

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

CARI. D. SEARCY and KIMBERLY )  
MCKEEAND, individually and as parent and )  
next friend of K.S., a minor, )  
    *Plaintiffs,* )  
    v. )  
LUTHER STRANGE, in his official capacity )  
as Attorney General for the State of Alabama, )  
    *Defendant.* )  
    ) )  
    )

Civil Action No.  
1:14-cv-208-CG-N

**DECLARATION OF LOREN MARKS, PH.D.**

I, Loren Marks, Ph.D., declare pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 as follows:

1. My name is Loren Marks, Ph.D. I have personal knowledge of the facts contained in this statement and they are true.
2. I have been retained by the Office of the Alabama Attorney General to render my opinions as to the conclusions of social science research regarding the well-being of children of gay and lesbian parents as compared to children raised in families with intact, traditional marriages.
3. I prepared a report in this case entitled "Expert Witness Report of Loren Marks," dated October 8, 2014. That report disclosed my opinions in this case (and bases for those opinions). A true and correct copy of that report is attached as Exhibit A. My curriculum vitae and all other items required by Rule 26 have been provided. My curriculum vitae and all other items required by Rule 26 have been provided.
4. I make this declaration to reaffirm my report as set forth in Exhibit A.
5. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct,

Executed this 10 day of October, 2014.

Loren D. Marks

Loren D. Marks, Ph.D.

Sworn to and subscribed before me on this the 10 day of October, 2014.

[Signature]  
Notary Public

**Pamela K. Alonso, Notary Public ID #85498**

My commission expires: AT Death

**EXHIBIT A:**

**Expert Witness Report of Loren Marks**

July 1, 2014

EXPERT WITNESS REPORT OF LOREN MARKS

*Searcy v. Strange*

Case #1:14-CV-208

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama

Loren Marks, Louisiana State University; 335 Long Fieldhouse; Baton Rouge, LA  
70803; E-mail: [lorenm@lsu.edu](mailto:lorenm@lsu.edu); FAX: (225)578-1357

October 8, 2014

### **Preliminary Statement**

I hold the Kathryn Norwood and Claude Fussell Alumni Professorship in the LSU College of Human Sciences and Education. I also serve as 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.

I have received several awards in the social sciences for both research and teaching. Perhaps most notably, in 2011-2012, the LSU College of Agriculture nominated me for the national CASE Professor of the Year Award. In April 2014, I was again nominated for the national CASE Award, this time by the LSU College of Human Sciences and Education.

I have been called as an expert witness to represent the intellectual standards of my scientific discipline. In this report, I examine social science that addresses children and families of lesbian and gay parents, compared and contrasted with children and families based on intact, traditional marriages.

A copy of my vita is attached hereto. In the past 10 years, I have provided expert reports in the following cases, each challenging marriage laws: *DeBoer v. Snyder*, involving the State of Michigan; *Perry v. Schwarzenegger* (California); *Harris v. McDonnell*, W.D., Case No.5:13-cv-00077 (Virginia), *Paul Hard v. Strange* (2:13-cv-

922, M.D. Ala.) and *Aaron-Brush v. Strange* (No. 2:14-cv-1091 N.D. Ala.). In addition, an expert report I drafted for the California case was submitted, with my permission, in *United States v. Windsor*. I was deposed in the California and Michigan cases, and provided trial testimony in the Michigan case.

For my work in this matter, I am being compensated at a rate of \$250 hour.

Loren D. Marks

October 8, 2014

## 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>*

Differences have recurred in connection with several outcomes of societal-level concern including: (a) health,<sup>3</sup> mortality,<sup>4</sup> and suicide risks,<sup>5</sup> (b) drug and alcohol abuse,<sup>6</sup> (c) criminality and incarceration,<sup>7</sup> (d) intergenerational poverty,<sup>8</sup> (e) education and/or labor force contribution,<sup>9</sup> (f) early sexual activity and early childbearing,<sup>10</sup> and (g) divorce rates as adults.<sup>11</sup> These outcomes represent important impact variables that influence the well-being of children and families, as well as the national economy. Many

---

<sup>1</sup> See Table B; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994; Wilcox et al., 2005

<sup>2</sup> McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994, p. 1 (emphasis in original)

<sup>3</sup> Waite, 1995

<sup>4</sup> Gaudino et al., 1999; Siegel et al., 1996

<sup>5</sup> Wilcox et al., 2005, p. 28; Cutler et al., 2000

<sup>6</sup> Bachman et al. 1997; Flewelling & Bauman, 1990; Horwitz et al., 1996; Johnson et al., 1996; Simon, 2002; Waite & Gallagher, 2000; Weitoft et al., 2003; Wilcox et al., 2005

<sup>7</sup> Blackmon et al., 2005; Harper & McLanahan, 2004; Kamark & Galston, 1990, pp. 14-15; Manning & Lamb, 2003; Margolin, 1992, p. 546

<sup>8</sup> Akerlof, 1998; Blackmon et al., 2005; Brown, 2004; Oliver & Shapiro, 1997; Rank & Hirschl, 1999

<sup>9</sup> 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

<sup>10</sup> Amato, 2005; Amato & Booth, 2000; Ellis et al., 2003; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994

<sup>11</sup> Cherlin et al., 1995; Wolfinger, 2005

states have legislation that promotes the placement of children in these homes, due to recurring, demonstrated advantages for children raised in traditional, marriage-based families in the outcome areas listed above. As the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit noted in 2004, in a case dealing with Florida adoption law:

Florida’s interest in furthering the best interests of adopted children by placing them in families with married mothers and fathers. Such homes, Florida asserts, provide the stability that marriage affords and the presence of both male and female authority figures, which it considers critical to optimal childhood development and socialization (*Lofton v. Florida*, p. 818). [Full Citation: *Lofton v. Secretary of Dept. of Children and Family Services*, 358 F.3d 804 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004).]

Again, these “optimal” advantages have been identified in studies with large, representative samples (see Table B). By way of comparison, social science research with small, convenience<sup>12</sup> samples has repeatedly reported no significant differences between children from gay/lesbian households and heterosexual households. The

Eleventh Circuit, weighing the latter studies, concluded that the critiques of this work

highlighted significant flaws in the studies’ methodologies and conclusions, such as the use of small, self-selected samples; reliance on self-report instruments; politically driven hypotheses; and the use of unrepresentative study populations consisting of disproportionately affluent, educated parents (*Lofton v. Florida*, p. 825).<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> “Convenience” sampling (sometimes called “haphazard” or “accidental” sampling) involves “select[ing] anyone who is convenient” and is fraught with flaws (Neuman, 1997, p. 205). Neuman warns in his classic text *Social Research Methods*, that haphazard or convenience sampling “can produce ineffective, highly unrepresentative samples and is not recommended.” Further, “when a researcher haphazardly selects cases that are convenient, he or she can easily get a sample that seriously misrepresents the population. Such samples are cheap and quick; however, the bias and systematic errors that easily occur make them worse than no sample at all” (pp. 204-205).

<sup>13</sup> The most substantial critique relied on by the court was a 148 page monograph entitled *No Basis: What the Studies Don’t Tell Us about Same-Sex Parenting*, authored by two research methodology experts, Lerner and Nagai. This monograph will be referenced later in the present report.

The Eleventh Circuit further suggested that it was “premature to rely on a very recent and still developing body of [same-sex parenting] research, particularly in light of the absence of longitudinal studies following child subjects into adulthood” (*Lofton v. Florida*, p. 825).

The following year, 2005, the American Psychological Association (APA), the world’s largest professional organization of social scientists, issued an official brief on “Lesbian and Gay Parenting.”<sup>14</sup> The APA Brief’s stated objective was primarily to influence family law. The preface stated that “the focus of the publication...[is] to serve the needs of psychologists, lawyers, and parties in family law cases” (APA Brief, 2005, p. 3). Perhaps no claim within the APA Brief garnered more attention or wielded more influence than the following (p. 15):

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.<sup>15</sup>

Was the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit correct in asserting that it was “premature to rely on a very recent and still developing body of [same-sex parenting] research” with “significant flaws” (p. 825) or, conversely, was the APA correct in advocating what has since been labeled the “no difference hypothesis”?<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> 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 lesbian and gay parenting and marriage rights, and the research is now frequently cited in public policy debates and judicial opinions” (p. 136).

<sup>15</sup> Patterson, p. 15 (from APA Brief, 2005)

<sup>16</sup> 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. Indeed, it is difficult to find a post-2005 same-sex marriage case where the APA Brief is not referenced. Further, many other professional organizations followed the APA model and issued briefs similarly endorsing the no difference hypothesis.

The present report addresses this question and examines the science behind these two divergent claims and yields support for the decision of the U.S. Eleventh Circuit. More specifically, the present report will indicate that although the author of the APA Brief (pp. 5-22) has contended for an “exceptionally clear”<sup>17</sup> verdict of “no difference” between same-sex and heterosexual parents since 1992, a closer examination leads to the conclusion that strong, generalized assertions, including those made by the APA Brief, were not empirically warranted.

### **Statement of Purpose**

In the present report, seven questions relating to the cited scientific evidence are posed, examined, and addressed.<sup>18</sup> Four recent empirical vignettes involving the American Psychological Association will also be presented, along with supporting data. The 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?*<sup>19</sup> *More specifically, are children with lesbian and gay parents demonstrably faring as well as those in marriage-based families?* As will be documented, the author cannot offer a high confidence, data-based ‘yes’ or ‘no’ response to this question.

---

<sup>17</sup> Patterson, 1992

<sup>18</sup> 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).

<sup>19</sup> 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).

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.”<sup>20</sup> The 59 published studies are listed in Table A of this paper, providing clear parameters from which to formulate responses to the seven outlined questions, next.

***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”<sup>21</sup> contain *far* fewer than 100 participants, including one study with five participants (Wright, 1998; see Table A). We will return to the size concern in Question 7 later, but for now we will address the issue of representativeness in sampling. As Strasser (2008) notes:

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).

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.

---

<sup>20</sup> 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.

<sup>21</sup> Stacey & Biblarz, 2001, p. 168, footnote 9

Lack of representativeness in sampling often entails lack of diversity as well.<sup>22</sup> 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).

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.<sup>23</sup> This is problematic given that recent work has indicated that

---

<sup>22</sup> 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.)

<sup>23</sup> 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; Hoeffler, 1981; Huggins, 1989; Koepke et al.,

racial minority same-sex couples are significantly more likely to have children (Gates, 2011), with one recent national probability sample reporting that 43% of lesbian cohabiting households surveyed were “Black or Hispanic” (Regnerus, 2012, p. 757).

Given the racially and economically privileged status of the participants in their sample, same-sex family researchers Lott-Whitehead and Tully (1993) urged restraint in the discussion of their APA Brief-cited study by warning:

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).

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:

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.<sup>24</sup>

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

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.<sup>25</sup>

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

---

1992; Rand et al., 1982; Siegenthaler & Bigner, 2000; Tasker & Golombok, 1995, 1998; Vanfraussen et al., 2003.

<sup>24</sup> Patterson, 1992, p. 1029

<sup>25</sup> Patterson, 1992, p. 1036 (emphasis added)

[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.<sup>26</sup>

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).<sup>27</sup> 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”<sup>28</sup> or “exceptionally clear.”<sup>29</sup>

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.”<sup>30</sup> *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.<sup>31</sup> Of these eight

---

<sup>26</sup> Patterson, 2000, p. 1064 (emphasis added)

<sup>27</sup> Patterson, 2000, p. 1064

<sup>28</sup> Patterson, 1992, p. 1036

<sup>29</sup> Patterson, 2000, p. 1064

<sup>30</sup> Demo & Cox, 2000, p. 890

<sup>31</sup> Bailey et al., 1995; Barrett & Tasker, 2001; Bigner & Jacobsen, 1989a, 1989b; Bozett, 1980; Harris & Turner, 1986; Miller, 1979; Sarantakos, 1996

studies, four did not include a heterosexual comparison group.<sup>32</sup> 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).
- (2) “parenting behaviors of...fathers” (Bigner & Jacobsen, 1989b, p. 173).
- (3) “problems” and “relationship with child” (Harris & Turner, 1986, pp. 107–8).

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. If “it would be misleading to cite a study of gay men in urban southern California as if they would represent gay

---

<sup>32</sup> Bailey et al., 1995; Barrett & Tasker, 2001; Bozett, 1980; Miller, 1979

men nationally” (Strasser, 2008, p. 37), it is also questionable to repeatedly select small, homogeneous samples of privileged lesbian mothers as representatives for all same-sex parents, including gay fathers. This documented and acknowledged pattern across three decades of research raises significant questions regarding scientific rigor, lack of representativeness, and lack of 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 between groups. 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, weaken it considerably because 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,”<sup>33</sup> 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).<sup>34</sup>

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 significant recurring differences in several outcomes of societal-level concern for children from (heterosexual) intact, marriage-based families compared with children in (heterosexual) cohabiting, divorced, step, and single-parent families.<sup>35</sup> Many of the cited findings are based on probability samples of thousands—the average sample size of the studies is 9,911 (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-level 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 heterosexual comparison group (p. 198).

---

<sup>33</sup> Patterson, 1992, p. 1029

<sup>34</sup> Patterson, 2000, p. 1064

<sup>35</sup> See footnotes 2-11 for documentation.

2. Hoefffer (1981) used “heterosexual single mothers” (p. 537).
3. Kirkpatrick et al. (1981) used “single, heterosexual mothers” (p. 545).
4. Kweskin and Cook (1982) used women from Parents without Partners (p. 969).
5. Lyons (1983) used “heterosexual single mothers” (p. 232).
6. Golombok et al. (1983) used “single-parent households” (p. 551).
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).
9. Huggins (1989) used “divorced heterosexual mothers”<sup>36</sup> (p. 123).
10. Tasker and Golombok (1995) used “heterosexual single mothers” (p. 203).
11. Tasker and Golombok (1997) used “single heterosexual mothers” (p. 38).

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

---

<sup>36</sup> More specifically, “4 of the 16 [divorced] heterosexual mothers were either remarried or currently living with a heterosexual lover” (p. 127).

comparison heterosexual-parent group is noteworthy, given McLanahan 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...*<sup>37</sup> (see also Amato, 2001).<sup>38</sup>

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 authors of 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). Namely, it is difficult to ascertain whether the heterosexual mothers in many of the studies were continuously married—*or* whether they were single, divorced, remarried, or cohabiting. It is similarly difficult in many of the comparison studies to determine whether the heterosexual "couples" that were used were continuously married—*or* whether they were 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" (p. 364).

---

<sup>37</sup> McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994, p. 1 (emphasis in original)

<sup>38</sup> 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 that he considered to children of continuously married parents (p. 360).

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 with samples larger than 300 each? The answer is zero. In an *American Psychologist* 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."<sup>39</sup> This is correct. A few exceptions exist with *small* samples<sup>40</sup> but even in these cases the "heterosexual couples" are rarely identified as intact, marriage-based couples.<sup>41</sup>

Given what we have seen regarding heterosexual comparison group selection, let us revisit three related claims across time by the author of the APA Brief (pp. 5-22). First, in 1992, Patterson posited that:

---

<sup>39</sup> Herek, 2006, p. 612

<sup>40</sup> For sake of clarity, "small" sample as used here means less than 300 (see Table A for documentation).

<sup>41</sup> Two exceptions will be discussed in connection with Questions 4 and 5 (Sarantakos, 1996, 2000).

[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*.<sup>42</sup>

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.<sup>43</sup>

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*.<sup>44</sup>

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"?***

---

<sup>42</sup> Patterson, 1992, p. 1036 (emphasis added)

<sup>43</sup> Patterson, 2000, p. 1064 (emphasis added)

<sup>44</sup> Patterson, p. 15 (from APA Brief, 2005), (emphasis added)

To restate: 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 (and increasingly *are*) 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.”<sup>45</sup> The present report will address a few exceptional studies—one now and one in connection with Question 5, and another study or two near the report’s end.

