parenting gone wired: Empowerment of new mothers on the Internet. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 7(2), 199–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649360600600528>
- Magidson, J., & Vermunt, J. (2004). Latent class models. In D. W. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of quantitative methodology for the social sciences* (pp. 176–199). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412986311.n10>
- Mattis, J. S., Eubanks, K., Zapata, A. A., Grayman, N., Belkin, M., Mitchell, N. K., & Cooper, S. (2004). Factors influencing religious non-attendance among African American men: A multimethod analysis. *Review of Religious Research*, 45(4), 386–403. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3511993>
- Mattis, J. S., & Jagers, R. J. (2001). A relational framework for the study of religiosity and spirituality in the lives of African Americans. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 29(5), 519–539. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.1034>
- Mattis, J. S., Jagers, R. J., Hatcher, C. A., Lawhon, G. D., Murphy, E. J., & Murray, Y. F. (2000). Religiosity, volunteerism, and community involvement among African American men: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 28(4), 391–406. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629\(200007\)28:4<391::AID-JCOP2>3.0.CO;2-A](https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629(200007)28:4<391::AID-JCOP2>3.0.CO;2-A)

- Mattis, J. S., McWayne, C. M., Palmer, G. J., Johnson, M. S., & Sparks, H. L. (2021). Color him father: Generative parenting among low-income, urban-residing, coresidential Black fathers. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 22(3), 455–465. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000300>
- Mattis, J. S., Powell, W., Grayman, N. A., Murray, Y., Cole-Lewis, Y. C., & Goodwill, J. R. (2017). What would I know about mercy? Faith and optimistic expectancies among African Americans. *Race and Social Problems*, 9(1), 42–52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-016-9190-9>
- McLeod, B. A. (2020). "Hello group, I need advice": A textual analysis of Black fathers' help-seeking posts on Facebook. *Family Relations*, 69(5), 944–955. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12500>
- Metzger, I. W., Cooper, S. M., Ritchwood, T. D., Onyeuku, C., & Griffin, C. B. (2017). Profiles of African American college students' alcohol use and sexual behaviors: Associations with stress, racial discrimination, and social support. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 54(3), 374–385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2016.1179709>
- Morgan, S. P., Bledsoe, C., Bianchi, S. M., Chase-Lansdale, P. L., DiPrete, T. A., Hotz, V. J., Sanders, S., Seltzer, J. A., & Thomas, D. (2008). Designing new models for explaining family change and variation. *Final Report to NICHD for Contract N, 1*. http://public.econ.duke.edu/~vjh3/working_papers/EFCFinal.pdf
- Nebbett, V. E., Lombe, M., Salas-Wright, C. P., & Cryer-Coupet, Q. (2014). Individual and ecological correlates of attitudes toward help seeking among African American adolescents in urban public housing. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 95(1), 67–75. <https://doi.org/10.1606/1044-3894.2014.95.8>
- Niela-Vilén, H., Axelin, A., Salanterä, S., & Melender, H. L. (2014). Internet-based peer support for parents: A systematic integrative review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 51(11), 1524–1537. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2014.06.009>
- Nylund, K. L., Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. O. (2007). Deciding on the number of classes in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 14, 535–569. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510701575396>
- Paulson, J. F., Dauber, S. E., & Leiferman, J. A. (2011). Parental depression, relationship quality, and nonresident father involvement with their infants. *Journal of Family Issues*, 32(4), 528–549. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X10388733>
- Perry, A., & Lewis, S. (2016). Leaving legacies: African American men discuss the impact of their fathers on the development of their own paternal attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Family Social Work*, 19(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10522158.2015.1112332>
- Perry, A. R. (2009). The influence of the extended family on the involvement of nonresident African American fathers. *Journal of Family Social Work*, 12(3), 211–226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10522150903046390>
- Perry, A. R., Harmon, D. K., & Leeper, J. (2012). Resident black fathers' involvement: A comparative analysis of married and unwed, cohabitating fathers. *Journal of Family Issues*, 33(6), 695–714. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X11428125>
- Peterson, N. A., Speer, P. W., & McMillan, D. W. (2008). Validation of a brief sense of community scale: Confirmation of the principal theory of sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 36(1), 61–73. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20217>
- Plowden, K. O., John, W., Vasquez, E., & Kimani, J. (2006). Reaching African American men: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Community Health Nursing*, 23(3), 147–158. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327655jchn2303_2
- Powell, W., Adams, L. B., Cole-Lewis, Y., Agyemang, A., & Upton, R. D. (2016). Masculinity and race-related factors as barriers to health help-seeking among African American men. *Behavioral Medicine*, 42(3), 150–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08964289.2016.1165174>
- Rainie, L. (2013). Cell phone ownership hits 91% of adults. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/06/06/cell-phone-ownership-hits-91-of-adults/>.
- Rich, J. A., & Grey, C. M. (2005). Pathways to recurrent trauma among young black men: Traumatic stress, substance use, and the "code of the street". *American Journal of Public Health*, 95(5), 816–824. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2004.044560>
- Ross, M. E. T., & Aday, L. A. (2006). Stress and coping in African American grandparents who are raising their grandchildren. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27(7), 912–932. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X06287167>
- Roy, K. M. (2006). Father stories: A life course examination of paternal identity among low-income African American men. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27(1), 31–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X05275432>
- Roy, K. M., & Dyson, O. L. (2005). Gatekeeping in context: Babymama drama and the involvement of incarcerated fathers. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research & Practice about Men as Fathers*, 3(3), 289–311. <https://doi.org/10.3149/fth.0303.289>
- Siedlecki, K. L., Salthouse, T. A., Oishi, S., & Jeswani, S. (2014). The relationship between social support and subjective well-being across age. *Social Indicators Research*, 117(2), 561–576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0361-4>

