Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1971

Post-divorce visitation of minor children; development of a questionnaire

Viola Cotter

Portland State University

Lorraine Goldenberg

Portland State University

Terry McGill

Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Child Psychology Commons](#), [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Cotter, Viola; Goldenberg, Lorraine; and McGill, Terry, "Post-divorce visitation of minor children; development of a questionnaire" (1971). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1448.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.1447>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

POST-DIVORCE VISITATION OF MINOR CHILDREN:
DEVELOPMENT OF A QUESTIONNAIRE

Prepared By

Viola Cotter
Lorraine Goldenberg
Terry McGill

Social Work 501, 502 and 503
Research Practicum

Directed By

Vincent Glaudin, Ph. D.

Portland State University
May 15, 1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special appreciation is expressed to Judge Jean L. Lewis whose concern for the minor children of divorced parents stimulated this study. Thanks are warmly extended to Mr. Richard Collins and Mr. Donald Welch who provided the research team with the resources of the Family Services Department. Mrs. Ruth Strejc and the secretarial staff of that department contributed their invaluable aid by helping with the mailing of the questionnaires. The research team also wishes to acknowledge the special contributions of Dr. Arthur Enlen, who provided resource material and offered his expertise in considering the methodological questions which grew out of this pilot project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	
/	A. Divorce: The Routine Crisis	1
/	B. Oregon Law	3
	C. Multnomah County	5
/	D. Custody and Visiting	7
/	E. Research on Post-Divorce Visiting of Minor Children	9
	F. Statement of Purpose	12
II.	Method	
	A. Overall Research Strategy	14
	B. Questionnaire Construction	14
	C. Questionnaire Respondent Sample	16
	1) Selection and Approach to Subjects	16
	2) Demographic Characteristics	18
	D. Interview Sub-Sample	20
	1) Selection and Approach to Subjects	20
	2) Demographic Characteristics of Interview Sample	23
III.	Results	
	A. Questionnaire Content	24

✓ 1)	Parent's Relationship	24
+ 2)	Discussion About Visiting	25
+ 3)	Custody and Care	26
+ 4)	Visiting and Expectancies	27
B.	Reliability of Questionnaire Items	30
1)	Source of Variance	30
2)	Scoring Agreement Criteria	31
3)	Percentage of Agreement	32
C.	Sample Representativeness	35
✓ 1)	Minor Child Questionnaire Mail	
	Sample	35
✓ 2)	Interview Sub-Sample	37
IV.	Discussion	40
A.	Visiting	40
B.	Questionnaire Reliability	42
C.	Sampling Representativeness	44
D.	A Dilemma of Preventive Mental Health	47
V.	Bibliography	51
VI.	Appendixes	53
A.	Questionnaires and Results	
1.	Questionnaire and Results From	
	the Mailed Questionnaire For	
	the Mother of a Minor Child	54

2. Questionnaire and Results From the Mailed Questionnaire For the Father of a Minor Child	67
B. Guidelines For Contacts With Subjects	
1. Letter From Judge Jean L. Lewis ...	80
2. Follow-Up Phone Call	82
3. Follow-Up Letter	83
4. Making Interview Appointment	84
5. Beginning of Interview	85
C. Number, Percentage, and Correlation of Response Agreement Between Mailed-In Questionnaires and the 30 Interviews ...	87

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Mean Demographic Characteristics of Respondents	18
2. Attrition Pattern From Questionnaire Respondents to Interview Subjects	21
3. Demographic Characteristics of Interview Sample	23
4. Percentage of Agreement for Factual vs. Feeling or Opinion Items	33
5. Percentage of Agreement for Items in Content Categories	34
6. Age, Years Married, and Number of Children of Oregon Samples	36
7. Educational Level of Questionnaire Respondents	37
8. Age, Years Married, and Number of Children of Mail Sample and Interview Sub-Sample	38
9. Educational Level of Mail Sample and Interview Sub-Sample	39
10. Size of Family	49
11. Number of Children by Age Group	49

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Divorce: The Routine Crisis

The dissolution of families by divorce has become extremely common. It attracts little attention as an acute mental health stress warranting vigorous methods of crisis intervention or preventive psychiatry concerning the minor children involved as third parties. Not only are divorces exceedingly common in contemporary society, but the rate of divorce per thousand population has been increasing in Oregon. Associated with this trend is the high percentage of broken homes which include minor children. Urban Multnomah County, for instance, recorded more than one-third of the divorces granted in 1969 as cases with children under age 18; rural Benton County, more than one-half. Since there are approximately two minor children per broken family, an estimated 3000 dependent children will feel the impact of divorces granted this year in Multnomah County. (Bureau of Vital Statistics, State of Oregon, 1969.)

