

Predictors of single, noncustodial fathers' physical involvement with their children

By: Patrick C. McKenry, Sharon J. Price, Mark A. Fine and Julianne Serovich

McKenry, P. C., Price, S. J., [Fine, M. A.](#), & Serovich, J. (1992). Predictors of single, noncustodial fathers' physical involvement with their children. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 153(3), 305-319.

This is an Author's Original Manuscript of an article whose final and definitive form, the Version of Record, has been published in the Journal of Genetic Psychology 1992

[copyright Taylor & Francis], available online at:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/vgnt20/current>

Abstract:

Presents a study on the factors affecting the relationship between a single, noncustodial father and his child. Factors that facilitate and enhance father-child relationship; Structural relationship characteristics; Representativeness of non-custodial fathers; Measures and analyses used.

Keywords: psychology | genetic psychology | single parents | parenting | fathers | parent-child relationships

Article:

ALTHOUGH DIVORCE HAS BECOME COMMONPLACE and is sometimes even described as a normative life transition, there is relatively little information about the husband/father role in divorce. What is known about divorce adjustment has been largely derived from the study of middle-class women (Depner & Bray, 1990; Kitson & Morgan, 1990). Researchers and practitioners have reported that women with custody of children are at greater risk for the negative effects of divorce because they have fewer economic resources and marketable skills than men do (Brown & Fox, 1978; McKenry & Price, 1990; Weitzman, 1985). However, some preliminary evidence suggests that men may be at equal or even greater risk than women for the negative consequences of divorce (Albrecht, Bahr, & Goodman, 1983; Hetherington, Cox, & Cox, 1976).

It appears that fatherhood compounds men's vulnerability to divorce. Because sole custody of the children by the mother with paternal visitation is still the most common custody arrangement (approximately 90%), most divorced fathers experience the loss of physical custody of their children. The loss of this relationship is a chief complaint of divorcing and divorced men (Hetherington et al., 1976; Jacobs, 1982; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980).

What we know about noncustodial fathers is largely based on small-scale and short-term clinical studies. In the clinical tradition, many of these studies have assumed a deficit perspective by being problem focused, sampling the most adversely affected families, lacking standardized instrumentation, and being very subjective in interpretation. Therefore, these studies are not generalizable to other populations.

Studies of noncustodial fathers have generally failed to distinguish between fathers in single-parent households and fathers who remarry or cohabit, or between noncustodial fathers whose children live in single-mother families and noncustodial fathers whose children reside with their remarried or cohabiting mothers (Demo & Acock, 1988; Depner & Bray, 1990). Research also has neglected to acknowledge the binuclear, interactive status of many single-parent families. These families may exhibit varying levels of conflict or instability that is related to divorce (McKenry & Price, 1990).

Much of the existing research has attempted to describe sources of stress for noncustodial fathers during divorce. For example, it has been noted that noncustodial fathers experience a chaotic lifestyle as they attempt to establish and manage a household (Hetherington et al., 1976). In addition, divorced fathers who economically support two households often experience financial problems. These problems are accentuated for remarried fathers because they have new responsibilities and conflicting loyalties (Ihinger-Tallman & Pasley, 1987).

Often, noncustodial fathers must learn a new social role, a role that involves the restructuring of the parent-child relationship within the constraints of time and location. This restructuring is often accompanied by feelings of great loss and deprivation (Wallerstein, Corbin, & Lewis, 1988).

Noncustodial fathers do not parent in isolation from their former spouses, and their level of involvement with their children after divorce is dependent on the parents' ability to cooperate with each other. It is not unusual for former spouses to have conflicts over such matters as finances, child custody, and visitation until they accept the finality of divorce--regardless of how satisfactory the settlement agreement might have been perceived at the time of the divorce (Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980).