Stokes, M. N., Cryer-Coupet, Q. R., & Tall, K. G. (2020). "You get more training to drive a car": Examining the parenting experiences and service needs of nonresident fathers who are experiencing homelessness. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 21(4), 558–569. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000255>

Taylor, R. J., Chatters, L. M., Tucker, M. B., & Lewis, E. (1990). Developments in research on black families: A decade review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52(4), 993–1014. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353315>

Thompson, S. D., & Walker, A. C. (2004). Satisfaction with parenting: A comparison between adolescent mothers and fathers. *Sex Roles*, 50(9–10), 677–687. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000027569.27653.8e>

Thorpe, Jr., R. J., Cobb, R., King, K., Bruce, M. A., Archibald, P., Jones, H. P., & Norris, K. C. (2020). The association between depressive symptoms and accumulation of stress among Black men in the health and retirement study. *Innovation in Aging*, 4(5), igaa047. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igaa047>

Toler Woodward, A., Taylor, R. J., & Chatters, L. M. (2011). Use of professional and informal support by Black men with mental disorders. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 21(3), 328–336. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731510388668>

Tsuchiya, K., Qian, Y., Thomas, A., Hill De Loney, E., & Caldwell, C. H. (2018). The effects of multiple dimensions of risk and protective factors on depressive symptoms among nonresident African American fathers. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 62(3–4), 464–475. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12275>

Utsey, S. O., Bolden, M. A., Lanier, Y., & Williams, O. (2007). Examining the role of culture- specific coping as a predictor of resilient outcomes in African Americans from high-risk urban communities. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 33(1), 75–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798406295094>

Watkins, D. C., Green, B. L., Goodson, P., Guidry, J. J., & Stanley, C. A. (2007). Using focus groups to explore the stressful life events of Black college men. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(1), 105–118. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2007.0009>

Williams, G. A., & Kibowski, F. (2016). Latent class analysis and latent profile analysis. *Handbook of methodological approaches to community-based research: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods*, 143–151.