In the “Summary of Findings” section, the APA Brief references a study by Sarantakos (1996),<sup>46</sup> but does so marginally—in a footnote that critiques the study (p. 6, footnote 1). 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. Consistent with best research practices, the children in the study were all “matched according to socially significant criteria (e.g., age, number of children [in the family],

---

<sup>45</sup> Patterson, p. 15 (from APA Brief, 2005)

<sup>46</sup> 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 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.

education, occupation, and socio-economic status).<sup>47</sup> 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,<sup>48</sup> 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) to 9 (very high performance)."<sup>49</sup> Based on teacher (not parent) reports, Sarantakos (1996) found several significant differences between intact, marriage-based families and homosexual families.

<i>Language Achievement:</i>	Married 7.7, Cohabiting 6.8, Homosexual 5.5
<i>Mathematics Achievement:</i>	Married 7.9, Cohabiting 7.0, Homosexual 5.5
<i>Social Studies Achievement:</i>	Married 7.3, Cohabiting 7.0, Homosexual 7.6
<i>Sport Interest/Involvement:</i>	Married 8.9, Cohabiting 8.3, Homosexual 5.9
<i>Sociability/Popularity:</i>	Married 7.5, Cohabiting 6.5, Homosexual 5.0
<i>School/Learning Attitude:</i>	Married 7.5, Cohabiting 6.8, Homosexual 6.5
<i>Parent-School Relationships:</i>	Married 7.5, Cohabiting 6.0, Homosexual 5.0
<i>Support with Homework:</i>	Married 7.0, Cohabiting 6.5, Homosexual 5.5
<i>Parental Aspirations:</i>	Married 8.1, Cohabiting 7.4, Homosexual 6.5 <sup>50</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Sarantakos, 1996, p. 23

<sup>48</sup> 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*.

<sup>49</sup> Sarantakos, 1996, p. 24

<sup>50</sup> Sarantakos, 1996, pp. 24–27

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,<sup>51</sup> than children of cohabiting and homosexual couples.”<sup>52</sup>

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*.”<sup>53</sup> 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 on their own children.<sup>54</sup> Sarantakos (1996) also drew data from school aptitude tests and observations, thereby modeling a research ideal of *triangulation* of sources.<sup>55</sup> 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

---

<sup>51</sup> As noted in the table, however, children of same-sex couples scored slightly higher in social studies.

<sup>52</sup> Sarantakos, 1996, p. 30

<sup>53</sup> APA Brief (2005), footnote 1, p. 6 (emphasis added)

<sup>54</sup> It is well documented 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).

<sup>55</sup> “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 promotes checks and balances.

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*,<sup>56</sup>
- b) *One of the most comparative* (only about five other studies used three comparison groups of 30 or more),<sup>57</sup> and
- c) *One of the most comprehensively triangulated* study (four data sources) conducted on same-sex parenting.<sup>58</sup>

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, 2007a) and the author/editor of a four-volume, 1672-page work in Sage Publications' *Benchmarks in Social Research Series* (2007b). This sheds light on the comparatively exemplary rigor of the study.

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.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> 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.

<sup>57</sup> For example, Brewaeys et al., 1997; Golombok et al., 2003; Golombok et al., 1997; MacCallum & Golombok, 2004; Tasker & Golombok, 1998

<sup>58</sup> 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 quite limited compared with most of the nationally representative studies on intact families listed in Table B.

<sup>59</sup> Patterson (2005) in APA Brief, p. 7, footnote 1

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 studies in Table A address the societal-level 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? It appears that almost none of the studies did so.

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).<sup>60</sup>

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"<sup>61</sup>; "behavioral adjustment, self-

---

<sup>60</sup> Anderssen et al., 2002, p. 343

<sup>61</sup> Bailey et al., 1995; Golombok & Tasker, 1996

concepts, and sex-role identity”<sup>62</sup>; “sexual identity”<sup>63</sup>; “sex-role behavior”<sup>64</sup>; “self-esteem”<sup>65</sup>; “psychosexual and psychiatric appraisal”<sup>66</sup>; “socioemotional development”<sup>67</sup>; and “maternal mental health and child adjustment.”<sup>68</sup> 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 outcome(s)” as identified by Anderssen et al.<sup>69</sup>

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 foci. 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 outcomes of societal-level concern.<sup>70</sup> The salient point here is not that the issues repeatedly studied (gender, adjustment, etc.) are not important but that several issues of profound importance have gone almost entirely unexamined. Therefore, when the APA Brief asserted that “Not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to be disadvantaged in any

---

<sup>62</sup> Patterson, 1994

<sup>63</sup> Green, 1978

<sup>64</sup> Hoeffler, 1981; Kweskin & Cook, 1982

<sup>65</sup> Huggins, 1989

<sup>66</sup> Golombok et al., 1983

<sup>67</sup> Golombok et al., 1997

<sup>68</sup> Patterson, 2001

<sup>69</sup> Anderssen et al., 2002, p. 343

<sup>70</sup> These outcomes of societal-level concern include intergenerational poverty, criminality, college education and/or labor force contribution, drug/alcohol abuse, suicide, sexual activity and early childbearing, and divorce as adults.

significant respect relative to children of heterosexual parents,”<sup>71</sup> a more careful and restrained summary might have 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 the societal-level concerns of intergenerational poverty, criminality, college education and/or labor force contribution, drug/alcohol abuse, suicide, sexual activity and early childbearing, and divorce as adults.”

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

- 1) The study includes lesbian *and gay* parents instead of focusing on lesbian mothers (Question 1);
- 2) The study includes a *socio-economically diverse sample* of lesbian and gay parents instead of focusing on parents who are educationally and economically privileged (Question 1);
- 3) The study uses not only one but *two heterosexual comparison samples*; one married parent sample and one cohabitating parent sample (Questions 2 & 3);
- 4) The study *examines several outcomes of societal-level concern* (Question 5); (and)
- 5) The study is unique in presenting *long-term (post-18 years old) outcomes* of children with lesbian and gay parents (Question 6, addressed later).

The landmark, book-length study’s conclusions regarding outcomes of young adult children of gay and lesbian parents read, 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

---

<sup>71</sup> Patterson, p. 15 (from APA Brief, 2005)

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) book-length study was not 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 adjustment have been focal but that many outcomes of societal-level concern were repeatedly overlooked in the APA-cited studies on same-sex parenting. By contrast, Sarantakos (2000; not cited in the APA Brief) examined *four* societal-level concerns, including: (a) drug and alcohol abuse, (b) education (truancy), (c) sexual activity, and (d) criminality—and noted significant differences in all of these areas. However, the Sarantakos (2000) study, though larger in size<sup>72</sup> than any child

---

<sup>72</sup> A detailed sample description is offered on Sarantakos (2000), pp. 15-16. Namely, N= 128 gay/lesbian couples with residential children (256 co-parents) and 181 children of gay/lesbian couples. Of these 181 children, however, only 18 fall into the 16 years and older category, exposing the study to the same sample size criticisms and threats to external validity to which most other same-sex parenting studies are vulnerable.

outcome-focused study cited in the APA Brief, is not generalizable and has many of the same scientific limitations outlined in the other studies discussed to this point.

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 outcomes of societal-level 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 the preceding section (Question 5), virtually none of the peer-reviewed, same-sex parenting comparison studies addressed these outcomes.<sup>73</sup>

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, other than the landmark but still severely limited study by Sarantakos (2000).

---

<sup>73</sup> 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.

The few that utilize comparison groups have comparison groups of 44 or smaller.<sup>74</sup> Let us further explore the importance of a lack of data regarding late 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.”<sup>75</sup> 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.” Brown 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.<sup>76</sup>

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

---

<sup>74</sup> i.e., Wainwright Russell, & Patterson, 2004

<sup>75</sup> Brown, 2004, p. 355

<sup>76</sup> 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.”<sup>77</sup>

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?<sup>78</sup> 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 the

---

<sup>77</sup> Wilcox et al. 2011, p.11

<sup>78</sup> 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.

studies in the APA Brief offer almost no empirical basis for responding. One response 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, nor are they generalizable because the 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). We continue to explore yet another problem and limitation resulting from small, convenience samples in Question 7, next.

***Question 7: Have the studies in this area used samples that were too small to detect differences?***

In a review published in the flagship APA journal *American Psychologist* (one year after the APA Brief was issued), Herek (2006) acknowledged that many same-sex parenting studies have “utilized small, select convenience samples and often employed unstandardized measures.”<sup>79</sup> Stacey and Biblarz (2001) refer to these “small, select convenience”<sup>80</sup> samples as “miniscule”<sup>81</sup> and Anderssen et al. (2002) similarly indicated in their review of same-sex parenting studies:

The samples were most often small, increasing the chance to conclude that no differences exist between groups when in fact the differences do exist. This casts doubt on the external validity of the studies (p. 348).

This recurring concern with inadequate sample size is salient because all a researcher need to do to be able to come to a conclusion of “no difference” is to conduct a study with a small sample and/or sufficient levels of random variation (Cohen, 1988).

---

<sup>79</sup> Herek, 2006, p. 612

<sup>80</sup> Herek, 2006, p. 612

<sup>81</sup> Stacey & Biblarz, 2001, p. 168, footnote 9

Even so, the 2005 APA Brief explicitly claimed that findings of non-significant differences between same-sex and heterosexual parents had been “repeatedly replicated” (p. 7, footnote 1). Reasons for skepticism regarding the APA Brief’s claim that findings have been “repeatedly replicated” arise with Neuman’s (1997) point that “the logic of replication implies that different researchers are unlikely to make the same errors.”<sup>82</sup> However, if errors (e.g., similarly biased sampling approaches employing “small, select convenience samples”<sup>83</sup> and comparison groups) are repeated by different researchers, the logic and assumptions behind replication are violated. Related concerns appeared central in the U.S. Eleventh Circuit ruling—the decision cited three published critiques outlining what were referenced as “recurring methodological flaws” (p. 825). The central critique noted in the ruling (footnote 24, p. 825) was a 148 page monograph by research methodologists Lerner and Nagai (2001) who noted, among other criticisms, that 17 of the 22 same-sex parenting comparison studies they reviewed had been designed in such a way that the odds of *failing* to find a significant difference [between homo- and heterosexual groups] was 85 percent or higher.<sup>84</sup>

As has been previously detailed in the response to Question 1 in this report, same-sex parenting researchers have repeatedly selected small samples of White, well-educated, middle- and upper-class lesbians to represent same-sex parents. This tendency has continued for more than a decade after this bias was explicitly identified by Patterson (1992, 2000). Further, repeated sampling tendencies in connection with heterosexual comparison groups (e.g., single mothers), were documented in response to Question 3 in

---

<sup>82</sup> Neuman, 1997, p. 150

<sup>83</sup> Herek, 2006, p. 612

<sup>84</sup> Lerner & Nagai, 2001, p. 103

this paper. These repeated (convenience) sampling tendencies across studies with “miniscule” or “small, select convenience samples” that employed different measures do not seem to constitute valid scientific replication. Indeed, the social science research methodologist W. Lawrence Neuman (1997) warns that convenience sampling

can produce ineffective, highly unrepresentative samples and is not recommended. When a researcher haphazardly selects cases that are convenient, he or she can easily get a sample that seriously misrepresents the population. Such samples are cheap and quick; however, the bias and systematic errors that easily occur [can] make them worse than no sample at all (pp. 204-205).

Let us now shift our focus from biased convenience sampling to some inherent problems with *small* samples.

In his volume on statistical analysis that is cited in the APA’s own *Publication Manual* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.),<sup>85</sup> Jacob Cohen stated:

Most psychologists of whatever stripe believe that samples, even small samples, mirror the characteristics of their parent populations. In effect, they operate on the unstated premise that the law of large numbers holds for small numbers as well.... (p. xv).

Cohen continues [citing Tversky and Kahneman], “The believer in the law of small numbers has incorrect intuitions...” (p. xv).

Let us contextualize “the law of small numbers” relative to the same-sex parenting studies cited in the APA Brief. The combined non-representative sample total of all 59 same-sex parenting studies in the 2005 APA Brief (pp. 23–45) is 7,800 (see Table A). By comparison, Table B lists 15 prominent, high quality studies that contrast children’s outcomes in intact, single-parent, divorced, and/or step-family forms using

---

<sup>85</sup> For example, see *APA 5<sup>th</sup> Publication Manual* (2001), p. 24.

large probability samples and comparison groups.<sup>86</sup> The average sample size in these studies is 9,911<sup>87</sup>—a figure of more than 2,100 larger than all 59 same-sex parenting studies combined (7,800). If we more closely examine the same-sex parenting sample total of 7,800, however, we find that this figure (7,800) includes heterosexual comparison samples (1,404), psychologists (388), college students' perception reports (489), and a sample of 2,431 adults reports of coming out, many of whom do not appear to be parents (Morris et al., 2002). Indeed, if we only include comparison studies that deal specifically with children's outcomes (see Table A) we find that 812 children of lesbian and gay parents have been studied<sup>88</sup>—comprising 10.4% of the original combined total of 7,800.

The average sample size of children of same-sex parents in these studies was about 34, less than one-tenth (8.6%) of the size required to detect a “small effect” in statistical comparison research.<sup>89</sup> After adding the comparison samples, the studies on

---

<sup>86</sup> 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”<sup>86</sup> (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 two of the 15 studies employ longitudinal designs, as recommended in the earlier examination of Question 6.

<sup>87</sup> This figure is the result of 148,667 divided by 15 studies.

<sup>88</sup> Comparison studies that focus on children's outcomes (as opposed to parents' self-reports on themselves as parents) include Brewaeys et al., 1997; Chan, Brooks, et al., 1998; Chan, Raboy, et al., 1998; Flaks et al., 15; Fulcher et al., 2002; Golombok et al., 1983; Golombok et al., 2003; Golombok & Tasker, 1996; Golombok et al., 1997; Green et al., 1986; Harris & Turner, 1986; Hoeffler, 1981; Huggins, 1989; Kirkpatrick et al., 1981; Kveskin & Cook, 1982; Miller et al., 1981; Mucklow & Phelan, 1979; Pagelow, 1980; Patterson, 1994; Sarantakos, 1996; Tasker & Golombok, 1995; Tasker & Golombok, 1997; Tasker & Golombok, 1998; Vanfraussen et al., 2003; Wainwright et al., 2004. The total number of children of lesbian or gay parents in these studies is 812.

<sup>89</sup> The minimal sample size required to detect a small effect is 393 or more, depending on the method employed (Cohen, 1988; Lerner & Nagai, 2001).

children's outcomes still fell far short of required sizes, with only six having more than one-quarter of the required sample size.<sup>90</sup>

Considering: (a) the constrained sample sizes, (b) the almost exclusive use of convenience sampling, (c) the privileged and homogenous lesbian samples employed, and (d) the boldness of the claims made by the APA in the 2005 Brief, some readers might concur with the Yale psychologist Virginia Shiller (2007), who concluded in the APA's own *American Psychologist* that "the line between science and advocacy appears blurred" (p. 712). Having offered responses to the seven questions raised in the present report, let us now turn our attention to four empirical vignettes relating to the American Psychological Association and the organization's advocacy position in the 2005 Brief.

#### **Four Recent Empirical Vignettes Involving the American Psychological Association**

A skilled playwright typically presents the setting, backdrop, and context before commencing with the action and content. As the present report concludes, the researcher instead addresses the setting *post hoc*. This will be done through the examination of four empirical vignettes that capture the sociopolitical context of academic work on same-sex issues by (and within) the American Psychological Association. These contextual examples include: (1) Inbar and Lammers' 2012 study of APA's Division 8; (2) the Haidt poll at a 2011 APA session; (3) the 2011 APA vote on same-sex marriage; and (4) the natural experiment of the Mucklow/Miller studies. These empirical vignettes are discussed next, along with supporting references for each example.

---

<sup>90</sup> The comparison studies on children's outcomes with a *combined* sample of more than 25% of 393 (which is 98) include: Brewaeys et al., 1997 (N=98); Golombok et al., 2003 (N=173); Golombok et al., 1997 (N=113); Green et al., 1986 (N=104 children); Sarantakos, 1996 (N=174); Tasker & Golombok, 1998 (N=99).