Much of the research on noncustodial fathers has logically focused on the visitation process, attempting to identify correlates of frequent and consistent visitation. Research has repeatedly indicated that the child's subsequent adjustment is strongly related to regular and frequent patterns of visitation in nonconflictual settings (Hetherington, Stanley-Hagan, & Anderson, 1989; Jacobson, 1978; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980; Wallerstein, 1985). Yet, for many fathers, the visitation process is emotionally painful. Some fathers have feelings of guilt about the marital breakup and feelings of inadequacy about their role as a parent (Dominic & Schlesinger, 1980). Other fathers are rejected by their children during their visits (Hetherington, Cox, & Cox, 1982), possibly contributing to a reduction in the frequency of visitation (Hetherington et al., 1976).

In a national survey of children several years after divorce, Furstenberg and Nord (1985) found that fathers averaged only two visits per month, and that almost half of the children had not seen their fathers in the past year. Furstenberg and Nord concluded that noncustodial fathers increasingly socialize with their children from a distance and with a great deal of laxity, becoming "pals" more than parents.

Noncustodial fathers are more likely to successfully negotiate the problems of visitation with some children than with others. For example, fathers are more likely to visit younger children and sons frequently and consistently because these children are perceived as more responsive (Guidubaldi & Perry, 1985; Seltzer & Bianchi, 1988; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980). Interestingly, fathers who have established close relationships with their children prior to divorce are not necessarily more likely to remain involved with their children after divorce. In fact, fathers' feelings about the former spouse appear to be a more influential predictor of frequency of visitation than fathers' feelings about their children (Hetherington, 1979; Wallerstein et al., 1988). Noncustodial fathers often experience intense conflicts with their former spouses, and these conflicts typically interfere with noncustodial fathers' parent-child relationship (Moreland & Schwebel, 1981; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980).

Higher socioeconomic status (SES), especially as measured by level of education, appears to facilitate consistent visitation. High-SES fathers are also more likely to pay court-ordered child support, and this is related to visitation (Furstenberg, Nord, Peterson, & Zill, 1983; Seltzer, Schaeffer, & Charny, 1989; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980). Furstenberg et al. noted that the male parental role is strongly associated with being a good provider, and that men who are less able to provide tend to interact less with their children. Also, high-SES fathers are more likely than low-SES fathers to conform to dominant social expectations for visitation and are financially better able to sustain relationships from afar.

Ahrons and Rodgers (1987) and Boss (1987) have applied the concept of family boundaries to divorced families. The concept of family boundary is derived from family systems theory and refers to system and subsystem rules regarding participating members, that is, who, when, and how members participate in family life (Minuchin, 1974). The establishment of boundaries is a particular problem in divorced families because of the necessity of differentiating between the parental and spousal subsystems. The process of redefining boundaries and understanding new roles is thought to be one of the most difficult tasks faced by divorced families (Ahrons & Rodgers, 1987).

Family boundaries become ambiguous when there is disparity between physical absence/presence and psychological absence/presence. This concept of boundary ambiguity has been most often discussed in reference to remarried families (cf. Pasley & Ihinger-Tallman, 1989), but it is also applicable to divorced families because (a) there is a lack of clarity regarding who is in and who is out of the family system, (b) divorce represents a loss of a family member

(psychological, physical, or both), and (c) it is unclear what the role of the nonresidential parent should be (Boss, 1987; Price & McKenry, 1989).

Society does not have normative guidelines that might clarify this ambiguity, and the divorce literature offers little guidance about an appropriate postdivorce role for the noncustodial parent. Much of the literature has described "freezing out," "closing ranks," or "closing out" family members, particularly noncustodial parents, as indicative of positive adjustment in divorced families (Price & McKenry, 1988). However, continued relationships between former spouses are increasingly viewed as appropriate and functional (Depner & Bray, 1990; Price & McKenry, 1988; Wright & Price, 1986), and some authors contend that dismissing the noncustodial father from the family system increases dysfunctional stress (Ahrons & Rodgers, 1987).