Wilson, D. K., Bamishigbin Jr, O. N., Guardino, C., & Schetter, C. D. (2021). Resilience resources in low-income Black, Latino, and White fathers. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), 282, 114139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114139>

Young, J. L., Griffith, E. E. H., & Williams, D. R. (2003). The integral role of pastoral counseling by African-American clergy in community mental health. *Psychiatric Services*, 54(5), 688–692. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.54.5.688>

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_2

How to cite this article: McBride, M., Cooper, S. M., Cryer-Coupet, Q., Burnett, M., Garrett, S., & Gibson, S. (2023). Multidimensional social support and parenting among Black fathers: A profile-oriented approach. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 51, 1876–1900. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22972>

APPENDIX

See Tables A1–A5

TABLE A1 Sample categorical demographics frequencies

	n	%
Education Level		
Less than high school	40	5.3
High school or equivalent	254	33.5
Vocational training/Associate's degree	205	27.0
Bachelor's degree and higher	246	32.4

(Continues)

TABLE A1 (Continued)

	<i>n</i>	%
Marital Status		
Married (and living together)	336	44.3
Living Together	122	16.1
Single	299	39.4
Location		
Midwest	137	18.1
Northeast	162	21.3
Southeast	294	38.7
Southwest	86	11.3
West	78	10.3
Employment Status		
Currently employed	585	77.1
Currently unemployed	170	22.4
Sexual Orientation		
Heterosexual	714	94.1
Homosexual/Bisexual/Other	39	5.1
Biological Status		
Biological Father	666	87.7
Nonbiological Father	93	12.3
Child Gender		
Female	329	43.3
Male	425	56.0
Residential Status		
Residential	570	75.1
Nonresidential	189	24.9

TABLE A2 Correlations, means, and standard deviations among study variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Father Age	1.00												
2. Education Level	0.14 ^b	1.00											
3. Marital Status	-0.18 ^b	-0.28 ^b	1.00										
4. Location	-0.01	-0.00	-0.04	1.00									
5. Employment Status	0.12 ^b	-0.20 ^b	0.13 ^b	-0.04	1.00								
6. Sexual Orientation	-0.09 ^a	0.08 ^a	-0.03	-0.00	-0.01	1.00							
7. Biological Status	0.02	-0.05	-0.07 ^a	0.04	0.06	0.06	1.00						
8. Child Age	0.41 ^b	0.07	-0.01	-0.02	0.03	-0.03	0.04	1.00					
9. Child Gender	-0.05	0.04	0.01	0.02	-0.03	-0.01	-0.02	0.02	1.00				
10. Residential Status	0.01	-0.20 ^b	0.43 ^b	0.02	0.13 ^b	0.00	-0.08 ^a	0.03	-0.02	1.00			
11. General Stress	-0.21 ^b	-0.03	0.07 ^a	0.00	-0.03	0.02	0.08 ^a	-0.07	-0.03	-0.00	1.00		
12. Parenting Stress	-0.17 ^b	-0.01	0.05	0.01	-0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.08 ^a	-0.04	-0.03	0.65 ^b	1.00	
13. GS- Family	0.04	0.21 ^b	-0.20 ^b	-0.05	-0.11 ^b	-0.04	-0.07	0.03	-0.02	-0.11 ^b	-0.16 ^b	-0.10 ^b	1.00
14. GS- Friend	0.03	0.17 ^b	-0.07 ^a	0.02	-0.11 ^b	-0.00	-0.13 ^b	0.00	0.06	-0.12 ^b	-0.15 ^b	-0.11 ^b	0.56 ^b
15. GS- Community	-0.02	0.16 ^b	-0.10 ^b	-0.01	-0.09 ^a	-0.01	-0.10 ^b	0.01	0.05	-0.15 ^b	-0.19 ^b	-0.13 ^b	0.49 ^b
16. PS- Parent	-0.10 ^a	0.12 ^b	-0.06	-0.02	-0.13 ^b	-0.06	-0.05	-0.06	0.05	-0.08 ^a	-0.06	0.01	0.38 ^b
17. PS- Co-Parent	0.05	0.09 ^a	-0.35 ^b	-0.02	-0.12 ^b	-0.05	0.03	-0.04	-0.01	-0.29 ^b	-0.08 ^a	-0.03	0.30 ^b
18. PS- Other Family	0.02	0.05	-0.02	-0.05	-0.05	-0.01	-0.05	-0.01	0.06	-0.05	-0.01	0.02	0.30 ^b
19. PS- Friend	-0.02	0.08 ^a	0.03	-0.02	-0.04	0.01	-0.06	0.03	0.04	-0.04	-0.01	0.03	0.19 ^b
20. PS- Religious	0.08 ^a	0.17 ^b	-0.13 ^b	0.06	-0.07	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.00	-0.18 ^b	-0.03	0.01	0.21 ^b
21. PS- Online	-0.15 ^b	0.03	0.02	-0.05	-0.12 ^b	0.07	-0.02	-0.03	0.05	-0.08 ^a	0.10 ^a	0.16 ^b	0.02