Certainly, there is no need to belabor the point that the breakdown of a family unit is painful for everyone in it, especially children in the early stages of development. It has been pointed out (Schwartz, 1968) that family agency counseling is routinely confronted by problems of divorce and children from multiple marriages. Furthermore, Coddington

ton (1970) found that professional people who deal with children rank divorce of parents as one of the most traumatic events that may distort normal development from the pre-school period through the mid-teens. It should be kept in mind that the impact of divorce per se is difficult to assess but it is correlated with a wide range of developmental maladjustments. A number of studies have shown that the nature of personal maladjustment in children whose parents divorce is complex and variable. (Locke, 1951; Goode, 1956; Landis, 1960; Glueck and Glueck, 1962; Rosenberg, 1965; Buss, 1966; Hunt, 1967.) Locally, it has been reported that about half the referrals for juvenile delinquency are children who are not living in a complete family unit. (Multnomah County Juvenile Dept., 1969.)

As a rule throughout the nation, our legal system inadvertently aggravates the divorce crisis rather than serving as an entre for both symptomatic treatment and secondary prevention¹ of behavior disorders. It has been pointed out many times that the adversary system is inappropriate in discharging the court's responsibilities to troubled families. The system of establishing "fault" aggravates the parents' vendetta and further impairs their capacity to rear children. Most recently, Wadlington (1969) has detailed the old

---

¹Gerald Caplan, Principles of Preventive Psychiatry (New York: Basic Books, 1964).

Caplan refers to three public health concepts regarding prevention--primary, secondary and tertiary prevention.

story of how negotiations concerning custody and visitation are sandwiched between the attorney's efforts to secure the best possible material settlement for his client. In discharging his ethical responsibility, to press his client's case along with the economic constraints of his professional role, it would be an extraordinary attorney indeed who could function effectively as a family counselor. Instead, the minor child is usually not unlike chattel in the bargaining "dividing the spoils." (Leslie, 1967.) Legal reforms such as "no fault" divorce decrees, establishment of "family courts," and having separate legal counsel for minor children are now being advocated. (Hansen & Goldberg, 1967; Wadlington, 1969.)

B. Oregon Law

Oregon's 1971 Legislature, now in session, is considering a number of reforms. It has enacted a "no fault" divorce law similar to those in Iowa and California. Moreover, the Legislature is weighing the establishment of a centralized administrative unit intended to strengthen resources for children. At the present time, however, all the problems of the adversary system exist in Oregon's law. The vast majority of minor children experiencing the crisis of their parents' divorce probably receive no special services. The usual system of private attorneys struggling

with custody-visitation problems, in the context of a financial settlement, is the rule. Since 80% to 90% of divorce decrees are default cases, they are processed by the court in just a few minutes. Ordinarily the trial judge will have time only to insure that there is some provision for child support and "reasonable visitation." Otherwise, the trial judge's time is consumed by the hard-core minority of cases which are bitter custody battles and hostile modifications of visiting arrangements. In these cases there is often a thorough examination of the families although solutions to date have been hampered by the adversary nature of the proceedings.

There is a great disparity between the practical problem the trial judge faces in dealing with hundreds of divorces and the great responsibility the law places upon him for the welfare of minor children. ORS 107.100 "Provisions of Decree of Divorce or Annulment" clearly states that the court shall consider the "best interests" of the child in determining custody and the mother per se shall not be given preference. Although it is customary to grant the non-custodial parent "reasonable" arrangements for visiting his children, this has been established by case law rather than by statute. (Hammersley, 1970.) There is no question that the trial judge has broad responsibilities and broad powers in looking after the welfare of a minor child as third party

to a divorce action. Furthermore, according to the Oregon Supreme Court (Tingen vs. Tingen, 1968) he is admonished to consider a complex configuration of no less than eight major factors in reaching his opinion rather than relying on any simplistic tradition.

C. Multnomah County

Oregon's highly urbanized center has a special resource to help cope with the problems of divorce, the Family Services Department of the Multnomah County Circuit Court. Its experienced counselors provide both conciliation counseling (prior to divorce) and custody-visitation consultations. Historically a high priority was given to conciliation counseling which might help head off impulsive, unwarranted divorce actions. Typically a husband petitions the court for conciliation counseling after his wife has taken some initial step in the divorce process. She may be required to participate in brief counseling before the court will act on her intention to dissolve the marriage. This is a unique variation on the widespread use of "marriage counseling" provided by pastors, social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists and others in the community.