Divorce confuses family boundaries because family tasks and responsibilities are rearranged, previous relationships are changed, and new members may enter the family. Because noncustodial fathers are physically separated from their children, they may be at high risk for role confusion, resulting in withdrawal from physical involvement with their children (Ahrons & Rodgers, 1987; Price & McKenry, 1989). Also, the concept of boundary ambiguity suggests that certain conditions pertaining to the father are conducive to fathers' having frequent contact with their children, including but not limited to perceived importance of and satisfaction with the father role, child responsiveness to the father, close physical proximity, less free time since the divorce, a cooperative relationship with the former spouse, and the father's or the former spouse's lack of involvement in a new intimate relationship.

Based on the concept of boundary ambiguity, we hypothesized that those factors that facilitate a noncustodial father's sense of belonging and meaningful role behavior would result in greater physical involvement as defined by frequency of visitation, length of visitation, time spent in meaningful activities, and extent of talking over the phone and/or writing. (These multiple dimensions were chosen because previous research has focused primarily on frequency of visitation, with generalizations made about overall levels of involvement. It was hypothesized that these might be distinct indicators of involvement.) More specifically, we predicted that certain child relationship characteristics (i.e., higher educational level, a positive attitude toward parenting, and feelings that they had a greater influence in their children's lives) would facilitate fathers' physical involvement with their children because these factors are reflective of greater parental motivation. We also hypothesized that certain child characteristics (i.e., having younger children, having boys, and having more than one child) would draw fathers closer to their children because divorced fathers appear to interact more easily with and have greater feelings of obligation toward these groups of children.

We also predicted that noncustodial fathers who have established a relatively mature and cooperative relationship with their former spouse (i.e., lack of conflict and more contact) would interact more frequently with their children because conflict and the lack of a positive or healthy relationship with the former spouse has been found to interfere with the parent-child relationship.

(Many divorced fathers are dependent on their spouses to facilitate interaction with their children, even when their children have married.) Finally, we expected that certain structural characteristics (i.e., fathers who live further away, have been divorced longer, are in a cohabiting relationship, or whose former spouse has remarried) would be related to fathers' having less physical involvement with their children because such fathers would be more physically and emotionally distant from their children.

We hypothesized that these four clusters of variables would differentially predict physical involvement. Recent research on the father role suggests that personal characteristics, or resources for parenting, including education and positive attitudes toward parenting, make it easier for the father to continue to define himself as an important part of his children's family (e.g., Seltzer & Bianchi, 1988). These child relationship resources are synonymous with the domain of personal psychological resources that Belsky (1984) found to be the most closely related of the three domains to parental functioning. Perhaps previous research has been most unequivocal in supporting the importance of child characteristics as being the most predictive of noncustodial physical involvement because children with certain characteristics are more likely to engage the male in the father role (e.g., Seltzer & Bianchi, 1988; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980). Although parental resources are intrinsic to the father, these child characteristics extend outside the father to the child and are thus of a secondary nature in terms of motivation. Boundary theory, from empirical and clinical perspectives, also supports the importance of factors descriptive of a lack of communication and conflict with the former spouse in divorced fathers' unwillingness to maintain physical contact with their children (Furstenberg & Nord, 1985; Hetherington, 1988; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980). Belsky's (1984) ecological model asserts that marital communication and support are crucial to parental functioning, although they are of less importance than personal resources. Relative to the other three domains, there has been much less research in the area of structural variations. Although boundary theory specifically implies that family structural variations should strongly affect paternal physical involvement (Pasley, 1987), some research suggests that change in the family structure of the custodial parent has little impact (e.g., Furstenberg et al., 1983; Seltzer & Bianchi, 1988). It is thought that these structural characteristics are more situational and less intrinsic to a father's effort to continue parenting; they represent personal factors less than individual parenting characteristics, child characteristics, or conflict with the former spouse.

Method

The National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH; Sweet, Bumpass, & Call, 1988) consists of interviews conducted in 1987 and 1988 with 13,017 respondents in a national probability sample. The survey contains a main sample of 9,643 respondents who represent the noninstitutional United States population aged 19 and older. Several population groups, including minority families, were double-sampled.

One adult per household was randomly selected to be the primary respondent. Several portions of the main interview were self-administered to facilitate the collection of sensitive information and to ease the flow of data collection. The mean interview lasted 1 hr and 40 min.