**Empirical Vignette 1: Inbar and Lammers' 2012 Study of APA's Division 8.**

Academics have recently addressed a growing concern with “sociopolitical groupthink” within academia generally and within the social sciences specifically (Klein & Stern, 2009a, 2009b; Redding, 2012, p. 512; Redding, 2013). Briefly explained, the form of sociopolitical groupthink that is of concern in the present report involves “a belief in the inherent morality of the liberal ingroup, negative stereotyping of the conservative outgroup...and a failure to consider conservative perspectives” (Redding, 2012, p. 513).

Functionally, the effect is that:

Over time a snowball effect accumulates, with departments [and disciplines] becoming less ideologically diverse. The ratio of liberals to conservatives in psychology has increased from 3 to 1 in the 1960s to roughly 10 to 1 today and to 20 to 1 or more in many disciplines<sup>91</sup>... (Redding<sup>92</sup>, 2012, p. 513).

As a scientific test of current political diversity in psychology, Inbar and Lammers “contacted all 1,939 members” of the American Psychological Association’s Division 8 (Society for Personality and Social Psychology) and received 800 responses<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> Klein and Stern (2009a, p. 22) review four studies from 2001-2007 that find an even higher Democrat: Republican ratio among sociologists (with an average ratio of more than 38:1 across four studies).

<sup>92</sup> Richard Redding, who is cited multiple times here, has published scholarship on same-sex issues (Redding, 2008) and has even co-authored related work with the sole author of the 2005 APA Brief, pp. 5-22 (i.e., Patterson & Redding, 1996). Redding is also a leading proponent of “sociopolitical diversity” within the academy (O’Donohue & Redding, 2009, p. 105). In spite of apparently favoring same-sex marriage, Redding has stated, “[T]he political imbalance in academic research on political or public policy issues, and in research in the social sciences...is unfortunate.... The fact that the professorate is overwhelmingly liberal is necessarily going to lead to a much narrower and more myopic research agenda than otherwise would be the case.... We also must recognize the inevitably discriminatory effects of liberal groupthink, which excludes or marginalizes conservatives and their views. The academy’s multicultural project cannot succeed when *diversity* is defined to include every kind of difference except the one that may matter most” [i.e., sociopolitical diversity] (O’Donohue & Redding, 2009, pp. 105-106).

<sup>93</sup> 800 responses from 1,939 constitutes a 41.3% response rate.

(2012, pp. 496, 497). The researchers surveyed three domains and “found an overwhelming liberal majority...on social issues” (p. 497). To be precise, 3.9% of the sample self-rated as conservative on social issues (only 5.5% self-rated as moderate; p. 497). If the apparent balance (90.6%) rated on the liberal continuum, this yields a liberal to conservative ratio of more than 23:1 on social issues.<sup>94</sup>

In a second survey, within the same study, the authors found that “Hostility toward and willingness to discriminate against conservatives is widespread” and that, based on the self-reports of APA Division 8 members, “More than one in three [37.5%] would discriminate against [conservatives] when making hiring decisions” (Inbar & Lammers, 2012, p. 501, and Table 2, “Stated Willingness to Discriminate Against Conservatives”). Inbar and Lammers go on to posit that the discrimination figure of 37.5% is likely underestimated. Given these reports, it would seem prudent for the rare social conservative in psychology to use avoid disclosing her/his perspective to hiring committees and/or colleagues, much less in the public domain. This leads us to our second empirical vignette.

**Empirical Vignette 2: The Haidt Poll at a 2011 APA Session.** In the Inbar and Lammers (2012) piece referenced above, the researchers relate the following narrative:

[I]n a provocative talk given by Jonathon Haidt<sup>95</sup> (2011) at the annual meeting of...APA Division 8...Haidt asked the political conservatives present to raise

---

<sup>94</sup> Eliminating the moderate reports, 90.6 liberal / 3.9 conservative = 23.23 ratio.

<sup>95</sup> Haidt describes his own political stance as follows: “I am not a conservative. I have no dog in this fight, no axe to grind. I was a liberal Democrat from my early teens until the Fall of 2010.... I now see both sides of the spectrum as having valid moral concerns, and as having good ideas about how to run a humane society.... So now I am a centrist. My goal in the partisanship debate is not to argue for one side or the other. My goal is to disrupt the moral forcefield that turns on when conservatives disappear from a community of social scientists.” [Retrieved from <http://people.stern.nyu.edu/jhaidt/postpartisan.html> on May 29, 2014].

their hands. In an audience of more than 1,000, only three hands went up (p. 496).<sup>96</sup>

The author of the present report contacted Professor Haidt to verify this claim and he promptly did so.<sup>97</sup> To restate, only three out of more than 1,000 APA Division 8 psychologists were willing to *publicly identify* as conservative.<sup>98</sup> Haidt has argued that “this ‘statistically impossible lack of diversity’ has serious negative consequences,”<sup>99</sup> including a lack of dialogue and problematic quality of science around socio-politically charged issues of inquiry like same-sex marriage. Other scholars share these concerns.<sup>100</sup>

**Empirical Vignette 3: The 2011 APA Vote on Same-Sex Marriage.** A self-reported liberal to conservative ratio on social issues of 23 to 1 in psychology (e.g., Inbar & Lammers, 2012, APA Division 8 study) may seem improbable to those outside the discipline. The Haidt report of “three hands [out of] more than a thousand”<sup>101</sup> from an APA Division 8 meeting may be still more difficult to believe. A fair-minded scholar might question if Division 8 of APA is a sociopolitical anomaly and wonder if there are

---

<sup>96</sup> Inbar & Lammers (2012) also add: “Haidt also described two other attempts he had made to locate conservatives in social psychology: searching the web using “conservative social psychologist” and asking 30 social psychologists to name a conservative colleague. Combined, these latter two methods uncovered one conservative social psychologist” (p. 496).

<sup>97</sup> Personal e-mail communication (May 24, 2014) is in possession of author and available for access. See <http://people.stern.nyu.edu/jhaidt/postpartisan.html> for an audio representation, along with PowerPoint slides.

<sup>98</sup> Using the Inbar and Lammers survey figure of self-reported socially conservative APA Division 8 members, it appears that less than one in ten of this very small sub-group (of 3.9%) were willing to publicly identify among colleagues.

<sup>99</sup> Haidt, as cited in Inbar & Lammers, 2012, p. 496. These negative consequences ostensibly include: “The unwillingness [of social scientists] to consider ‘taboo’ hypotheses” (Inbar & Lammers, 2012) and the claim that “sociopolitical discrimination is a fact of academic life” for conservatives in psychology.

<sup>100</sup> Including: Inbar & Lammers, 2012; Klein & Stern, 2009a, 2009b; O’Donohue & Redding, 2009; Redding, 2012, 2013.

<sup>101</sup> Haidt, as cited in Inbar & Lammers, 2012, p. 496.

any data or reports that represent the American Psychological Association as a larger body that might shed additional light on the broader sociopolitical tenor of the organization. Let us examine one example.

In 2011 Gallup polls, percentages “for” and “against” same-sex marriage were fairly evenly divided.<sup>102</sup> By comparison, in August of the same year (2011), the American Psychological Association’s policymaking body supported same-sex marriage unanimously in a 157-0 vote.<sup>103</sup> Whether such a vote reflects remarkable solidarity or scientific groupthink is likely a matter of perspective and interpretation, but the absence of a single dissenter is a matter of record. Let us now examine a final empirical vignette.

#### **Empirical Vignette 4: The Natural Experiment of the Mucklow/Miller**

**Studies.** As previously noted, a central claim of the 2005 APA Brief was 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.<sup>104</sup>

Studies that contradict this claim were reviewed in the responses to Questions 4 and 5 but we turn to another illustration that seems to provide additional context regarding the identified tendency for “sensitive scholars” in the same-sex parenting domain “to tread gingerly around the terrain of differences.”<sup>105</sup>

From 1979-1981, the Mucklow/Miller research team<sup>106</sup> produced three closely related research articles<sup>107</sup> that studied lesbian mothers and their families. One article

---

<sup>102</sup> Newport (2011) reported on Gallup polls that indicated 45% opposed gay marriage.

<sup>103</sup> Retrieved on May 29, 2014 from: <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/american-psychological-association-supports-same-sex-marriage-157-0>

<sup>104</sup> Patterson, p. 15 (from APA Brief, 2005)

<sup>105</sup> Stacey & Biblarz, 2001, p. 162

<sup>106</sup> The research partnership was composed of Mucklow, Miller, Jacobsen, Bigner, and Phelan.

reported adverse information about lesbian parents—including reports that they experienced significantly less positive nuclear family relationships (Miller, Mucklow, Jacobsen, & Bigner, 1980), whereas the other two articles (Miller, Jacobsen, & Bigner, 1981; Mucklow & Phelan, 1979) reported more positive information on the lesbian families.<sup>108</sup> The three articles were by overlapping authors from the same academic institution<sup>109</sup> and were published in the same journal (in two cases).<sup>110</sup> The articles were also published during the same three-year time frame. Nevertheless, a 2010 review found that the adverse article (Miller et al., 1980) had only been cited twice, whereas the other two articles have been cited at least 65 times,<sup>111</sup> “a statistically significant difference, although it is possible the least cited article [with the negative reports] was the soundest methodologically.”<sup>112</sup>

The author of the present report performed an updated citation check on Googlescholar.com on June 4, 2014, and found that the first positive piece (Mucklow & Phelan, 1979) has now been cited 68 times. The second positive piece (Miller et al., 1981) has now been cited 89 times (157 total citations between the two articles). The negative lesbian mother report (Miller et al., 1980) has been cited six times—and at least two of the six citations are references that draw attention to the relative neglect of the

---

<sup>107</sup> Chronologically, these included: Mucklow & Phelan, 1979; Miller, Mucklow, Jacobsen, & Bigner, 1980; and Miller, Jacobsen, & Bigner, 1981

<sup>108</sup> See Schumm, 2010d for a detailed review

<sup>109</sup> Colorado State University

<sup>110</sup> *Psychological Reports*, 1979, 1980

<sup>111</sup> Mucklow and Phelan (1979) was cited 28 times and Miller et al. (1981) was cited 37 times (see Schumm, 2010d, p. 377).

<sup>112</sup> Schumm, 2010c, p. 371

study.<sup>113</sup> Differential attention to positive articles (and aversion to negative articles) on same-sex parenting has been statistically documented elsewhere<sup>114</sup> but this particular example of differential citation involving overlapping authors in the same journal during adjacent years may be aptly described as a natural experiment in the social sciences—an experiment of statistically significant bias.<sup>115</sup> We now examine how this citation differential relates to the 2005 APA Brief that has apparently served as a template and model for the briefs of several other organizations.

The 2005 APA Brief’s “Summary of Research Findings” (pp. 5-22) cites the two positive articles<sup>116</sup> from the Mucklow, Miller, Jacobsen, and Bigner team on p. 7 and then correspondingly lists both in the reference section on pp. 19 and 20. Both positive studies receive attention again later and are featured with summaries<sup>117</sup> in the “Annotated Bibliography” section of the APA Brief (pp. 23-45)—as are additional (positive) studies from members of the same research team (e.g., Bigner & Jacobsen, 1989a, 1989b).<sup>118</sup> In total, the positive articles produced by members of the Mucklow, Miller, Jacobsen, and Bigner team are referenced or summarized a total of at least eight times in the APA

---

<sup>113</sup> Two studies that highlight the differential citations between the negative and positive articles are Schumm, 2010c and 2010d.

<sup>114</sup> For example, see Schumm’s (2010d) article “Evidence of Pro-Homosexual Bias in Social Science: Citation Rates and Research on Lesbian Parenting.” This article is published in *Psychological Reports*, the same journal as two of the Mucklow/Miller studies. See also, Cameron (2009) and Schumm (2008).

<sup>115</sup> See Schumm (2010d) for documentation of 2010 citations and identification of statistically significant differences.

<sup>116</sup> Miller, Jacobsen, & Bigner, 1981; Mucklow & Phelan, 1979

<sup>117</sup> These two annotated bibliography summaries appear on p. 35 of the APA Brief.

<sup>118</sup> As of June 4, 2014, GoogleScholar.com identifies these two studies (Bigner & Jacobsen, 1989a, 1989b) as having been cited 79 and 148 times, respectively.

Brief.<sup>119</sup> Conversely, the Miller, Mucklow, Jacobsen, and Bigner (1980) article with the negative reports regarding lesbian mother families is never referenced in either of the major portions of the APA Brief, in spite of being produced by the same authors and being published in the same journal as the multi-cited 1979 piece (Mucklow & Phelan, 1979).

We now move from four data-based vignettes of sociopolitical context regarding the APA Brief, back to the *content* of the Brief itself. In review, let us revisit the seven specific questions asked in this report, along with summative responses to these questions based on the examinations of the 59 published studies cited in the APA Brief.

#### **Report Summary**

***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 well-educated, middle-high socioeconomic status, 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.

---

<sup>119</sup> Specifically, the predominantly positive articles produced by the team are cited on pp. 7 (two references), 8 (two references), 16 (two references), 19 (one reference), 20 (one reference), 24 (two references), 35 (two references), for total of 12 listings. The report author does not count four reference listings in the above total of “at least eight” references.

**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 instead 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., Miller et al., 1980; 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 societal-level 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 almost unexamined.<sup>120</sup>

**Question 6: *What do we know about the long-term outcomes of children of lesbian and gay parents?*** Virtually no comparison studies examine the outcomes of societal-level concern during late adolescence or early adulthood. One study that was overlooked by the APA, Sarantakos (2000), did examine four critical societal outcomes

---

<sup>120</sup> 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”<sup>120</sup> (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.

and found several differences favoring (adult) children from intact, marriage-based families—but like the studies cited by the APA Brief, this study’s sample was small, limited, non-representative, and not generalizable.

***Question 7: Have the studies in this area used samples that were too small to detect differences?*** The total number of children (of lesbian and gay parents) whose outcomes were directly assessed in comparison studies was 812. The average sample size of children of same-sex parents in these studies was about 34, less than one-tenth (8.6%) of the size required to detect a “small effect” in statistical comparison research.<sup>121</sup> After adding the comparison samples, the studies on children’s outcomes still fell far short of required sizes, with only six comparison studies having more than one-quarter of the required minimum sample size.<sup>122</sup>

## **Conclusion**

*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.

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

---

<sup>121</sup> As mentioned previously, the minimal sample size required to detect a small effect is 393 or more, depending on the method employed (Cohen, 1988; Lerner & Nagai, 2001).

<sup>122</sup> As denoted in footnote 91.

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”<sup>123</sup> disparaging gay and lesbian parents. Conversely, some same-sex parenting researchers and advocates seem to have contended for an “exceptionally clear”<sup>124</sup> 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.<sup>125</sup> Empirical truth is often expensive and, as a collective of social scientists, we have not generated the price required to make truth claims related to this domain.

The scientific conclusions in this domain will increase in validity as researchers: (a) move from small, biased convenience samples towards larger, more representative samples; (b) increasingly examine outcomes of societal-level concern 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<sup>126</sup> from methodological experts.<sup>127</sup> Taking these steps will help

---

<sup>123</sup> This reality has been disapprovingly documented by Shiller (2007).

<sup>124</sup> Patterson, 1992

<sup>125</sup> 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 as psychologists we speak from research evidence and clinical experience and expertise” (Cummings, 2006, p. 2).

<sup>126</sup> 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

produce more methodologically rigorous and scientifically valid responses to significant questions affecting families and children.

---

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.