(Continues)

TABLE A2 (Continued)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
22. PS- Counseling	-0.09 ^a	0.13 ^b	-0.01	0.04	-0.07	0.02	-0.05	-0.03	0.03	-0.09 ^a	0.12 ^b	0.18 ^b	0.05
23. Parenting Satisfaction	0.05	0.14 ^b	-0.22 ^b	-0.03	-0.15 ^b	-0.02	-0.05	0.03	0.05	-0.27 ^b	-0.25 ^b	-0.22 ^b	0.35 ^b
24. Parenting Efficacy	0.04	0.12 ^b	-0.11 ^b	0.00	-0.06	-0.05	-0.10 ^b	-0.00	0.02	-0.10 ^b	-0.13	-0.15 ^b	0.32 ^b
25. Home Involvement	-0.08 ^a	0.04	-0.10 ^b	0.02	-0.05	--0.04	-0.01	-0.11 ^b	0.01	-0.24 ^b	-0.07	-0.04	0.26 ^b
26. School Involvement	-0.02	0.07	-0.17 ^b	0.05	--0.10 ^b	-0.01	-0.05	0.02	0.01	-0.23 ^b	-0.09 ^a	-0.07	0.19 ^b
Mean	39.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	12.06	--	--	2.75	2.50	3.93
SD	10.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	2.87	--	--	1.11	1.22	0.97
Variable	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	25
14. GS- Friend	1.00												
15. GS- Community	0.53 ^b	1.00											
16. PS- Parent	0.28 ^b	0.36 ^b	1.00										
17. PS- Co-Parent	0.18 ^b	0.21 ^b	0.45 ^b	1.00									
18. PS- Other Family	0.35 ^b	0.35 ^b	0.57 ^b	0.39 ^b	1.00								
19. PS- Friend	0.41 ^b	0.27 ^b	0.45 ^b	0.31 ^b	0.61 ^b	1.00							
20. PS- Religious	0.24 ^b	0.31 ^b	0.46 ^b	0.36 ^b	0.54 ^b	0.50 ^b	1.00						
21. PS- Online	0.13 ^b	0.16 ^b	0.29 ^b	0.18 ^b	0.44 ^b	0.44 ^b	0.46 ^b	1.00					
22. PS- Counseling	0.14 ^b	0.19 ^b	0.32 ^b	0.17 ^b	0.43 ^b	0.43 ^b	0.53 ^b	0.60 ^b	1.00				
23. Parenting Satisfaction	0.32 ^b	0.36 ^b	0.18 ^b	0.31 ^b	0.12 ^b	0.10 ^b	0.17 ^b	-0.04	-0.02	1.00			
24. Parenting Efficacy	0.34 ^b	0.44 ^b	0.22 ^b	0.17 ^b	0.16 ^b	0.15 ^b	0.14 ^b	0.06	0.03	0.46 ^b	1.00		