Responses from divorced, nonremarried, noncustodial fathers of minor children were examined. Two hundred four subjects met these criteria, but only 86 were used in the data analyses because of missing data. This sample of 86 did not significantly differ from the 118 who were omitted on the basis of salient demographic characteristics (i.e., age, education, income, age of child, and sex of child), which were determined by t tests and chi-square analyses.

Demographic data for these subjects indicated that the mean age of the fathers was 37.6 years ($SD = 8.3$). The majority (84.4%, $n = 76$) of the fathers had 12 or more years of education, and all were currently employed. Most (75.6%, $n = 65$) reported that their overall financial condition either had not changed or had improved since the divorce. The majority (88.4%, $n = 76$) reported good or excellent health. The mean age of the focal child was 9.8 years ($SD = 4.8$). Forty-seven percent ($n = 41$) were boys, and 52.3% ($n = 45$) were girls. The mean number of nonresidential children was 2.4 ($SD = 1.4$).

Measures

Physical involvement. The dependent measure of physical involvement was measured using four indices of involvement--frequency of visitation, length of visitation, time spent in meaningful activities, and extent of talking on the telephone and/or writing. Frequency of visitation was measured by one item asking respondents the frequency of visitation during the past 12 months; responses ranged from not at all (1) to several times a week (6). Length of visitation was measured by one item asking respondents how many weeks the child visited or lived with them during the past 12 months; responses ranged from 0-52 weeks. Time spent in meaningful activities was assessed by four items measuring (on a 6-point scale) the extent to which the respondents engaged in the following types of activities with their children: leisure; religious; talking, working, or playing; and school or organized activity. Responses ranged from not at all (1) to several times a week (6). Extent of talking on the telephone and/or writing was measured with one item that asked the respondents to indicate how often they had talked on the telephone with their child or had sent a letter to their child in the past 12 months; responses ranged from not at all (1) to several times a week (6). The results of a principal components analysis indicated that all items loaded on one factor only; factor loadings ranged from .46 to .73. Consequently, a total physical involvement score was computed by summing the scores on the individual measures.

Child relationship characteristics. Educational level was measured by the raw number of years of education. Satisfaction with parenting was assessed using six items asking respondents to evaluate dimensions of parenting: interesting-boring, appreciated-unappreciated, overwhelming-manageable, complicated -simple, lonely-sociable, and poorly done-well done. The response set

ranged from 1-7 between the two polar opposites. A summary score was used in the analysis; the Cronbach alpha was .77. Higher scores indicated greater satisfaction with parenting. Influence in children's lives was measured by one item that assessed the extent of the respondents' perceived influence on their children's lives in such areas as education, religion, and health care. Response options were none (1), some (2), and a great deal of influence (3).

Child characteristics. Raw data pertaining to the focal child were used to determine the child's age and gender. A raw score was also used to determine how many children under age 18 were living in the former spouse's household.

Relationship with former spouse. Conflict with the former spouse was measured with six items asking the respondent to indicate the amount of conflict in the following areas: where child lives, how child is raised, how father spends money on child, how mother spends money on child, father's visits with child, and father's contribution to child support. Responses ranged from none (1) to a great deal (3). A summary score was used in the data analysis; the Cronbach alpha was .78. Amount of contact with former spouse was measured by one item asking respondents how much contact they had had with their former spouse during the past year. Possible responses ranged from not at all (1) to more than once a week (6).

Structural characteristics. Distance away from child was measured by the number of miles between where the father and child live. Time since divorce was determined by raw data. Cohabitation was determined by a constructed variable that identified dichotomously (yes/no) if the father was presently cohabiting with anyone. Former spouse remarried was determined with a dichotomous variable that identified whether (yes/no) the mother of the children had remarried.

Results

We used a hierarchical multiple regression analysis to assess the extent to which the four clusters of independent variables were predictive of the extent of fathers' physical involvement with their children. The four clusters, in the order they were entered into the regression equation, were (a) child relationship characteristics, (b) child characteristics, (c) relationship with former spouse characteristics, and (d) structural characteristics.