<sup>127</sup> 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)**

Author and Year	GayLes N	Hetero N	Outcome Studied	Hetero Compar Group
Bailey et al., 1995	55par;82chl	0	Sexual Orientation	None
Barrett & Tasker, 2001	101	0	Child Responses to a Gay Parent	None
Bigner & Jacobsen, 1989a	33	33	Parents Reports of Values of Children	Fathers
Bigner & Jacobsen, 1989b	33	33	Parent Reports of Parent Behavior	Fathers
Bos et al. 2003	100	100	Parental Motives and Desires	Families
Bos et al., 2004	100	100	Parent Reports of Couple Relations	Families
Bozett, 1980	18	0	Father Disclosure of Homosexuality	None
Brewaeyts et al., 1997	30	68	Emotional/Gender Development	DI/Non-DI Couples
Chan, Brooks, et al., 1998	30	16	Division of Labor/Child Adjustment	DI Couples
Chan, Raboy, et al., 1998	55	25	Psychosocial Adjustment	DI Couples
Ciano-Boyce & Shelley-Sireci, 2002	67	44	Division of Child Care	Adoptive Parents
Crawford et al., 1999	0	0	388 Psychologists' Attitudes	N/A
Flaks et al., 1995	15	15	Cognitive/Behavioral/Parenting	Married Couples
Fulcher et al., 2002	55	25	DI/Adult-Child Relationships	Parents
Gartrell et al., 1996	154	0	Prospective Parent Reports	None
Gartrell et al., 1999	156	0	Reports on Parenting Issues	None
Gartrell et al., 2000	150	0	Reports on Parenting Issues	None
Gartrell et al., 2005	74	0	Health, School/Education	None
Gershon et al., 1999	76	0	Adolescent coping	None
Golombok et al., 1983	27	27	Psychosexual Development	Single Mother Families
Golombok et al., 2003	39	134	Socioemotional Dev./Relations	Couples & Singles
Golombok & Rust, 1993	N/A	N/A	Reliability Testing of a Pre-School Gender Inventory	
Golombok & Tasker, 1996	25	21	Sexual Orientation	Children of Single Mothers
Golombok et al., 1997	30	83	Parent-Child Interactions	Couples & Singles
Green, 1978	37	0	Sexual Identity	None
Green et al., 1986	50par;56chl	40par;48chl	Sexual Identity/Social Relations	Single Mothers
Harris & Turner, 1986	23	16	Sex Roles/Relationship with Child	Single Moth. & Fath.
Hoeffler, 1981	20	20	Sex-role Behavior	Single Mothers
Huggins, 1989	18	18	Self-Esteem of Adolescent Children	Divorced Mothers
Johnson & O'Connor, 2002	415	0	Parenting Beliefs/Division of Labor/etc.	None
King & Black, 1999	N/A	N/A	338 College Students' Perceptions	N/A
Kirkpatrick et al., 1981	20	20	Gender Development	Single Mothers

Koepke et al., 1992	47 couples	0	Relationship quality	None
Kweskin & Cook, 1982	22	22	Sex-Role Behavior	Single Mothers
Lewis, 1980	21	0	Child Response to M. Disclosure	None
Lott-Whitehead & Tully, 1993	45	0	Adult Reports of Impacts on Children	None
Lyons, 1983	43	37	Adult Self-Reports	Divorced Mothers
McLeod et al., 1999	0	0	151 College Student Reports	N/A
Miller, 1979	54	0	Father Behavior & F-Child Bond	None
Miller et al., 1981	34	47	Mother Role/Home Environment	Mothers
Morris et al., 2002	2,431	0	Adult Reports on "Coming Out"	None
Mucklow & Phelan, 1979	34	47	Behavior and Self-Concept	Married Mothers
O'Connell, 1993	11	0	Social and Sexual Identity	None
Pagelow, 1980	20	23	Problems and Coping	Single Mothers
Patterson, 1994	66	0	Social/Behavioral/Sexual Identity	Available Norms
Patterson, 1995	52	0	Division of Labor/Child Adjustment	None
Patterson, 2001	66	0	Maternal Mental Health/Child Adjustment	None
Patterson et al., 1998	66	0	Contact w/Grandparents & Adults	None
Rand, Graham, & Rawlings, 1982	25	0	Mothers' Psychological Health	None
Sarantakos, 1996	58	116	Children's Educational/Social Outcomes	Married/Non-married
Siegenthaler & Bigner, 2000	25	26	Mothers' Value of Children	Mothers
Steckel, 1987	(Review)	N/A	Psychosocial Development of Children	None
Sullivan, 1996	34 couples	0	Division of Labor	None
Tasker & Golombok, 1995	25	21	Psychosocial/Sexual Orientation	Single Mothers
Tasker & Golombok, 1997	27	27	Psychological Outcomes/Family Rel.	Single Mothers
Tasker & Golombok, 1998	15	84	Work and Family Life	DI & NC Couples
Vanfraussen et al., 2003	24	24	Donor Insemination/Family Funct.	Families
Wainwright et al., 2004	44	44	Psychosocial/School/Romantic	Couples
Wright, 1998	5	0	Family Issues/Processes/Meaning	None

**Table B: Brief Overview of 15 Intact/Divorce/Step/Single Family Studies**

(N): Number of reported participants  
 Probability: Is the study based on a Probability Sample?  
 Comp Grp: Is a probability sample used as a comparison group?  
 Long: Does the study employ measurements across time?  
 Key: ! = Yes; X = No

	(N)	Probability	Comp Grp	Long
<b>Amato, 1991</b>	9,643	!	!	!
<b>Aquilino, 1994</b>	4,516	!	!	!
<b>Brown, 2004<sup>128</sup></b>	35,938	!	!	X
<b>Chase-Lansdale et al., 1995<sup>129</sup></b>	17,414	!	!	!
<b>Cherlin et al., 1998<sup>130</sup></b>	11,759	!	!	!
<b>Ellis et al., 2003</b>	762	!	!	!
<b>Harper &amp; McLanahan, 2004<sup>131</sup></b>	2,846	!	!	!
<b>Hetherington &amp; Kelly, 2002<sup>132</sup></b>	1,400	!	!	!
<b>Jekielek, 1998</b>	1,640	!	!	!
<b>Lichter et al., 2003<sup>133</sup></b>	7,665	!	!	X
<b>Manning &amp; Lamb, 2003</b>	13,231	!	!	X
<b>McLanahan &amp; Sandefur, 1994</b> (based on 4 data sets):				
<b>PSID<sup>134</sup></b>	2,900	!	!	!
<b>NLSY<sup>135</sup></b>	5,246	!	!	!
<b>HSBS<sup>136</sup></b>	10,400	!	!	!
<b>NSFH<sup>137</sup></b>	13,017 <sup>138</sup>	!	!	!
<b>Mitchell et al., 2009<sup>139</sup></b>	4,663	!	!	!
<b>Nock, 1998<sup>140</sup></b>	3,604	!	!	!
<b>Page &amp; Stevens, 2005<sup>141</sup></b>	2,023	!	!	!
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>148,667</b>			

<sup>128</sup> National Survey of America's Families (NSAF)

<sup>129</sup> United Kingdom study and sample

<sup>130</sup> United Kingdom study and sample

<sup>131</sup> National Longitudinal Survey of Young Men and Women (NLSY)

<sup>132</sup> Virginia Longitudinal Study (VLS)

<sup>133</sup> National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG)

<sup>134</sup> Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)

<sup>135</sup> National Longitudinal Survey of Young Men and Women (NLSY)

<sup>136</sup> The High School and Beyond Study (HSBS)

<sup>137</sup> National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)

<sup>138</sup> This is the total original sample. The sub-sample is unlisted but is likely smaller.

<sup>139</sup> National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health)

<sup>140</sup> National Longitudinal Survey of Young Men and Women (NLSY)

<sup>141</sup> Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)

## References

- Akerlof, G. (1998). Men without children. *Economic Journal*, *108*, 287-309.
- Amato, P. (1991). Parental absence during childhood and depression in later life. *Sociological Quarterly*, *32*, 543-556.
- Amato, P. (2001). Children of divorce in the 1990s: An update of the Amato and Keith (1991) meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *15*, 355-370.
- Amato, P. (2005). The impact of family formation change on the cognitive, social, and emotional well-being of the next generation. *The Future of Children*, *15*, 75-96.
- Amato, P., & Booth, A. (2000). *A generation at risk: Growing up in an era of family upheaval*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Anderssen, N., Amlie, C., & Ytteroy, E. A. (2002). Outcomes for children with lesbian or gay parents: A review of studies from 1978 to 2000. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *43*, 335-351.
- (APA) *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). (2001). APA: Washington, DC.
- Aquilino, W. S. (1994). Impact of childhood family disruption on young adults' relationships with parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *56*, 295-313.
- Bachman, J. G., et al. (1997). *Smoking, drinking and drug abuse in young adulthood*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bailey, J. M., Bobrow, D., Wolfe, M., & Mikach, S. (1995). Sexual orientation of adult sons of gay fathers. *Developmental Psychology*, *31*, 124-129.
- Barrett, H., & Tasker, F. (2001). Growing up with a gay parent: Views of 101 gay fathers on their sons' and daughters' experiences. *Educational and Child Psychology*, *18*, 62-77.
- Battle, J. (1998). What beats having two parents?: Educational outcomes for African-American students in single- versus dual-parent families. *Journal of Black Studies*, *28*, 783-801.
- Blackmon, L., Clayton, O., Glenn, N., Malone-Colon, L., & Roberts, A. (2005). *The consequences of marriage for African Americans: A comprehensive literature review*. New York: Institute for American Values.
- Bigner, J. J., & Jacobsen, R. B. (1989a). The value of children to gay and heterosexual fathers. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *19*, 163-172.
- Bigner, J. J., & Jacobsen, R. B. (1989b). Parenting behaviors of homosexual and heterosexual fathers. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *19*, 173-186.
- Bos, H. M. W., van Balen, F., & van den Boom, D. C. (2003). Planned lesbian families: Their desire and motivation to have children. *Human Reproduction*, *10*, 2216-2224.
- Bos, H. M. W., van Balen, F., & van den Boom, D. C. (2004). Experience of parenthood, couple relationship, social support, and child-rearing goals in planned lesbian mother families. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *45*, 755-764.
- Bozett, F. W. (1980). Gay fathers: How and why they disclose their homosexuality to their children. *Family Relations*, *29*, 173-179.
- Brewaeys, A., Ponjaert, I., Van Hall, E. V., & Golombok, S. (1997). Donor insemination: Child development and family functioning in lesbian mother families. *Human Reproduction*, *12*, 1349-1359.

- Brown, S. L. (2004). Family structure and child well-being: The significance of parental cohabitation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 351-367.
- Byrd, A. D. (2008). Conjugal marriage fosters healthy human and societal development. In L. Wardle, ed., *What's the harm? Does legalizing same-sex marriage really harm individuals, families or society?* (pp. 3-26). Lanham, MD: University Press.
- Cameron, P. (2009). Gay fathers' effects on children: A review. *Psychological Reports*, 104, 649-659.
- Chan, R. W., Brooks, R. C., Raboy, B., & Patterson, C. J. (1998). Division of labor among lesbian and heterosexual parents: Associations with children's adjustment. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 12, 402-419.
- Chan, R. W., Raboy, B., & Patterson, C. J. (1998). Psychosocial adjustment among children conceived via donor insemination by lesbian and heterosexual mothers. *Child Development*, 69, 443-457.
- Chase-Lansdale, P. L., Cherlin, A. J., & Kiernan, K. K. (1995). The long-term effects of parental divorce on the mental health of young adults: A developmental perspective. *Child Development*, 66, 1614-1634.
- Cherlin, A. J., et al. (1995). Parental divorce in childhood and demographic outcomes in young adulthood. *Demography*, 32, 299-318.
- Cherlin, A. J., Chase-Lansdale, P. L., & McRae, C. (1998). Effects of parental divorce on mental health throughout the life course. *American Sociological Review*, 63, 239-249.
- Ciano-Boyce, C., & Shelley-Sireci, L. (2002). Who is Mommy tonight? Lesbian parenting issues. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43, 1-13.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Crawford, I., McLeod, A., Zamboni, B. D., & Jordan, M. B. (1999). Psychologists' attitudes toward gay and lesbian parenting. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 30, 394-401.
- Cummings, N. A. (2006, August 12). *The APA and psychology need reform*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Cutler, D. M., et al. (2000). *Explaining the rise in youth suicide*. Working Paper 7713. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Demo, D. H., & Cox, M. J. (2000). Families with young children: A review of research in the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 876-895.
- Ellis, B. J., et al. (2003). Does father absence place daughters at special risk for early sexual activity and teenage pregnancy? *Child Development*, 74, 801-821.
- Flaks, D., Ficher, I., Masterpasqua, F., & Joseph, G. (1995). Lesbians choosing motherhood: A comparative study of lesbian and heterosexual parents and their children. *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 104-114.
- Flewelling, R. L., & Bauman, K. E. (1990). Family structure as a predictor of initial substance use and sexual intercourse in early adolescence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 171-181.
- Fulcher, M., Chan, R. W., Raboy, B., & Patterson, C. J. (2002). Contact with grandparents among children conceived via donor insemination by lesbian and heterosexual mothers. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 2, 61-76.

- Gartrell, N., Banks, A., Hamilton, J., Reed, N., Bishop, H., & Rodas, C. (1999). The national lesbian family study: II. Interviews with mothers of toddlers. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *69*, 362-369.
- Gartrell, N., Banks, A., Reed, N., Hamilton, J., Rodas, C., & Deck, A. (2000). The national lesbian family study: III. Interviews with mothers of five-year olds. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *70*, 542-548.
- Gartrell, N., Deck, A., Rodas, C., Peyser, H., & Banks, A. (2005). The national lesbian family study: 4. Interviews with the ten-year old children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *75*, 518-524.
- Gartrell, N., Hamilton, J., Banks, A., Mosbacher, D., Reed, N., Sparks, C. H., & Bishop, H. (1996). The national lesbian family study: 1. Interviews with prospective mothers. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *66*, 272-281.
- Gates, G. J. (2001). Family formation and raising children among same-sex couples. *NCFR Report*, *56(4)*, F1-F3.
- Gaudino, J. A., et al. (1999). No fathers' names: A risk factor for infant mortality in the state of Georgia. *Social Science and Medicine*, *48*, 253-265.
- Gershon, T. D., Tschann, J. M., & Jemerin, J. M. (1999). Stigmatization, self-esteem, and coping among the adolescent children of lesbian mothers. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *24*, 437-445.
- Glenn, N. D. (1989). What we know, what we say we know: Discrepancies between warranted and stated conclusions in the social sciences. In H. Eulau (Ed.) *Crossroads of social science: The ICPSR 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary volume* (pp. 119-140). New York: Agathon Press.
- Glenn, N. D. (1997). A reconsideration of the effect of no-fault divorce on divorce rates. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *59*, 1023-1025.
- Golombok, S., Perry, B., Burston, A., Murray, C., Mooney-Somers, J., Stevens, M., & Golding, J. (2003). Children with lesbian parents: A community study. *Developmental Psychology*, *39*, 20-33.
- Golombok, S., & Rust, J. (1993). The Pre-School Activities Inventory: A Standardized Assessment of Gender Role in Children. *Psychological Assessment*, *5*, 131-136.
- Golombok, S., Spencer, A., & Rutter, M. (1983). Children in lesbian and single-parent households: Psychosexual and psychiatric appraisal. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *24*, 551-572.
- Golombok, S., & Tasker, F. (1996). Do parents influence the sexual orientation of their children? Findings from a longitudinal study of lesbian families. *Developmental Psychology*, *32*, 3-11.
- Golombok, S., Tasker, F., L., & Murray, C. (1997). Children raised in fatherless families from infancy: Family relationships and the socioemotional development of children of lesbian and single heterosexual mothers. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *38*, 783-791.
- Green, R. (1978). Sexual identity of 37 children raised by homosexual or transsexual parents. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *135*, 692-697.
- Green, R., Mandel, J. B., Hotvedt, M. E., Gray, J., & Smith, L. (1986). Lesbian mothers and their children: A comparison with solo parent heterosexual mothers and their children. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *7*, 175-181.