TABLE A2 (Continued)

Variable	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	25
25. Home Involvement	0.24 ^b	0.37 ^b	0.30 ^b	0.28 ^b	0.29 ^b	0.23 ^b	0.28 ^b	0.14 ^b	0.15 ^b	0.45 ^b	0.36 ^b	1.00	
26. School Involvement	0.23 ^b	0.30 ^b	0.22 ^b	0.26 ^b	0.22 ^b	0.24 ^b	0.26 ^b	0.13 ^b	0.18 ^b	0.38 ^b	0.24 ^b	0.55 ^b	1.00
Mean	3.70	3.57	2.89	3.03	2.56	2.62	2.34	1.91	1.97	4.30	3.85	3.57	2.76
SD	0.99	0.87	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.93	1.09	1.10	1.10	0.84	0.76	0.82	0.78

Note: ^a $p < 0.05$; ^b $p < 0.01$; educational level (1 = less than high school education; 2 = high school diploma or equivalent; 3 = vocational tech diploma/associate degree; 4 = 4-year college degree and higher); marital status (1 = married and living together; 2 = living together, not married; 3 = single); location (1 = Midwest; 2 = Northeast; 3 = Southeast; 4 = Southwest; 5 = West); employment status (1 = currently employed; 2 = currently unemployed); sexual orientation (1 = heterosexual; 2 = homosexual/bisexual/other); biological father status (1 = biological father; 2 = nonbiological father (i.e., adoptive father, stepfather, foster father/male guardian, and other relationship); gender (1 = female; 2 = male; 3 = nonbinary); residential status (1 = residential full time; 2 = nonresidential).

GS = General Support.

PS = Parenting-specific Support.

TABLE A3 Model fit indices for profile solutions

	AIC	BIC	Entropy	BLRT
2 class solution	19391.13	19534.72	0.83	0.00
3 class solution	18822.13	19016.67	0.84	0.00
4 class solution	18590.83	18836.32	0.86	0.00
5 class solution	18388.35	18684.80	0.82	0.00
6 class solution	18263.22	18610.62	0.80	0.00
7 class solution	18168.48	18566.84	0.83	0.00
8 class solution	18102.97	18552.27	0.81	0.00
9 class solution	18023.92	18524.18	0.82	0.00
10 class solution	17884.07	18435.27	0.84	0.02
11 class solution	17842.67	18444.83	0.83	0.00

TABLE A4 Support standardized scores by profile: Means

	Profile 1 Low multi- domain support (n = 65)	Profile 2 Distal parenting support (n = 20)	Profile 3 Moderate general family/ co-parent support (n = 58)	Profile 4 Social media support (n = 74)	Profile 5 Low parenting support (n = 34)	Profile 6 High parenting support (n = 108)	Profile 7 Low community parenting support (n = 171)	Profile 8 Proximal support (n = 85)	Profile 9 Intergenerational/ Institutional parenting support (n = 83)	Profile 10 high multi- domain support (n = 61)
GS- Family	-2.626 ^a	-2.32 ^a	0.054	-0.33	0.337	0.135	0.437 ^a	0.993 ^a	0.063	0.812 ^a
GS- Friends	-1.588 ^a	-1.414 ^a	-0.992 ^a	-0.121	0.530	0.202	0.160	0.893 ^a	0.024	0.946 ^a
GS- Community	-1.317 ^a	-2.014 ^a	-0.814 ^a	-0.316	0.565	0.391 ^a	-0.023	0.726 ^a	0.060	1.219 ^a
PS- Parents	-1.800 ^a	-1.214 ^a	-1.055 ^a	-0.031	-2.154 ^a	0.515 ^a	0.126	0.981 ^a	0.463 ^a	1.359 ^a
PS- Co-Parent	-1.063 ^a	-1.110 ^a	0.013	-0.05	-1.897 ^a	0.192 ^a	0.095	0.675 ^a	0.093	0.971 ^a
PS- Other Family	-1.714 ^a	-0.720	-1.732 ^a	-0.026	-2.215 ^a	1.020 ^a	-0.295	1.149 ^a	0.362	1.981 ^a
PS- Friends	-1.170 ^a	-0.328	-1.748 ^a	0.275	-1.949 ^a	0.767 ^a	-0.256	0.799 ^a	0.305	1.760 ^a
PS- Religion	-1.198 ^a	-0.507	-1.070 ^a	-0.413	-1.487 ^a	1.183 ^a	-0.705 ^a	0.789 ^a	0.597 ^a	1.752 ^a
PS- Social Media	-1.533 ^a	2.310 ^a	-1.789 ^a	1.961 ^a	-1.897 ^a	3.028 ^a	-1.630 ^a	-1.322 ^a	-1.063 ^a	4.117 ^a
PS- Counseling	-1.502 ^a	2.355 ^a	-1.812 ^a	-1.102 ^a	-1.816 ^a	2.265 ^a	-1.771 ^a	-1.222 ^a	2.64 ^a	4.133 ^a