The results are presented in Table 1, along with the simple correlations between the dependent variable and each independent variable. As shown in the table, at Step 1 child relationship characteristics contributed to a significant portion of the variance in fathers' physical involvement ($R^2 = .28, p < .0001$). Two variables--satisfaction with parenting, and influence in children's lives--individually contributed to a significant portion of the variance. Therefore, fathers were more physically involved with their children if they were satisfied being parents and if they perceived that they had an influence on their children's lives.

The addition of the second cluster at Step 2 failed to yield a significant increase in the variance accounted for, and this cluster was not independently related to the dependent measure. Also,

none of the individual child characteristics contributed significantly to the variance in physical involvement, indicating that gender of child, child's age, and number of nonresidential children were not related to the fathers' physical involvement with children.

At Step 3, the addition of the third cluster (relationship with former spouse characteristics) did not lead to a significant increase in variance explained. However, amount of contact with the former spouse was marginally related to the extent of fathers' physical involvement with their children. This cluster, however, was independently related to physical involvement ($F = 4.97$, $p < .009$, $R^2 = .107$) with contact with the former spouse contributing significantly to the variance in the dependent measure.

Finally, the fourth cluster (structural characteristics) failed to produce a significant increase in explained variance. However, the geographical distance between father and child significantly contributed to the variance in the dependent variable (i.e., fathers who lived farther away from their children had less physical contact with them). Also, this cluster was independently related to physical contact ($F = 4.05$, $p < .005$, $R^2 = .167$), with distance from child significantly contributing to the variance in the dependent measure.

Collinearity diagnostics, that is, condition index (SAS Institute, 1988), indicated that multicollinearity was not a threat to the stability of the regression analysis. Further, correlations among the independent variables were generally low to moderate, ranging from .00 to -.48.

Discussion

Consistent with a boundary theoretical perspective, three clusters facilitated nonresidential fathers' physical involvement. However, using the hierarchical procedures, only three variables (satisfaction with parenting, perception of influencing child's life, and geographical proximity to children) actually contributed to the variation in the dependent measure. However, analysis of the relationship with spouse cluster indicated that amount of contact with spouse was also a significant predictor of fathers' physical involvement with their children. Thus, more satisfaction with parenting, greater perceived influence in their children's lives, living closer to their children, and more contact with their former spouse were related to more physical involvement of nonresidential fathers with their children.

As we hypothesized, the strongest predictor was the first entered cluster, child relationship characteristics. This is consistent with Belsky's (1984) ecological model of parenting, which has suggested that the personal resources of the parent are the most predictive indicator of parental functioning, including involvement. Based on an exhaustive review of the literature, Belsky concluded that an individual's enduring characteristics, which are largely a product of his or her environment, strongly influence that individual's parenting style. From the perspective of boundary ambiguity, these factors would be descriptive of a father's motivation to overcome the isolating barriers of divorce and binuclear family life. Two of these variables (satisfaction with parenting and influence in child's life) have been conceptualized as nonresidential fathers'

personal resources that make it easier for fathers to define themselves as an important part of their children's lives (Seltzer & Bianchi, 1988). These factors would also be related to role clarity, making the role of noncustodial father less confusing.

Another cluster that was significantly related to the fathers' physical involvement was structural characteristics. This was largely due to the strength of one variable, geographic distance between father and child. Although this factor might easily explain frequency of visitation, it is not reasonable to expect that this factor would be strongly related to telephoning, letter writing, and time spent in meaningful activity. This variable may be merely a byproduct of the situation wherein fathers do not perceive that they have much influence on their children and/or are unsatisfied with parenting; distance could inhibit the development of relationships, but it could also provide the father with an excuse for his lack of interest in maintaining the noncustodial parent-child relationship, or it could reflect other priorities the father has that are geographically distant from the children. Geographic distance was moderately related to these two child relationship characteristics, $r = .29$ and $.31$ ($ps < .01$), respectively. Thus, geographic proximity seems to facilitate a father's ability to engage in a meaningful role with his noncustodial children.