- Haidt, J. (2011, January). *The bright future of post-partisan socialpsychology*. Talk given at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, San Antonio, TX. Retrieved from <http://people.virginia.edu/~jdh6n/postpartisan.html>
- Harper, C., & McLanahan, S. (2004). Father absence and youth incarceration. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 14*, 369-397.
- Harris, M. B., & Turner, P. H. (1986). Gay and lesbian parents. *Journal of Homosexuality, 12*, 101-113.
- Heiss, J. (1996). Effects of African American family structure on school attitude and performance. *Social Problems, 43*, 246-267.
- Herek, G. M. (2006). Legal recognition of same-sex relationships in the United States: A social science perspective. *American Psychologist, 61*, 607-621.
- Hetherington, M., & Kelly, J. (2002). *For better or for worse: Divorce reconsidered*. New York: Norton.
- Hoeffler, B. (1981). Children's acquisition of sex-role behavior in lesbian mother families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 5*, 536-544.
- Horwitz, A. V., White, H. R., & Howell-White, S. (1996). Becoming married and mental health: A longitudinal study of a cohort of young adults. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58*, 895-907.
- Huggins, S. L. (1989). A comparative study of self-esteem of adolescent children of divorced lesbian mothers and divorced heterosexual mothers. *Journal of Homosexuality, 18*, 123-135.
- Inbar, Y., & Lammers, J. (2012). Political diversity in social and personality psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*, 496-503.
- Jekielek, S. (1998). Parental conflict, marital disruption, and children's emotional well-being. *Social Forces, 76*, 905-936.
- Johnson, R. A., et al. (1996). *The relationship between family structure and adolescent substance abuse*. Rockville, MD: U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services.
- Johnson, S. M., & O'Connor, E. (2002). *The gay baby boom: The psychology of gay parenthood*. New York: NYU Press.
- Kamark, E. C., & Galston, W. A. (1990). *Putting children first: A progressive family policy for the 1990s*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.
- King, B. R., & Black, K. N. (1999). College students' perceptual stigmatization of the children of lesbian mothers. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 69*, 220-227.
- Kirkpatrick, M., Smith, C., & Roy, R. (1981). Lesbian mothers and their children: A comparative survey. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 51*, 545-551.
- Klein, D. B., & Stern, C. (2009a). By the numbers: The ideological profile of professors. In R. Maranto, R. E. Redding, & F. M. Hess (eds.), *The politically correct university: Problems, scope, and reforms* (pp. 15-38). Washington, DC: AEI Press.
- Klein, D. B., & Stern, C. (2009b). Groupthink in academia: Majoritarian departmental policies and the professorial pyramid. In R. Maranto, R. E. Redding, & F. M. Hess (eds.), *The politically correct university: Problems, scope, and reforms* (pp. 79-98). Washington, DC: AEI Press.
- Koepke, L., Hare, J., & Moran, P. (1992). Relationship quality in a sample of lesbian couples with children and child-free lesbian couples. *Family Relations, 41*, 224-229.

- Kuhn, T. S. (1970/1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
- Kweskin, S. L., & Cook, A. S. (1982). Heterosexual and homosexual mothers' self-described sex-role behavior and ideal sex-role behavior in children. *Sex Roles*, 8, 967-975.
- Lansford, J. E. (2009). Parental divorce and children's adjustment. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 140-152
- Lerner, R., & Nagai, A. (2001). *No basis: What the studies don't tell us about same-sex parenting*. Washington, DC: Marriage Law Project.
- Lewis, K. G. (1980). Children of lesbians: Their point of view. *Social Work*, 198-203.
- Lichter, D. T., Graefe, D. R., & Brown, J. B. (2003). Is marriage a panacea?: Union formation among economically disadvantaged unwed mothers. *Social Problems*, 50, 60-86.
- Lofton v. Secretary of Dept. of Children and Family Services*, 358 F.3d 804 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004).
- Lott-Whitehead, L., & Tully, C. T. (1993). The family lives of lesbian mothers. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 63, 265-280.
- Lyons, T. A. (1983). Lesbian mother's custody fears. *Women & Therapy*, 2, 231-240.
- MacCallum, F., & Golombok, S. (2004). Children raised in fatherless families from infancy: A follow-up of children of lesbian and single heterosexual mothers at early adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45, 1407-1419.
- Manning, W. D., & Lamb, K. A. (2003). Adolescent well-being in cohabiting, married, and single-parent families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65, 876-893.
- Margolin, L. (1992). Child abuse by mothers' boyfriends: Why the overrepresentation? *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 16, 541-551.
- McLanahan, S., & Sandefur, G. (1994). *Growing up with a single parent: What hurts, what helps*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McLeod, A. C., Crawford, I., & Zecheister, J. (1999). Heterosexual undergraduates' attitudes toward gay fathers and their children. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 11, 43-62.
- Miller, B. (1979). Gay fathers and their children. *Family Coordinator*, 28, 544-552.
- Miller, J. A., Jacobsen, R. B., & Bigner, J. J. (1981). The child's home environment for lesbian versus heterosexual mothers: A neglected area of research. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 7, 49-56.
- Miller, J. A., Mucklow, B. M., Jacobsen, R. B., & Bigner, J. J. (1980). Comparison of family relationships: Homosexual versus heterosexual women. *Psychological Reports*, 46, 1127-1132.
- Mitchell, K. S., Booth, A., & King, V. (2009). Adolescents with nonresident fathers: Are daughters more disadvantaged than sons? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71, 650-662.
- Moore, M. R. (2008). Gendered power relations among women: A study of household decision making in Black, lesbian step families. *American Sociological Review*, 73, 335-356.
- Morris, J. F., Balsam, K. F., & Rothblum, E. D. (2002). Lesbian and bisexual mothers and non-mothers: Demographics and the coming out process. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 16, 144-156.

- Mucklow, B. M., & Phelan, G. K. (1979). Lesbian and traditional mothers' responses to adult responses to child behavior and self concept. *Psychological Reports*, 44, 880-882.
- Neuman, W. L. (1997). *Social research methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Newport, F. (2011). For the first time, majority of Americans favor legal gay marriage. Gallup Politics. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/147662/First-time-Majority-Americans-Favor-Legal-Gay-Marriage>.
- Nock, S. L. (1998). *Marriage in men's lives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nock, S. (2001). The Affidavit of Steven Nock, *Halpern v. Attorney General of Canada*, No. 684/00 (Ont. Sup. Ct. of Justice).
- O'Connell, A. (1993). Voices from the heart: The developmental impact of a mother's lesbianism on her adolescent children. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 63, 281-299.
- O'Donohue, W., & Redding, R. E. (2009). The psychology of political correctness in higher education. In R. Maranto, R. E. Redding, & F. M. Hess (eds.), *The politically correct university: Problems, scope, and reforms* (pp. 99-120). Washington, DC: AEI Press.
- Oliver, M. L., & Shapiro, T. M. (1997). *Black wealth/White wealth*. New York: Routledge.
- Page, M. E., & Stevens, A. H. (2005). Understanding racial differences in the economic costs of growing up in a single-parent family. *Demography*, 42, 75-90.
- Pagelow, M. D. (1980). Heterosexual and lesbian single mothers: A comparison of problems, coping, and solutions. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 5, 198-204.
- Patterson, C. J. (1992). Children of lesbian and gay parents. *Child Development*, 63, 1025-1042.
- Patterson, C. J. (1994). Children of the lesbian baby boom: Behavioral adjustment, self-concepts, and sex-role identity. In B. Greene & G. Herek (Eds.), *Contemporary perspectives on lesbian and gay psychology: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 156-175). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Patterson, C. J. (1995). Families of the lesbian baby boom: Parents' division of labor and children's adjustment. *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 115-123.
- Patterson, C. J. (2000). Family relationships of lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 1052-1069.
- Patterson, C. J. (2001). Families of the lesbian baby boom: Maternal mental health and child adjustment. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Psychotherapy*, 4(3/4), 91-107.
- Patterson, C. J. (2005). *Lesbian and gay parents and their children: Summary of research findings* (pp. 5-22). Lesbian and Gay Parenting: American Psychological Association.
- Patterson, C. J., Hurst, S., & Mason, C. (1998). Families of the lesbian Baby boom: Children's contacts with grandparents and other adults. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 68, 390-399.
- Patterson, C. J., & Redding, R. E. 1996. Lesbian and gay families with children: Implications of social science research for policy. *Journal of Social Issues*, 52, 29-50.

- Phillips, C. P., & Asbury, C. A. (1993). Parental divorce/separation and the motivational characteristics and educational aspirations of African American university students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 62, 204-210.
- Rand, C., Graham, D. L. R., & Rawlings, E. I. (1982). Psychological health and factors the court seeks to control in lesbian mother custody trials. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 8, 27-39.
- Rank, M. R., & Hirschl, T. A. (1999). The economic risk of childhood in America: Estimating the probability of poverty across the formative years. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 1058-1067.
- Redding, R. E. (2008). It's really about sex: Same-sex marriage, lesbian parenting, and the psychology of disgust. *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy*, 15, 128-193.
- Redding, R. E. (2012). Likes attract: The sociopolitical groupthink of (social) psychologists. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7, 512-515.
- Redding, R. E. (2013). Politicized science. *Society*, 50, 439-446.
- Regnerus, M. (2012). How different are the adult children of parents who have same-sex relationships? Findings from the New Family Structures Study. *Social Science Research*, 41, 752-770.
- Roese, N. J. & Olson, J. M. (2007). Better, stronger, faster self-serving judgment, affect regulation, and the optimal vigilance hypothesis. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2, 124-141.
- Rosenfeld, M. J. (2010). Nontraditional families and childhood progress through school. *Demography*, 47, 755-775.
- Sarantakos, S. (1996). Children in three contexts: Family, education, and social development. *Children Australia*, 21, 23-31.
- Sarantakos, S. (2000). *Same-sex couples*. Sydney: Harvard Press.
- Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sarantakos, S. (2007a). *Tool kit for quantitative data analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sarantakos, S. (2007b). *Data analysis* (4 vols.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schumm, W. R. (2004). What was really learned from Tasker and Golombok's (1995) study of lesbian and single parent mothers? *Psychological Reports*, 94, 422-424.
- Schumm, W. R. (2008). Re-evaluation of the "no differences" hypothesis concerning gay and lesbian parenting as assessed by eight early (1979-1986) and four later (1997-1998) dissertations. *Psychological Reports*, 103, 275-304.
- Schumm, W. R. (2010a). Comparative relationship stability of lesbian mother and heterosexual mother families: A review of evidence. *Marriage & Family Review*, 46, 499-509.
- Schumm, W. R. (2010b). Statistical requirements for properly investigating a null hypothesis. *Psychological Reports*, 107, 953-971.
- Schumm, W. R. (2010c). "Adult attachment style dimensions in women who have gay or bisexual fathers": Response to Sirota. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 24, 371-372.
- Schumm, W. R. (2010d). Evidence of pro-homosexual bias in social science: Citation rates and research on lesbian parenting. *Psychological Reports*, 106, 374-380.
- Schumm, W. R. (2011). Child outcomes associated with lesbian parenting: Comments on Biblarz and Stacy's 2010 report. *Journal of Human Sexuality*, 3, 35-80.
- Schwandt, T. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Shiller, V. M. (2007). Science and advocacy issues in research on children of gay and lesbian parents. *American Psychologist*, *62*, 712-713.
- Siegel, C., et al. (1996). Mortality from intentional and unintentional injury among infants of young mothers in Colorado, 1982-1992. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine*, *150*, 1077-1083.
- Siegenthaler, A. L., & Bigner, J. J. (2000). The value of children to lesbian and non-lesbian mothers. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *39*, 73-91.
- Simon, R. W. (2002) Revisiting the relationships among gender, marital status, and mental health. *American Journal of Sociology*, *107*, 1065-1096.
- Stacey, J., & Biblarz, T. J. (2001). (How) does the sexual orientation of parents matter? *American Sociological Review*, *66*, 159-183.
- Steckel, A. (1985). *Separation-individuation in children of lesbian and heterosexual couples*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Wright Institute Graduate School, Berkeley, CA.
- Steckel, A. (1987). Psychosocial development of children in lesbian mothers. In F. W. Bozett (Ed.), *Gay and lesbian parents* (pp. 75-85). New York: Praeger.
- Strasser, M. (2008). The alleged harms of recognizing same-sex marriage. In L. Wardle (Ed.), *What's the harm? Does legalizing same-sex marriage really harm individuals, families or society?* (pp. 27-46). Lanham, MD: University Press.
- Sullivan (1996). Rozzie and Harriett? Gender and family parents of lesbian coparents. *Gender and Society*, *10*, 747-767.
- Tasker, F. L., & Golombok, S. (1995). Adults raised as children in lesbian families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *65*, 203-215.
- Tasker, F. L., & Golombok, S. (1997). *Growing up in a lesbian family: Effects on child development*. New York: Guilford.
- Tasker, F. L., & Golombok, S. (1998). The role of co-mothers in planned lesbian-led families. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, *2*, 49-68.
- Teachman, J. R., et al. (1998). Sibling resemblance in behavioral and cognitive outcomes: The role of father presence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *60*, 835-848.
- Vanfraussen, K., Ponjaert-Kristoffersen, I., & Brewaeys, A. (2003). Family functioning in lesbian families created by donor insemination. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *73*, 78-90.
- Wainright, J. L., Russell, S. T., & Patterson, C. J. (2004). Psychosocial adjustment, school outcomes, and romantic relationships of adolescents with same-sex parents. *Child Development*, *75*, 1886-1898.
- Waite, L. (1995). Does marriage matter? *Demography*, *32*, 483-507.
- Waite, L., & Gallagher, M. (2000). *The case for marriage: Why married people are happier, healthier, and better off financially*. New York: Doubleday.
- Wallerstein, J., Lewis, J. M., & Blakeslee, S. (2001). *The unexpected legacy of divorce*. New York: Hyperion.
- Wardle, L. D. (1997). The potential impact of homosexual parenting on children. *University of Illinois Law Review*, *1997*, 833-919.
- Weitoft, G. R., et al. (2003). Mortality, severe morbidity, and injury in children living with single parents in Sweden: A population-based study. *The Lancet*, *361*, 289-295.

- Wilcox, W. B., et al. (2005). *Why marriage matters* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Institute for American Values.
- Wilcox, W. B., et al. (2011). *Why marriage matters* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Institute for American Values.
- Williams, R. N. (2000). A critique of the research on same-sex parenting. In D. C. Dollahite (Ed.), *Strengthening our families* (pp. 325-355). Salt Lake City, UT: Bookcraft.
- Wolfinger, N. H. (2005). *Understanding the divorce cycle: The children of divorce in their own marriages*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Wright, J. M. (1998). *Lesbian stepfamilies: An ethnography of love*. New York: Harrington Park.