Note: ^a p < 0.05, Significantly different from the overall mean.

GS = General Support.

PS = Parenting-specific Support.

TABLE A5 Profile mean and SD comparisons of continuous study variables using BCH technique

	Profile 1	Profile 2	Profile 3	Profile 4	Profile 5	Profile 6	Profile 7	Profile 8	Profile 9	Profile 10
	Low multi-domain support (n = 65)	Distal parenting support (n = 20)	Moderate general family/co-parent support (n = 58)	Social media support (n = 74)	Low parenting support (n = 34)	High parenting support (n = 108)	Low community parenting support (n = 171)	Proximal support (n = 85)	Intergenerational/Institutional parenting support (n = 83)	High Multi-domain Support (n = 61)
Parenting Satisfaction	3.68 (0.16)	3.06 (0.27)	4.21 (0.14)	4.00 (0.13)	4.80 (0.10)	4.28 (0.08)	4.37 (0.07)	4.80 (0.08)	4.30 (0.09)	4.73 (0.08)
										1 < 3,5,6,7,8,9,10; 2 < 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10; 3,6,7,9 < 5,8,10; 4 < 5,7,8,10;
Parenting Efficacy	3.40 (0.11)	2.78 (0.25)	3.81 (0.10)	3.63 (0.11)	4.16 (0.16)	3.92 (0.08)	3.81 (0.06)	4.27 (0.08)	3.73 (0.09)	4.44 (0.10)
										1 < 3,5,6,7,8,9,10; 2 < 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10; 3,6,7,9 < 8,10; 4 < 5,6,8,10; 5 > 7,9; 6 < 10
Parenting Stress	2.71 (0.18)	2.68 (0.34)	2.70 (0.20)	2.70 (0.16)	2.29 (0.23)	2.89 (0.15)	2.19 (0.11)	1.91 (0.14)	2.60 (0.15)	2.73 (0.21)
										1,3,4,9,10 > 7,8; 2 > 8; 6 > 5,7,8;
Home Involvement	3.10 (0.14)	2.87 (0.23)	3.34 (0.16)	3.34 (0.11)	3.50 (0.14)	3.82 (0.07)	3.47 (0.07)	3.97 (0.09)	3.53 (0.10)	4.22 (0.10)
										1,2 < 5,6,7,8,9,10; 3,4,5 < 6,8,10; 6 > 7,9; 6,9 < 10; 7 < 8,10; 8 > 9;
School Involvement	2.37 (0.12)	2.30 (0.24)	2.43 (0.15)	2.66 (0.09)	2.86 (0.16)	2.83 (0.08)	2.63 (0.07)	3.01 (0.10)	2.95 (0.09)	3.35 (0.09)
										1 < 5,6,8,9,10; 2,3 < 6,8,9,10; 4,7 < 8,9,10; 10 > 5,6,8,9

Note: Comparisons are significant at $p < 0.05$.