Although the relationship with the former spouse cluster was not a significant contributor to an increase in the variance of the dependent measure in the hierarchical analysis, it was independently related to fathers' physical involvement because of the strength of the variable, amount of contact with former spouse. As we hypothesized, boundary ambiguity suggests that the custodial parent (i.e., the mother) is responsible for facilitating the noncustodial father's interaction with his children. Interestingly, amount of contact with former spouse was the only significant predictor; amount of conflict was not. It could be that instead of acting as a facilitator of interaction with the children, amount of contact is merely an artifact of extent of involvement as a result of close proximity and meaningful interaction with the child. The amount of contact with the former spouse was significantly related to both proximity ($r = .32$, $p < .01$) and influence on the child ($r = .23$, $p < .01$).

Contrary to expectation, variables from the child characteristics cluster were not collectively or individually predictive of the extent of physical contact between noncustodial fathers and their children. These findings are inconsistent with previous research indicating that the amount of noncustodial fathers' contact with their children is strongly related to the age and gender of the child (Guidubaldi & Perry, 1985; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980). Child characteristics have received the most support in research predicting post-divorce father involvement, but this could be related to the tendency of researchers, especially clinical researchers, to focus on child characteristics. The finding in this study is consistent with the Belsky (1984) paradigm--child characteristics were the least predictive of parental functioning of the three clusters in this model. Belsky stated that, although child characteristics do indeed seem to shape the quantity and quality of parental care, existing research indicates that characteristics that would make children more difficult to parent are relatively easy to overcome when personal resources and support systems function effectively. From the perspective of boundary ambiguity, this finding suggests that numerous

other factors can overcome these characteristics that might be related to a noncustodial father's disinterest in a high level of physical involvement. It seems that a father's motivation and proximity would overrule certain child characteristics, making it more probable that the father would act as a genuine member of the noncustodial child's family.

Several other variables were not individually related to fathers' physical involvement. There are many possible explanations. First, the relatively small sample size resulted in less-than-desirable levels of statistical power in the analyses. Some of the predictors (gender of child, number of nonresidential children, and time since divorce) were related in the expected direction to fathers' physical involvement, but because of the lack of statistical power, these findings were nonsignificant. Further, the stability of the hierarchical regression analysis was threatened by the relatively large number of independent variables for this sample size. Contradicting this claim, however, is the observation that bivariate correlations between each independent variable and the amount of physical contact with the child yielded results that were quite consistent with those from the multiple regression analyses.

Second, it is possible that the 86 men in this sample were not representative of the population of noncustodial fathers with minor children. The 86 fathers we used were those for whom we had complete data on the variables of interest. The sample was chosen from a total of 204 men who met the inclusion criteria. It is unlikely that this led to a serious bias, however, because comparative analyses indicated that the fathers with complete data were similar to those with missing data. More important, men in this sample may not be representative because they admitted to marital disruption, whereas many men in the NSFH data set experienced but did not report such disruption. Bumpass, Casto Martin, and Sweet (1991), using the same data set, demonstrated that men consistently underreport the frequency of marital disruption. Bumpass et al. also found that variables related to marital disruption may be quite different for those men who report disruption and for those who do not. Thus, our hypotheses might have been more strongly supported if the sample of men used in this study had been more representative.

A third possible explanation for the lack of significance in several of the hypothesized relationships is the use of single-item measures. (This limitation is also present in the NSFH data set, which relies on single-item measures of most constructs.) The use of multiple items or standardized instrumentation might have provided more valid measures of factors that are thought to be related to noncustodial paternal involvement.

The results of this study suggest several directions for future research. First, a larger sample size of noncustodial fathers would be desirable because this would provide greater statistical power to identify predictors of the amount of the fathers' contact with their nonresidential children. Second, using measures that directly assess variables from boundary theory would be helpful, including fathers' perceptions of how much they are a part of their children's family, fathers' sense of inclusion and involvement in their children's lives, and fathers' perceptions of how important their ex-spouses consider them to be to the children. Although the measures used in

this study were related to constructs from boundary theory, they were limited to those available in the NSFH data set.