**EXHIBIT B:**

**Curriculum Vitae of Loren Marks**

## **Loren D. Marks**

Kathryn Norwood and Claude Fussell Alumni Professorship

Associate Professor

*Louisiana State University / School of Social Work / Child & Family Studies /  
325 Huey P. Long Fieldhouse / Baton Rouge, LA 70803 / phone: (225) 578-0433 /  
E-mail: [lorenm@lsu.edu](mailto:lorenm@lsu.edu) / fax: (225)578-1357*

### **EMPLOYMENT**

- 2012-            Program Director  
                  Child and Family Studies  
                  School of Social Work  
                  College of Human Sciences and Education  
                  Louisiana State University
- 2011-2012      Interim Division Head  
                  Child and Family Studies  
                  School of Human Ecology  
                  College of Agriculture  
                  Louisiana State University
- 2009-            Kathryn Norwood and Claude Fussell Alumni Professorship  
                  Division of Family, Child, and Consumer Sciences  
                  School of Human Ecology  
                  College of Agriculture  
                  Louisiana State University
- 2008-            Associate Professor  
                  Division of Family, Child, and Consumer Sciences  
                  School of Human Ecology  
                  College of Agriculture  
                  Louisiana State University
- 2002-2008      Assistant Professor  
                  Division of Family, Child, and Consumer Sciences  
                  School of Human Ecology  
                  College of Agriculture  
                  Louisiana State University

**EDUCATION**

- Ph.D. University of Delaware, 2002  
 Major: Family Studies  
 Areas of Interest: Religious Faith, Parenting, and Marriage  
 Dissertation: Illuminating the Interface between Families and Faith  
 Major Professor: Dr. Rob Palkovitz
- M.S. Brigham Young University, 1999  
 Major: Family Sciences and Human Development  
 Major Professor: Dr. David C. Dollahite
- B.S. Brigham Young University, 1997  
 Major: Family Sciences

**TEACHING***Louisiana State University; School of Social Work / Child and Family Studies*

- 2012-2014 Child and Family Studies (CFS) 2050 – *Family Dynamics*  
 2012-2014 CFS 2065 – *Family Resource Management*  
 2012-2014 CFS 3067 – *Field Experience in Family, Child, and Consumer Sciences*  
 2012-2014 CFS 3090 – *Seminar in Human Ecology (Internship Preparation)*  
 2012-2014 CFS 4067 – *Internship in Family, Child, and Consumer Sciences*  
 2012-2014 SSW 7052 – *Qualitative Research Methods*

*Louisiana State University; Division of Family, Child, and Consumer Sciences*

- 2009-2012 Human Ecology (HUEC) 2050 – *Family Dynamics*  
 2007-2012 HUEC 2065 – *Family Resource Management*  
 2003-2009 HUEC 2091 – *Marriage and Family Relationships*  
 2006-2012 HUEC 3067 – *Field Experience in Family, Child, and Consumer Sciences*  
 2002-2012 HUEC 3090 – *Seminar in Human Ecology (Internship Preparation)*  
 2006 HUEC 4065 – *Family Life Education*  
 2003-2012 HUEC 4067 – *Internship in Family, Child, and Consumer Sciences*  
 2003-2005 HUEC 7051 – *Contemporary Family*  
 2004-2012 HUEC 7052 – *Qualitative Research Methods*  
 2004-2010 HUEC 7057 – *Theories of Family Science*  
 2010 HUEC 7093 – *Advanced Research Methods*

*University of Delaware; Department of Individual and Family Studies*

- 2001-2002 IFST 101 – *Introduction to Community and Family Services*  
 2002 IFST 201 – *Lifespan Development*  
 2001 IFST 202 – *Foundations of Family Studies*  
 2002 IFST 230 – *Emerging Lifestyles: Relationships and Diversity*

*Brigham Young University; Department of Family Sciences*

- 1998-99 Family Sciences 303 – *Parenting*

**GRANTS AND AWARDS**

- 2013 **Marks, L.** *LSU Tiger Athletic Foundation Award for Undergraduate Teaching Excellence.* College of Human Sciences and Education, \$1,000.
- 2010-2012 Cherry, K., Garrison, M. E. B., & **Marks, L. D.** *Coping with Natural and Technological Disasters: Human Adaptive Capacities after Katrina and the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill.* British Petroleum Exploration & Production, \$150,000.
- 2010 **Marks, L. D.** *Families and Faith: A Qualitative Study of a Diverse U.S. Sample of Religious Families.* Kappa Omicron Nu National Alumni Research Grant, \$2,000.
- 2010 **Marks, L. D.** *The Meanings behind the Religion-Marriage Connection: Qualitative Reports from a Diverse U.S. Sample.* Office of Research and Economic Development Faculty Travel Grant, \$750.
- 2009 **Marks, L.** *LSU Sedberry Award for Undergraduate Teaching Excellence.* College of Agriculture, \$1,000.
- 2008 **Marks, L. D.** *Religion and Strong, Happy, Enduring African-American Marriages.* Office of Research and Economic Development Faculty Travel Grant, \$750.
- 2006 **Marks, L. D.** *National Study of Faith and Families.* LSU Council on Research, \$750.
- 2005 **Marks, L. D.** *When Faith Comes Home: A Qualitative Study of 150 Christian, Jewish, and Muslim Families.* Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Jack Shand Research Award, \$3,000.
- 2005 **Marks, L.** *LSU Tiger Athletic Foundation Award for Undergraduate Teaching Excellence.* College of Agriculture, \$1,000.

- 2005 Degreenia, K., LeJeune, E., Lawrence, F. C., **Marks, L.**, & Burczyk-Brown, J. J. *The Influence of Parents on Students' Money Management and Credit Behaviors*. LSU College of Agriculture Undergraduate Research Grant, \$750.
- 2004 **Marks, L. D.** *Why Religious Beliefs, Practices, and Communities Matter: A National Qualitative Study of Muslim, Jewish, and Christian Families*, Faculty Research Grant Program, LSU Office of Research and Graduate Studies, \$10,000.
- 2004 **Marks, L. D.** *A Qualitative Test of a Conceptual Model of How Highly Religious Families Strive to Fulfill Sacred Purposes*. Louisiana Board of Regents Travel Grant for Emerging Faculty, \$1,000.
- 2004 Garrison, M. E., & **Marks, L. D.** *Major Coastal Storms and Family Functioning*. Quick Response Grant Program, Natural Hazards Center, \$3,460.
- 2003 **Marks, L. D.**, & Garrison, M. E. B. *Children, Mothers, Fathers, and Family Challenges: A Mixed-Method Study of Family Stress, Coping Processes, and Children's Outcomes*. Billie Collier Challenge Grant, \$1,500.
- 2003 **Marks, L. D.** *The Meaning and Influence of Religious Beliefs in Families: Muslim, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. LSU Council on Research, \$5,000.
- 2003 Davis, T., **Marks, L.**, Sasser, D., Garrison, M.E.B., Hopkins, K. & Nesteruk, O. *A Qualitative Study of Family Stress and Coping in African-American Families*. Undergraduate Research Grant, College of Agriculture, \$500 (\$800 match from Human Ecology).
- 2003 Fritzingler, T., Garrison, M.E.B., **Marks, L.**, Sasser, D., & Dunaway, D. *A Multidisciplinary and Longitudinal Investigation of Parenting and Children's Classroom Motivation*. Undergraduate Research Grant, College of Agriculture, \$500 (\$800 match from Human Ecology).

#### **PUBLICATIONS (reverse chronological order)**

##### Peer-Reviewed Articles, Books, and Chapters

Goodman, M., Dollahite, D., & **Marks, L.** (in press). A modern Mormon approach to marriage and family. *Marriage & Family Review*.

- Marks, L. D.**, & Dollahite, D. C. (forthcoming). *Religion and families: An introduction*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis. [Book Manuscript].
- Hatch, T., Cherry, K., Lu, Y., & **Marks, L.** (forthcoming). On seeing silver linings six years after the 2005 Hurricanes Katrina and Rita: Meaning making, positive adaptation, and psychological growth. In K. Cherry (ed.), *Traumatic stress and long-term recovery: Coping with disasters and other negative life events*. New York: Springer.
- Lu, Y., **Marks, L.**, Cherry, K., & Hatch, T. (forthcoming). Faith and coping: Spiritual beliefs and religious practices after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. In K. Cherry (ed.), *Traumatic stress and long-term recovery: Coping with disasters and other negative life events*. New York: Springer.
- Marks, L.**, Lu, Y., Cherry, K., & Hatch, T. (forthcoming). The role of the Church in the aftermath: Curse it, bless it, or both? In K. Cherry (ed.), *Traumatic stress and long-term recovery: Coping with disasters and other negative life events*. New York: Springer.
- Hatch, T., Cherry, K., & **Marks, L.** (forthcoming). Loss, challenge, chaos, and failure of systems: The storm after the storm. In K. Cherry (ed.), *Traumatic stress and long-term recovery: Coping with disasters and other negative life events*. New York: Springer.
- Cherry, K., Kytola, K., **Marks, L.**, & Hatch, T. (forthcoming). To return or not to return, that is the question: A qualitative comparison of Katrina victims who relocated versus those who returned. In K. Cherry (ed.), *Traumatic stress and long-term recovery: Coping with disasters and other negative life events*. New York: Springer.
- Kor, E., Cherry, K., & **Marks, L.** (forthcoming). Forgiveness after the concentration camp. In K. Cherry (ed.), *Traumatic stress and long-term recovery: Coping with disasters and other negative life events*. New York: Springer.
- Apavaloaie, L., Page, T. F., & **Marks, L. D.** (in press). Romanian children's representations of negative and self-conscious emotions in a narrative story stem technique. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*.
- Goodman, M., Dollahite, D., **Marks, L.**, & Layton, E. (2013). Religious faith and transformational processes in marriage. *Family Relations*, 62, 808-823.
- Cherry, K. E., **Marks, L. D.**, Benedetto, T., Sullivan, M. C., & Barker, A. (2013). Perceptions of longevity and successful aging in very old adults. *Journal of Religion, Spirituality, and Aging*, 25, 288-310.

- Lu, Y., **Marks, L. D.**, Nesteruk, O., Goodman, M., & Apavaloiae, L. (2013). Faith, conversion, and challenge: A qualitative study of Chinese immigrant Christian marriages. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 44, 227-247.
- Marks, L. D.**, Hopkins, K., Nesteruk, O., Chaney, C., & Baumgartner, J. (2012). A qualitative exploration of why faith matters in African-American marriages and families. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 43, 695-714.
- Cherry, K. E., Brown, J. S., **Marks, L. D.**, Galea, S., Volaufova, J., Lefante, C., Su, L. J., Welsh, D. A., Jazwinski, S. M., (2012). Longitudinal assessment of cognitive and psychosocial functioning after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita: Exploring disaster impact on middle-aged, older, and oldest-old adults. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research*, 16, 187-211.
- Phillips, T. M., Wilmoth, J. D., & **Marks, L. D.** (2012). Challenges and conflicts...strengths and supports: A study of enduring African American marriages. *Journal of Black Studies*, 43, 936-952.
- Lu, Y., **Marks, L. D.**, & Apavaloiae, L. (2012). Chinese immigrant families and Christian faith community: A qualitative study. *Family and Consumer Science Research Journal*, 41, 118-130.
- Marks, L.** (2012). Same-sex parenting and children's outcomes: A closer examination of the American Psychological Association's Brief on Lesbian and Gay Parenting. *Social Science Research*, 41, 735-751.
- Marks, L.** (2012). "We see what we seek": Responses to the reviews of Amato, Eggebeen, and Osborne. *Social Science Research*, 41, 784-785.
- Burr, W. R., **Marks, L. D.**, & Day, R. (2012). *Sacred matters: Religion and spirituality in families*. New York: Routledge. [Book Manuscript]
- Marks, L. D.**, Dollahite, D. C., & Barker, K. (2012). "Don't forget home": The importance of sacred ritual in families. In J. Hoffman (Ed.), *Understanding religious rituals* (pp. 186-203). New York: Routledge.
- Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (2012). Mormon American families. In R. Wright, C. H. Mindel, R. W. Habenstein, & T. Van Tran (Eds.) *Ethnic families in America: Patterns and Variations*, 5<sup>th</sup> Ed. (pp. 461-486). Upper Saddle Hall, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, T., Lu, Y., **Marks, L. D.**, & Dollahite, D. C. (2011). Meaning making across three dimensions of religious experience: A qualitative exploration. *Counselling and Spirituality*, 30, 11-36.

- Nesteruk, O., & **Marks, L. D.** (2011). Parenting in immigration: Experiences of mothers and fathers from Eastern Europe raising children in the United States. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 42, 809-826.
- Laird, R., **Marks, L. D.**, & Marrero, M. (2011). Religiosity, self-control, and antisocial behavior: Religiosity as a promotive and protective factor. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 32, 78-85.
- Marks, L. D.**, & Dollahite, D. C. (2011). Mining the meanings from psychology of religion's correlation mountain. *Journal of Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 3, 181-193.
- Sasser, D. D., Robinson, L. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (2011). LSU AgCenter: Extension-based parenting program successful. *Journal of Family & Consumer Sciences*, 103, 61-62.
- Lu, Y., **Marks, L. D.**, & Baumgartner, J. (2011). "The compass of our life": A qualitative study of marriage and faith among Chinese immigrants. *Marriage & Family Review*, 47, 125-148.
- Tausch, C., **Marks, L. D.**, Brown, J. S., Cherry, K. E., Frias, T., McWilliams, Z., Melancon, M., & Sasser, D. (2011). Religion and coping in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita: Qualitative themes from the Louisiana Healthy Aging Study. *Journal of Religion, Spirituality, and Aging*, 23, 236-253.
- Laird, R. D., Marrero, M. D., & **Marks, L. D.** (2010). Adolescent religiosity as a protective factor for delinquency: Review of evidence and a conceptual framework for future research. In O. Sahin & J. Maier (Eds.), *Delinquency: Causes, reduction, and prevention* (pp. 157-176). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- Marks, L. D.**, Dollahite, D. C., & Baumgartner, J. (2010). "In God we trust": Perspectives on finances, family relationships, and faith. *Family Relations*, 59, 439-452.
- Lambert, N. M., Fincham, F. D., **Marks, L. D.**, & Stillman, T. F. (2010). Invocations and intoxication: Does prayer decrease alcohol consumption? *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 24, 209-219.
- Marks, L. D.**, Hopkins, K., Chaney, C., Nesteruk, O., & Sasser, D. (2010). "My kids and wife have been my life": Married African American fathers staying the course. In R. Coles & C. Green (Eds.), *The myth of the missing black father* (pp. 19-46). New York: Columbia University.

- Holmes, E. K., Baumgartner, J., **Marks, L. D.**, Palkovitz, R., & Nesteruk, O. (2010). Contemporary contradictions and challenges facing married fathers and mothers. In K. S. Pearlman (Ed.), *Marriage: Roles, stability, and conflict*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- Brown, J. S., Cherry, K. E., **Marks, L. D.**, Volaufova, J., Lefante, C., & Jazwinski, S. M. (2010). After Hurricanes Katrina and Rita: Gender differences in physical function and psychological well-being in middle-aged and older adults. *Health Care for Women International, 31*, 997-1012.
- Chaney, C., **Marks, L. D.**, Sasser, D. D., & Hopkins, K. (2010). "Train up a child in the way...": A qualitative study of how the Black church influences parents. *International Journal of Religion and Society, 1*, (2-3). [Published simultaneously In J. K. Quinn & I. G. Zambini (Eds.), *Family Relations: 21<sup>st</sup> century issues and challenges* (pp. 151-167). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.]
- Marks, L. D.**, Dollahite, D. C., & Dew, J. (2009). Enhancing cultural competence in financial counseling and planning: Understanding why families make religious contributions. *Financial Counseling and Planning, 20*, 14-26.
- Nesteruk, O., & **Marks, L. D.** (2009). Grandparents across the ocean: Eastern European immigrants' struggle to maintain intergenerational relationships. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 40*, 77-95.
- Marks, L. D.**, Cherry, K., & Silva, J. (2009). Faith, crisis, coping, and meaning making after Katrina: A qualitative, cross-cohort examination. In K. Cherry (ed.), *Lifespan Perspectives on Natural Disasters: Coping with Katrina, Rita and other Storms* (pp. 195-215). New York: Springer.
- Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (2009). A conceptual model of processes in a diverse, national sample of highly religious families. *Review of Religious Research, 50*, 373-391.
- Nesteruk, O., **Marks, L. D.**, & Garrison, M. E. (2009). Immigrant parents' concerns regarding their children's education in the U.S. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 37*, 422-441.
- Silva, J., **Marks, L. D.**, & Cherry, K. (2009). The psychology behind helping and prosocial behaviors: An examination from intention to action in an adult population. In K. Cherry (ed.), *Lifespan Perspectives on Natural Disasters: Coping with Katrina, Rita and other Storms* (pp. 219-240). New York: Springer.
- Nesteruk, O., **Marks, L. D.**, & Garrison, M. E. (2009). Immigrant parents' concerns regarding their children's education in the U.S. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 37*, 422-441.