Third, because of men's tendency to underreport marital disruption (Bumpass et al., 1991), using objective indicators of divorce (e.g., divorce records) would result in a more representative sample of noncustodial fathers than the one used in this study. Fourth, data gathered from multiple sources, particularly from ex-spouses and from nonresidential children, would permit a more objective assessment of the predictors of noncustodial fathers' physical involvement with their children. For example, in this study, assessment of the amount of conflict between the former spouses was limited to the fathers' perceptions. The hypothesized negative relation between the amount of parental conflict and the fathers' amount of contact with their children may have been supported if the mothers' perceptions had been examined.

Finally, longitudinal studies would help identify factors that are causally related to the amount of noncustodial fathers' involvement with their children. Such studies might assess the amount of contact fathers have with their children immediately after divorce or separation, as well as gather information on the predictors of the amount of father-child contact. Longitudinal assessments of the same variables would strengthen researchers' ability to draw causal inferences because it would be possible to examine how changes in the independent variables relate to changes in the amount of fathers' physical involvement with their children.

This study was funded by the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (H-971).

TABLE 1 Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis on Fathers' Physical Contact With Child

Legend for Chart:

- A - Variable
- B - Cumulative R²
- C - R² change
- D - Beta
- E - r

A	B	C	D	E
Step 1				
Education			.04	.03
Satisfaction with parenting			.20[*]	.25[*]
Influence in child's life			.40[**]	.48[**]

Summary of Step 1	.277[**]	.277[**]
-------------------	----------	----------

Step 2

Age of child	-.07	-.03
Gender of child (1 = male, 2 = female)	-.04	-.10

Number of nonresidential children	.14	.15
-----------------------------------	-----	-----

Summary of Step 2	.298[**]	.021
-------------------	----------	------

Step 3

Conflict with former spouse	.10	.11
-----------------------------	-----	-----

Amount of contact with former spouse	.13	.31[**]
--------------------------------------	-----	---------

Summary of Step 3	.341[**]	.043
-------------------	----------	------

Step 4

Distance away from child	-.27[*]	-.38[**]
--------------------------	---------	----------

Time since divorce Cohabitation (1 = yes, 2 = no)	-.06	-.07
	.06	.13

Former spouse remarried (1 = yes, 2 = no)	-.05	.08
--	------	-----

Summary of Step 4	.387[**]	.046
-------------------	----------	------

Note. N = 86. For final equation, $F(12,73) = 3.84$, $p < .0002$. Beta weights were derived from the final model.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

References

- Ahrons, C. R., & Rodgers, R. H. (1987). *Divorced families: A multidisciplinary view*. New York: Norton.
- Albrecht, S. L., Bahr, H. M., & Goodman, K. L. (1983). *Divorce and remarriage: Problems, adaptations, and adjustment*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development*, 55, 83-96.
- Boss, P. (1987). Family stress. In M. B. Sussman & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.). *Handbook of marriage and the family* (pp. 695-724). New York: Plenum.
- Brown, P., & Fox, G. (1978). Sex differences in divorce. In E. Gomberg and V. Franks (Eds.), *Gender and disordered behavior: Sex differences in pathology* (pp. 437-445). New York: Bruner/Mazel.
- Bumpass, L. L., Casto Martin, T. C., & Sweet, J. A. (1991). The impact of family background and early marital factors on marital disruption. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 22-42.
- Demo, D. H., & Acock, A. C. (1988). The impact of divorce on children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 619-645.
- Depnet, C. E., & Bray, J. H. (1990). Modes of participation for noncustodial parents: The challenge for research, policy, practice, and education. *Family Relations*, 39, 378-381.
- Dominic, K. T., & Schlesinger, B. (1980). Weekend fathers: Family shadows. *Journal of Divorce*, 3, 241-247.
- Dudley, J. R. (1991). Increasing an understanding of divorced fathers who have infrequent contact with their children. *Family Relations*, 40, 279-285.
- Furstenberg, F. A., Jr., & Nord, C. W. (1985). Parenting apart: Patterns of child rearing after marital disruption. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 47, 893-904.
- Furstenberg, F. A., Jr., Nord, C. W., Peterson, J. L., & Zill, N. (1983). The life course of children of divorce: Marital disruptions and parental contact. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 656-668.
- Guidubaldi, J., & Perry, J. D. (1985). Divorce and mental health sequelae for children: A two-year follow-up of a nationwide sample. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 24, 531-537.
- Hetherington, E. M. (1979). Divorce: A child's perspective. *American Psychologist*, 34, 851-858.

Hetherington, E. M. (1988). Parents, children, and siblings six years after divorce. In R. Hindle & J. Stevenson-Hindle (Eds.), *Relationships within families* (pp. 221-245). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Hetherington, E. M., Cox, M., & Cox, R. (1976). Divorced fathers. *Family Coordinator*, 25, 417-428.

Hetherington, E. M., Cox, M., & Cox, R. (1982). Effects of divorce on parents and young children. In M. Lamb (Ed.), *Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development* (pp. 417-428). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hetherington, E. M., Stanley-Hagan, M., & Anderson, E. R. (1989). Marital transitions: A child's perspective. *American Psychologist*, 44, 303-312.

Ihinger-Tallman, M., & Pasley, K. (1987). *Remarriage*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jacobs, J. W. (1982). The effect of divorce on fathers: An overview of the literature. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 139, 1235-1241.

Jacobson, D. S. (1978). The impact of marital separation/divorce on children. II: Parent-child separation and adjustment. *Journal of Divorce*, 1, 341-360.

Kitson, G. C., & Morgan, L. A. (1990). The multiple consequences of divorce: A decade review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 913-924.

McKenry, P. C., & Price, S. J. (1990). Divorce: Are men at risk? In D. Moore & F. Leafgren (Eds.), *Men in conflict* (pp. 95-112). Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.

Minuchin, S. (1974). *Families and family therapy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moreland, J., & Schwebel, A. I. (1981). A gender role transcendent perspective of lathering. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 9, 45-52.

Pasley, K. (1987). Family boundary ambiguity: Perceptions of adult stepfamily family members. In K.

Pasley & M. Ihinger-Tallman (Eds.), *Remarriage and step-parenting: Current research and theory* (pp. 206-224). New York: Guilford. Pasley, B. K., & Ihinger-Tallman, M. (1989). Boundary ambiguity in remarriage: Does ambiguity differentiate degree of marital adjustment and interaction? *Family Relations*, 38, 46-52.

Price, S. J., & McKenry, P. C. (1988). *Divorce*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Price, S. J., & McKenry, P. C. (1989). Current trends and issues in divorce: An agenda for family scientists in the 1990s. *Family Science Review*, 2, 222-234.

SAS Institute (1988). SAS user's guide statistics. Cary, NC: SAS Institute.

Seltzer, J. A., & Bianchi, S. M. (1988). Children's contact with absent parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 663-677.

Seltzer, J.A., Schaeffer, N. C., & Charng, H. (1989). Family ties after divorce: The relationship between visitation and paying child support. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 1013-1032.

Sweet, J., Bumpass, L., & Call, V. (1988). The design and content of the National Survey of Families and Households. Working paper NSFH-1. Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Wallerstein, J. S., & Kelly, J. B. (1980). *Surviving the breakup: How children and parents cope with divorce*. New York: Basic Books.

Wallerstein, J. S., Corbin, S. B., & Lewis, J. M. (1988). Children of divorce: A ten-year study. In E. M. Hetherington & J. Arasteh (Ed.), *Impact of divorce, single-parenting, and stepparenting on children* (pp. 198-214). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Weitzman, L. (1985). *The divorce revolution: The unexpected social and economic consequences for women and children in America*. New York: Free Press.

Wright, D. W., & Price, S. J. (1986). Court-ordered child support payment: The effect of the former-spouse relationship on compliance. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 869-874.