- Marks, L. D.**, Hopkins, K., Chaney, C., Nesteruk, O., Monroe, P., & Sasser, D. (2008). "Together, we are strong": A qualitative study of happy, enduring African-American marriages. *Family Relations*, 57, 171-184.
- Marks, L. D.** (2008). Prayer and marital intervention: Asking for divine help...or professional trouble? *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 27, 678-685.
- Marks, L. D.**, & Beal, B. (2008). Preserving peculiarity as a people: Mormon distinctness in values and internal structure. In C. K. Jacobson, J. P. Hoffmann, and T. B. Heaton (Eds.), *Revisiting "The Mormons": Persistent themes and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 258-285). Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah.
- Batson, M., & **Marks, L. D.** (2008). Making the connection between prayer, faith, and forgiveness in Roman Catholic families. *The Qualitative Report*, 13, 394-415.
- Marks, L. D.**, & Palkovitz, R. (2007). Fathers as spiritual guides. In S. E. Brotherson & J. M. White (Eds.), *Why fathers count* (pp. 209-223). Harriman, TN: Men's Studies Press.
- Marks, L. D.**, & Dollahite, D. C. (2007). Fathering and religious contexts: Why religion makes a difference to fathers and their children. In S. E. Brotherson & J. M. White (Eds.), *Why fathers count* (pp. 335-351). Harriman, TN: Men's Studies Press.
- Marks, L. D.**, & Chaney, C. (2007). Faith communities and African American families: A qualitative look at why the black church matters. In S. D. Ambrose (Ed.), *Religion and psychology: New research* (pp. 277-294). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- Marks, L. D.** (2006). Religion and family relational health: An overview and conceptual model. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 45, 603-618.
- Marks, L. D.** (2006). Mental health, religious belief, and "the terrifying question." *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 15, 133-139.
- Marks, L. D.**, Swanson, M., Nesteruk, O., & Hopkins-Williams, K. (2006). Stressors in African American marriages and families: A qualitative study. *Stress, Trauma, and Crisis: An International Journal*, 9, 203-225.
- Boyatzis, C., Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (2006). The family as a context for religious and spiritual development in children and youth. In E. C. Roehlkepartain, P. E. King, L. Wagener, & P. L. Benson (Eds.), *The handbook of spiritual development in childhood and adolescence* (pp. 297-309). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Lawrence, F., Cude, B., Lyons, A., **Marks, L.**, & Machtmes, K. (2006). College students' financial practices: A mixed methods analysis. *Journal of Consumer Education*, 23, 13-26.
- Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (2006). Family and community nurturing spirituality in Latter-day Saint children and youth. In K. Yust, A. N. Johnson, S. E. Sasso, & E. C. Roehlkepartain (Eds.), *Nurturing childhood and adolescent spirituality: Perspectives from the world's religious traditions* (pp. 394-408). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Marks, L. D.** (2005). How does religion influence marriage?: Christian, Jewish, Mormon, and Muslim perspectives. *Marriage and Family Review*, 38, 85-111.
- Marks, L. D.**, Nesteruk, O., Swanson, M., Garrison, M. E. B., & Davis, T. (2005). Religion and health among African Americans: A qualitative examination. *Research on Aging*, 27, 447-474.
- Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (2005). How highly religious families strive to fulfill sacred purposes. In V. Bengtson, A. Acock, K. Allen, P. Dillworth-Anderson, & D. Klein (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theory and research* (pp. 533-541). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Marks, L. D.** (2005). Religion and bio-psycho-social health: A review and conceptual model. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 44, 173-186.
- Marks, L. D.** (2004). Sacred practices in highly religious families: Christian, Jewish, Mormon, and Muslim perspectives. *Family Process*, 43, 217-231.
- Garrison, M. E. B., **Marks, L. D.**, Lawrence, F. C., & Braun, B. (2004). Religious beliefs, faith community involvement, and depression: A study of rural, low-income mothers. *Women & Health*, 40, 51-62.
- Marks, L. D.**, & Palkovitz, R. (2004). American fatherhood types: The good, the bad, and the uninterested. *Fathering*, 2, 113-129.
- Dollahite, D. C., **Marks, L. D.**, & Goodman, M. (2004). Religiosity and families: Relational and spiritual linkages in a diverse and dynamic cultural context. In M. J. Coleman & L. H. Ganong (Eds.), *The handbook of contemporary families* (pp. 411-431). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Palkovitz, R., **Marks, L. D.**, Appleby, D. W., & Holmes, E. K. (2003). Parenting and adult development: Contexts, processes and products of intergenerational relationships. In L. Kucynski (Ed.), *The handbook of dynamics in parent-child relations* (pp. 307-323). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Palkovitz, R., & **Marks, L. D.** (2002). Refining fatherhood and motherhood: An analysis of cultural trends in American parenting. In W. E. Fthenakis & M. R. Trexter (Eds.), *Mutterschaft, Vatterschaft*, (pp. 156-169). Germany: Weinheim and Basel.

Dollahite, D. C., **Marks, L. D.**, & Olson, M. M. (2002). Fathering, faith, and family therapy: Generative narrative therapy with religious fathers. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy*, 13, 263-294. [Published simultaneously in T. D. Carlson & M. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Spirituality and Family Therapy* (pp. 259-290). New York: Haworth.]

**Marks, L. D.**, & Dollahite, D. C. (2001). Religion, relationships, and responsible fathering in Latter-day Saint families of children with special needs. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18, 625-650.

Dollahite, D. C., **Marks, L. D.**, & Olson, M. M. (1998). Faithful fathering in trying times: Religious beliefs and practices of Latter-day Saint fathers of children with special needs. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 7, 71-93.

#### Invited Publications and Book Reviews

Alghafli, Z., Hatch, T., & **Marks, L.** (in press). Islam. In M. Coleman & L. Ganong (Eds.), *The social history of the American family*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Alghafli, Z., Hatch, T., & **Marks, L.** (in press). Sharia law. In M. Coleman & L. Ganong (Eds.), *The social history of the American family*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hatch, T., & **Marks, L.** (in press). Bar and Bat Mitzvah. In M. Coleman & L. Ganong (Eds.), *The social history of the American family*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hatch, T., & **Marks, L.** (in press). Jews and Orthodox Judaism. In M. Coleman & L. Ganong (Eds.), *The social history of the American family*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hatch, T., & **Marks, L.** (in press). Passover. In M. Coleman & L. Ganong (Eds.), *The social history of the American family*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**Marks, L. D.** (2013). Wrestling with *Sacred Matters*: A new theory in family studies. *NCFR Report*, 57, F17-F18.

**Marks, L. D.** (2013). Families, Religion, Research, and...Parrots? *NCFR Religion and Family Life Newsletter*.

- Marks, L. D.** (2012). [Book Review] *Men on a mission: Valuing youth work in our communities*, by W. Marsiglio. *Fathering*, 10, 90-92.
- Marks, L. D.**, Dollahite, D. C., & Freeman, J. J. (2011). Faith and prayer in family life. In T. W. Draper, A. J. Hawkins, & D. C. Dollahite (Eds.), *Strengthening our families* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (pp. 185-195). Provo, UT: BYU.
- Wilcox, W. B., Anderson, J. R., Doherty, W., Eggebeen, D., Ellison, C. G., Gilbert, N., Haskins, R., Lerman, R., Malone-Colon, L., **Marks, L.**, Palkovitz, R., Popenoe, D., Regnerus, M., Stanley, S., Waite, L., & Wallerstein, J. (2011). *Why marriage matters: Thirty conclusions from the social sciences*. New York: Institute for American Values.
- Marks, L. D.** (2011). "We have choices within our situation": The story of Biarnetta Bell. *LSU AgCenter State Newsletter*, 6, 14-15.
- Marks, L. D.** (2009). [Book Review] *American religions and the family: How faith traditions cope with modernization & democracy*, edited by D. S. Browning and D. A. Clairmont. *BYU Studies*, 48, 182-185.
- Marks, L. D.** (2005). The importance of family in children's education. *The Baton Rouge Association for the Education of Young Children Quarterly*.
- Marks, L. D.**, & Dollahite, D. C. (2005). Family worship in Christian, Jewish, and Muslim homes. In C. H. Hart, L. D. Newell, E. Walton, & D. C. Dollahite (Eds.), *Helping and healing our families*, (pp. 259-263). Salt Lake City: Deseret Book.
- Marks, L. D.** (2003). The effects of religious beliefs in marriage and family. *Marriage and Families*, 12, 2-10.
- Marks, L. D.**, & Dollahite, D. C. (2003). Families of faith: A preliminary report of why religion matters. *NCFR Report*, 48, F3-F4.

Manuscripts under Review

- Cherry, K. E., Brown, J. S., **Marks, L.**, Galea, S., Volaufova, J., Lefante, C., Welsh, D.A., & Jazwinski, S. W. (under review). Psychological well-being after hurricanes Katrina and Rita in oldest-old adults. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*.
- Cherry, K. E., Brown, J. S., **Marks, L.**, Galea, S., Volaufova, J., Lefante, C., Su, L.S., Welsh, D., & Jazwinski, S. M. (under review). Psychological well-being after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in younger, middle aged, older, and oldest-old adults in the Louisiana Healthy Aging Study (LHAS). *Journal of Aging Research*.

Bidtah, E. A., Lambert, N. M., Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (under review). Prayer and relationships: How prayer transforms motivation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*.

Lawrence, M. Lambert, N. M., Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (under review). The power of prayer in transforming perceptions about marriage and family relationships. *Family Relations*.

Porter, E., Lambert, N. M., Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (under review). The transformative power of prayer: How prayer changes affect. *Journal of Family Issues*.

Cherry, K. E., Nezat, P. F., Cacamo, A., **Marks, L. D.**, Galea, S., & Sampson, V. (under review). Long-term psychological outcomes in older adults after disaster: Relationships to religiosity and social support. *Aging and Mental Health*.

Alghafli, Z., Hatch, T., **Marks, L.** (under review). Religion and relationships in Muslim families: A qualitative examination of married Shia and Sunni couples.

#### Major Manuscripts in Preparation

Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (in preparation). *Generative faith and marriage: A national qualitative study*. [Book manuscript].

Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (in preparation). *Generative faith and youth: A national qualitative study*. [Book manuscript].

Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (in preparation). *Generative faith and family processes: A national qualitative study*. [Book manuscript].

**Marks, L. D.** (in preparation). *Strong black marriages: A qualitative study of what keeps them together*. [Book manuscript].

#### Conference Proceedings Publications

Hatch, T., Lu, Y., **Marks, L. D.**, Cherry, K. E., Kytola, K., Johnson, T., Ballard, S. & Pinkston, B. (2013). Perceived positive outcomes in disaster survivors after the 2005 Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Gerontological Society of America, New Orleans, LA. *The Gerontologist*, 53 (S1), 109.

Lu, Y., Hatch, T. G., **Marks, L. D.**, Cherry, K. E., Kytola, K. L., Johnson, T. J., Allen, E. T., & Benedetto, T. (2013). Faith helps me through: Religious coping in disaster survivors in the years after the 2005 Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Gerontological Society of America, New Orleans, LA. *The Gerontologist*, 53 (S1), 157.

- Cherry, K. E., **Marks, L. D.**, Sampson, L., Galea, S., Nezat, P. F., Holland, K., Lyon, B. (2013). Religiosity and psychological well-being six years after the 2005 Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Gerontological Society of America, New Orleans, LA. *The Gerontologist*, 53 (S1), 108-109.
- Cude, B., Lawrence, F., Lyons, A., **Marks, L.**, Machtmes, K., Metzger, K., & LeJeune, E. (2006). College students and financial literacy: What they know and what we need to learn. *Proceedings of the 33rd Conference of the Eastern Family Economics-Resource Management Association*, 102-109.
- Lawrence, F., Metzger, K., LeJeune, E., **Marks, L.**, Machtmes, K., & Lyons, A. (2005). College students' money management behaviors and who influences them. *Proceedings of the Association for Financial Counseling and Planning*, 30-32.
- Davis, T., Hopkins, K., Nesteruk, O., **Marks, L. D.**, Sasser, D.D., Burczyk-Brown, J., & Garrison, M. E. B. (2003). A Qualitative Study of Family Stress and Coping in African-American Families: Preliminary Findings. *Family Relations and Human Development / Family Economics and Resource Management Biennial*, 5.
- Fritzingier, T., Garrison, M. E. B., **Marks, L. D.**, Sasser, D., Burczyk-Brown, J. (2003). A multidisciplinary and longitudinal investigation of parenting and children's classroom motivation. *Family Relations and Human Development / Family Economics and Resource Management Biennial*, 5.

#### REFERREED OR INVITED PRESENTATIONS

- Dollahite, D. C., Shichida, T., Dalton, H., & **Marks, L. D.** (November, 2014). *A conceptual framework on paradoxes at the nexus of religion and family relationships*. Proposal for the Theory Construction and Research Methodology Workshop of the National Council on Family Relations, Baltimore, MD.
- Lu, Y., & **Marks, L. D.** (March, 2014). *Chinese immigrants and religious conversion: An exploration of Christianity in Chinese immigrant families*. Paper/poster to be presented at the 2014 Society for Research in Human Development (SRHD) Biennial Meeting, Austin, TX.
- Lyon, B., Adamek Campbell, R. , Walsh, D., Anbinder, D., Fitzgerald, K., Bernacchio, C., Nezat, P. F., **Marks, L. D.**, & Cherry, K. (March, 2014). *After the oil spill: Concerns of the Louisiana fishermen and coastal residents*. Poster to be presented at the Life Course and Aging Center Conference, Baton Rouge, LA.

- Ryker, K., Lyon, B., Nezat, P. F., Sampson, L., Holland, K. R., Kytola, K. L., **Marks, L.**, & Cherry, K. E. (March, 2014). *Assessing religiosity after disaster: The Religiosity Questionnaire*. Poster to be presented at the Life Course and Aging Center Conference, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Dollahite, D. C., Goodman, M. A., & **Marks, L. D.** (November, 2013). *Religion and transformative processes in marriage: A qualitative study*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Religious Research Association and Society for the Scientific Study of Religion. Boston, MA.
- Porter, E., Lambert, N. M., Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (November, 2013). *The transformative power of prayer: How prayer changes affect*. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations, San Antonio, Texas.
- Lawrence, M., Lambert, N. M., Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (November, 2013). *The power of prayer in transforming perceptions*. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations, San Antonio, Texas.
- Apavaloaie, L., Grist, C. L., & **Marks, L.** (November, 2013). *Children's representations of multiple family system relationships in story stems*. Poster presented at the National Council on Family Relations, San Antonio, TX.
- Cherry, K. E., **Marks, L. D.**, Sampson, L., Galea, S., Nezat, P., Holland, K., & Lyon, B. (November, 2013). *After the British Petroleum oil spill: On cumulative adversity and psychological well-being in commercial fishers from South Louisiana*. Paper presented at the Gerontological Society of America, New Orleans, LA.
- Lu., Y., Hatch, T., **Marks, L. D.**, & Cherry, K. (November, 2013). *"Faith Keeps You Strong": Religious Coping in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita*. Poster presented at the Gerontological Society of America, New Orleans, LA.
- Hatch, T., Lu., Y., **Marks, L. D.**, & Cherry, K. (November, 2013). *Seeing the silver linings: Positive outcomes from Five Years after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita*. Paper presented at the Gerontological Society of America, New Orleans, LA.
- Cherry, K. E., **Marks, L.**, Sampson, L., Nezat, P., Holland, K., & Lyon, B. (April, 2013). *After the British Petroleum oil spill: Psychological well-being in commercial fishers from South Louisiana*. Poster presented at 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Conference, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Marks, L. D.** (March, 2013). *Important considerations in research on children's well-being and long-term developmental outcomes*. Invited presentation at BYU-Idaho, Rexburg, ID.
- Marks, L. D.** (March, 2013). *Truth is expensive, have we paid the required price?: A closer examination of research on children's well-being*. Invited presentation at J. Reuben Clark Marriage and Family Law Conference, BYU, Provo, UT.

- Hatch, T., Lu, Y., **Marks, L. D.**, & Cherry, K. (February, 2013). *Seeing the silver linings: Positive outcomes from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita*. Life Course and Aging Center Conference, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Lu, Y., Hatch, T., **Marks, L. D.**, & Cherry, K. (February, 2013). "Faith Keeps You Strong": *Religious Coping in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita*. Life Course and Aging Center Conference, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Marks, L. D.** (November, 2012). *Religion and individual well-being: A primer and overview*. Special session invited speaker at the National Council on Family Relations, Phoenix, AZ.
- Lu, Y., **Marks, L. D.**, Apavaloie, L., & Alghafli, Z. (November, 2012). *The role of the Chinese Christian Church in Chinese immigrant families*. Poster presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Phoenix, AZ.
- Goodman, M., Dollahite, D., Layton, E., & **Marks, L.** (November, 2012). *Transformational processes and religious faith in marriage and family: A qualitative exploration of a diverse, national sample*. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Phoenix, AZ.
- Marks, L. D.**, Burr, W. R., & Day, R. (November, 2011). *Meta-theoretical issues and controversies: Beyond the 2005 sourcebook*. Paper presented at the Theory Construction and Research Methodology Workshop of the National Council on Family Relations, Orlando, FL.
- Marks, L.**, Dollahite, D., & Lawrence, F. (November, 2011). "In God we trust": *Perspectives on finances, family relationships, and faith*. Poster presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Orlando, FL.
- Goodman, M., Dollahite, D., & **Marks, L.** (May, 2011). *A modern Mormon approach to marriage and family*. Paper presented at Christian Scholars Conference, Pepperdine University.
- Lu, Y., & **Marks, L. D.** (March, 2011). *Chinese Christian immigrants: A qualitative study of faith and marriage*. Presented at the South Eastern Council on Family Relations, Birmingham, AL.
- Forest, P., Presley, R., Fontenot, P., Garrison, M. E. B., **Marks, L. D.**, & Cherry, K. (February, 2011). *Spiritual and secular coping strategies influence post-Katrina resilience*. Life Course and Aging Center Conference, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Burr, W. R., **Marks, L. D.**, Day, R. D. (November, 2010). *The sacred in families: Ways religion helps and harms families*. Presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Minneapolis, MN.

- Brown, J. S., Cherry, K. E., **Marks, L. D.**, Jackson, E. M., Volaufova, J., Lefante, C., & Jazwinski, S. M. (November, 2010). *Health-related quality of life after hurricanes Katrina and Rita*. Presented at the Gerontological Society of America Conference, New Orleans, LA.
- Marks, L. D.**, & Dollahite, D. C. (November, 2010). *The meanings behind the religion-marriage connection: Qualitative reports from a diverse U.S. sample*. Presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Minneapolis, MN.
- Marks, L. D.** (September, 2010). "In God we trust": Perspectives on finances, family relationships, and faith. Presented to University Methodist Women's Organization, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Marks, L. D.**, Sasser, D., & Robinson, L. (February, 2010). *A qualitative report on the Parents Preparing for Success Program (PPSP): Challenges, struggles, and successes*. Presented at the International Conference on Parenting Education, Denton, TX.
- Marks, L. D.**, Lawrence, F., & Dollahite, D. C. (November, 2009). *Understanding why families make religious contributions*. Presented at the AFCPE Conference, Phoenix, AZ.
- Lu, Y., & **Marks, L. D.** (November, 2009). *The influence of religion on Chinese Christian immigrants: A qualitative study of marriage*. Presented at the National Council on Family Relations, San Francisco, CA.
- Lambert, N., Fincham, F., & **Marks, L.** (June, 2009). *Does talking to God make people less inclined to drink?: The association between prayer and alcohol consumption*. World Congress on Positive Psychology. Philadelphia, PA.
- Laird, R., Marrero, M., & **Marks, L.** (April, 2009). *Does opportunity, propensity, or proximity account for the association between religiosity and behavior problems?* Paper presented at the Society for Research on Child Development, Denver, CO.
- Marks, L. D.**, Hopkins, K., Chaney, C., & Sasser, D. (November, 2008). *Religion and strong, happy, enduring African-American marriages*. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Little Rock, Arkansas.
- Nesteruk, O., **Marks, L., D.**, & Garrison, M. E. B. (November, 2008). *The challenges of raising children in immigration: Voices of parents from Eastern Europe*. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Little Rock, Arkansas.
- Marks, L. D.** (April, 2008). *Strengthening families: Lessons learned from happy, enduring African-American marriages*. LSU AgCenter State Conference. Baton Rouge, LA.

- Marks, L. D.** (March, 2008). Striving to be a great dad: Traps, trials, and truths. 22<sup>nd</sup> Annual “Kids Are Worth It!” Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Marks, L. D.**, Chaney, C., Hopkins, K., & Sasser, D. (February, 2008). *A qualitative study of strong, happy, enduring African-American marriages*. Society for Cross-Cultural Research, 37<sup>th</sup> Annual National Conference, New Orleans, LA.
- Marks, L. D.** (November, 2007). *Why do highly religious marriages last?: Experiences and explanations from a National Qualitative Sample*. Paper presented at the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Washington, DC.
- Nesteruk, O., & **Marks, L. D.** (November, 2007). *Grandparents across the ocean: A qualitative study of Eastern European immigrant families*. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Marks, L. D.** (March, 2007). *The difficulties of qualitative research and some strategies for overcoming them*. Invited lecture at the LSU Qualitative Research Special Interest Group, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Marks, L. D.**, Chaney, C., & Hopkins-Williams, K. (November, 2006). *Faith communities and African-American families: A qualitative study*. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Minneapolis, MN.
- Nesteruk, O., & **Marks, L. D.** (November, 2006). *What do the aliens see?: A qualitative study of Eastern European immigrant families*. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Minneapolis, MN.
- Marks, L.** (March, 2006). *What does science tell us about families and religion?* Invited lecture at the LSU Science and Religion Collegium, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Marks, L.**, Dollahite, D., Berry, A., & Nesteruk, O. (November, 2005). *Faith communities and American families: A qualitative exploration of the challenges, the rewards, and the meanings*. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Phoenix, AZ.
- Nesteruk, O., **Marks, L.**, & Garrison, M.E.B. (November, 2005). *What aliens see: A qualitative exploration of U.S. cultural influences*. Presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Phoenix, AZ.
- Lawrence, F. C., Metzger, K., LeJeune, E., **Marks, L.**, & Lyons, A. (November, 2005). *College students’ money management behaviors and who influences them*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference for the Association for Financial Counseling, Planning, and Education, Scottsdale, AZ.

- Nesteruk, O., Swanson, M., Berry, A., & **Marks, L. D.** (March, 2005). *A qualitative examination of religious beliefs among African Americans*. Paper presented at the LSU Life Course and Aging Center Conference, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Marks, L. D.**, Swanson, M., Hopkins-Williams, K., & Nesteruk, O. (November, 2004). *Religion, stress, and coping in African American families*. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Orlando, FL.
- Nesteruk, O., Hopkins-Williams, K., Swanson, M., & **Marks, L. D.** (November, 2004). *Why do religious African Americans live almost 14 years longer?* Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Orlando, FL.
- Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (November, 2004). *A qualitative test of a conceptual model of how highly religious families strive to fulfill sacred purposes*. Paper presented at the Theory Construction and Research Methodology Workshop of the National Council on Family Relations, Orlando, FL.
- Marks, L. D.** (March, 2004). *Research in the School of Human Ecology: The ivory tower meets the real world*. Presentation at Annual LSU AgCenter Family and Consumer Sciences Conference, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Nesteruk, O., Swanson, M., Hopkins-Williams, K., & **Marks, L. D.** (March, 2004). *Religion, health, and longevity among African Americans*. Paper presented at the LSU Life Course and Aging Center Conference, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Marks, L. D.** (February, 2004). *State of the black church*. Panelist/presentation at LSU Black History Month Celebration, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Marks, L. D.** (February, 2004). *Religious diversity in the workplace*. Presentation at Annual LSU AgCenter Diversity Conference, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Marks, L. D.** (November, 2003). *How and why does religion influence marriage?: Muslim, Jewish, and Christian perspectives*. Paper presented at the 2003 National Council on Family Relations, Vancouver, BC.
- Marks, L. D.** (October, 2003). *Food for thought: Linkages between health, religious communities, and nutrition education*. Presentation given at 2003 Annual Conference of LSU AgCenter Family Nutrition Program, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Marks, L. D.** (November, 2002). *Highly involved families of faith: A qualitative analysis of the costs, the challenges, and why it's worth it*. Paper presented at the 2002 National Council on Family Relations, Houston, TX.
- Marks, L. D.** (November, 2002). *The meaning and influence of religious practices for families: What do they do and why do they do it?* Paper presented at 2002 Society for the Scientific Study of Religion Conference, Salt Lake City, UT.

- Marks, L. D.** (October, 2002). *Why religion matters to families and those who study them*. Invited paper presented at School of Family Life Symposium, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
- Marks, L. D.** (May, 2002). *Why religion matters to families: A review and new conceptualization*. Paper presented at the Marion H. Steele Symposium of the Delaware Association of Family and Consumer Sciences, Newark, DE.
- Marks, L. D.** (November, 2001). *Religion, families, and fathers*. Paper presented at the Theory Construction and Research Methodology Workshop of the National Council on Family Relations, Rochester, NY.
- Marks, L. D., & Dollahite, D. C.** (November, 2000). *Religious experience and meaning for Latter-day Saint fathers of children with special needs*. Presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Minneapolis, MN.
- Marks, L. D., & Dollahite, D. C.** (October, 1999). *Religious experience and meaning for Latter-day Saint fathers of children with special needs*. Presented at the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Boston, MA.
- Marks, L. D., Springer, P., & Ogden, M.** (April, 1999). *LDS fathers of children with special needs: A qualitative analysis*. Presented at the Brigham Young University Conference for Family Sciences, Provo, UT.
- Marks, L. D.** (April, 1998). *Challenges and supports for fathers of children with special needs*. Presented at the Utah Council on Family Relations, Provo, UT.
- Dollahite, D. C., **Marks, L. D., & Olsen, M. M.** (November, 1997). *Faithful fathering in trying times: Religious beliefs and practices in fathers of children with special needs*. Presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Crystal City, VA.
- Olson, M. M., Dollahite, D. C., & **Marks, L. D.** (November, 1997). *Generative fathering of children with special needs: Conceptual connections and narratives*. Poster presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Crystal City, VA.
- Marks, L. D., & Dollahite, D. C.** (April, 1997). *Faithful fathering: Ten qualitative themes*. Presented at the Utah Council on Family Relations, Provo, UT.

## **AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS**

- 2013 Tiger Athletic Foundation Outstanding Teacher Award, LSU College of Human Sciences and Education
- 2013 All-Time Top Ten List – *Social Science Research Network* (Political Behavior: Cognition, Psychology, & Behavior)

**AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS (cont.)**

2013 All-Time Top Ten List – *Social Science Research Network* (Legal Scholarship Network: ADL)

2012 Paper of the Year Award, NCFR Religion and Family Life Section (Professional Division, Co-Author)

2012 Paper of the Year Award, NCFR Religion and Family Life Section (SNP Division, Co-Author)

2011 U.S. CASE National Professor of the Year Nominee (LSU College of Agriculture)

2011 Top Ten (Most Viewed Article) List – *Social Science Research Network* (Cognition & Culture)

2011 Top Ten List – *Social Science Research Network* (Sexuality & the Law)

2011 Top Ten List – *Social Science Research Network* (Law & Religion)

2011 Top Ten List – *Social Science Research Network* (Political Science)

2011 Top Ten List – *Social Science Research Network* (Law, Cognition, & Decision Making)

2011 Top Ten List – *Social Science Research Network* (General Cognitive Social Science)

2011 Top Ten List – *Social Science Research Network* (Law, Brain, & Behavior)

2011 Top Ten List – *Social Science Research Network* (Legal Ethics & Professional Responsibility)

2011 Top Ten List – *SSRN* (Political Behavior: Cognition, Psychology, & Behavior)

2011 Top Ten List – *Social Science Research Network* (Cognitive Social Science)

2011 Top Ten List – *Social Science Research Network* (Conflict Studies)

2009-2012 Gamma Sigma Delta Teaching Merit Honor Roll

2009 Alpha Lambda Delta “Dedication to Instruction” Recognition

2009 Sedberry Outstanding Undergraduate Teaching Award, LSU College of Agriculture

2009 *LSU Today* Flagship Faculty

2009 Kathryn Norwood and Claude Fussell Alumni Professorship

2008 Alumni Association Outstanding Teacher Award, LSU School of Human Ecology

2008 LSU (Inaugural) Rainmaker Award – Top 100 LSU Research Faculty for 2008

2005 Tiger Athletic Foundation Outstanding Teacher Award, LSU College of Agriculture

2005 Jack Shand Research Award, Society for the Scientific Study of Religion

2004 Paper of the Year Award, NCFR Religion and Family Life Section

2004 Alumni Association Outstanding Teacher Award, LSU School of Human Ecology

2002 Best Paper Award, Delaware Association of Family and Consumer Sciences

**MEMBERSHIPS AND CERTIFICATIONS**

Member, National Council on Family Relations (NCFR), 1997-2013

Member, Religious Research Association

Member, Kappa Omicron Nu Honor Society

Member, Gamma Sigma Delta Honor Society

Certified Family Life Educator (CFLE, 2004)

**PROFESSIONAL/ORGANIZATIONAL SERVICE**

Chair-Elect, NCFR Religion and Family Life Section (2011-2013)  
 Secretary/Treasurer, NCFR Religion and Family Life Section (2009-2011)  
 Member, NCFR Diversity Task Force (2008-2009)  
 Member, Men-in-Families Paper Award Selection Committee (2010)

**SERVICE AS REVIEWER**

Reviewer for *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-being* (United Kingdom)  
 Reviewer for *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science* (UK)  
 Reviewer for *BYU Studies*  
 Reviewer for *Counseling and Spirituality* (Canada)  
 Reviewer for *Criminal Justice and Behavior*  
 Reviewer for *Family Relations*  
 Reviewer for *Fathering*  
 Reviewer for *Health Education Research*  
 Reviewer for *Journal of Child and Family Studies*  
 Reviewer for *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* (Canada)  
 Reviewer for *Journal of Early Adolescence*  
 Reviewer for *Journal of Family Issues*  
 Reviewer for *Journal of Family Theory and Review*  
 Reviewer for *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*  
 Reviewer for *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*  
 Reviewer for *Journal of Marriage and Family*  
 Reviewer for *Journal of Political Science & Public Affairs*  
 Reviewer for *Journal of Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*  
 Reviewer for *Journal of Religion and Health*  
 Reviewer for *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*  
 Reviewer for *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*  
 Reviewer for *Marriage and Family Review*  
 Reviewer for *Religions*  
 Reviewer for *Research on Aging*  
 Reviewer for *Review of Religious Research*  
 Reviewer for *Social Science Research*  
 Reviewer for NCFR Religion and Family Life Section  
 Reviewer for NCFR Research and Theory Section  
 Reviewer for NCFR Theory Construction and Research Methodology Conference  
 Reviewer for Columbia University Press  
 Reviewer for *Encyclopedia of Family Studies*  
 Reviewer for Lexington Press  
 Reviewer for Oxford University Press  
 Reviewer for Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University  
 Reviewer for Sage Publications

**(References attached)**

## REFERENCES

David Dollahite, Professor  
School of Family Life  
Brigham Young University  
Provo, UT 84602  
Phone: (801)378-4179  
E-mail: [dave\\_dollahite@byu.edu](mailto:dave_dollahite@byu.edu)

Betsy Garrison, Professor  
Associate Dean, College of Agriculture  
Louisiana State University  
Baton Rouge, LA 70803  
Phone: (225)578-2085  
E-mail: [hcgarr@lsu.edu](mailto:hcgarr@lsu.edu)

Pam Monroe, Professor  
Former President, National Council on Family Relations (NCFR)  
Fellow, NCFR  
School of Social Work  
Louisiana State University  
Baton Rouge, LA 70803  
Phone: (225)578-5225  
E-mail: [pmonroe@lsu.edu](mailto:pmonroe@lsu.edu)

Rob Palkovitz, Professor  
Department of Individual and Family Studies  
University of Delaware  
104 Alison Hall  
Newark, DE 19716  
Phone: (302)831-8559  
E-mail: [robp@udel.edu](mailto:robp@udel.edu)

Wes Burr, Professor Emeritus  
Brigham Young University  
Former President, National Council on Family Relations (NCFR)  
E-mail: [wheelersxx@q.com](mailto:wheelersxx@q.com)