Over the years, the Family Services Department has gradually developed an increasing caseload of "custody counseling," focused primarily on issues of custody and visit-

ing arrangements. (Family Services Department Annual Report, 1969.) This might properly be called "divorce counseling" as well in that it attempts to help marriage partners separate with less rancor and better able to carry out their parenting roles. Here there is an attempt to have parents participate in decision-making regarding how they will function as parents to their minor children, rather than engaging in bitter court battles or being subject to arbitrary judicial rulings. In some instances, the circuit court may require time-limited custody-visiting counseling with the understanding that an agreement must be reached by the parents or rules will be dictated to the parents.

Although Multnomah County is fortunate in being a step closer to a problem-solving "family court," only a selected segment of cases has an opportunity to benefit from these sophisticated extra services. These are the cases where a party to the legal conflict contests what the spouse or ex-spouse is doing or intends to do. The routine divorce in Multnomah County, as elsewhere, is handled as a default case whether there are minor children involved or not. This means that the most common type of family dissolution takes place mechanically with no special services provided by the State of Oregon either to guide the separating parents or to directly help their minor children cope with this loss.

D. Custody and Visiting

Although it is agreed that the "best interests" of the minor child shall have the highest priority when a family is disrupted by divorce, there is a notable lack of scientific knowledge about which custody and visiting arrangement will best serve the child's development. Quite apart from the value issue about what is "good for the child," there is no prediction equation for the court to weigh the data on the child's behalf. Even if these data were reliable--rather than ranging from demographic facts through expert opinion to biased anecdotes--there are no firmly established correlations relating these "facts" to outcome criteria.

Nevertheless, the court is expected to consider the following factors in rendering a sound decision:

- 1) The conduct of the parties; 2) the moral, emotional, and physical fitness of the parties; 3) the comparative physical environments; 4) the emotional ties of the child to other family members; 5) the interest of the parties in, and attitude toward, the child; 6) the age, sex and health of the child; 7) the desirability of continuing an existing relationship and environment; and 8) the preference of the child. (Tingen vs. Tingen, 1968.)

The custody arrangement not only must consider which parent has foremost responsibility for the child's day-to-day care and financial basis for child support, but it must come to grips with the non-custodial parent's role. Usually the court defines this secondary parenting role as "reason-

able visitation." Again the trial judge would be hard pressed to have a basis in fact for his recommendations or decisions concerning visiting in the average case. Behavioral scientists have not provided a foundation of data-based conclusions upon which the court can build. Because of this lack, counselors would be wise to be humble and open-minded in providing guidance about visiting. (Griffith, Hack, Murphy, Weiman, Williams, Van Lydegraf, & Glaudin, 1970.)

What is available in the literature, concerning the relationship of a dependent child to his non-custodial parent, is largely a matter of conjecture and clinical opinion. Usually the absentee father is urged to maintain a visiting relationship as part of being a responsible parent, modulated by the practical considerations of the child's developmental stage. (Grollman, 1969; Hansen & Goldberg, 1967; Despert, 1962.) Much of this guidance has a moralistic ring including a cataloguing of the "sins" of divorcing parents. (Pollack, 1967.) Even the progressive family court is in danger of assuming that its list of "shoulds" inevitably serves the child's welfare. (Hansen & Goldberg, 1967.) In contrast, Steinzor (1969) contends that the parents need "heartfelt confrontation" which produces a genuine "emotional divorce." His experience leads him to believe that parents are capable of only the most superfi-

cial cooperation in caring for a dependent child after divorce. In any event, the typical non-custodial father appears to fade out of the picture rapidly both in terms of visiting and maintaining his child support. (Eckhardt, 1968.) The entire matter is complicated by remarriages (Schwartz, 1968) with some findings suggesting that this normalizes the life of the fatherless child (Goode, 1956), while other data show that the custodial mother's remarriage injures the self-esteem of at least some children. (Rosenberg, 1965.)

E. Research on Post-Divorce Visiting of Minor Children

There has been almost no published research specifically pertaining to the nature of the visiting relationship between the non-custodial parent and his minor child or its bearing on the child's best interests. As indicated in section D above, most data is anecdotal, unsystematic or tangential to this area. However, Goode (1956) systematically interviewed more than 400 divorced mothers of minor children on many topics and included several questions about the frequency and quality of visiting. A little more than half of the mothers "permitted" visiting at "any time" or "weekly." This was classified as high frequency visiting. The median group of mothers was satisfied with visiting frequency, whether it was high or low, but one-fifth desired

the fathers to see more of the children. Goode concluded that the children seemed to provide a vehicle for the continuing struggle between the divorced parents, including the issue of support payment. It was his interpretation that the child benefited most when the mother remarried so that the youngster was integrated in a new family unit. It is important, however, to keep in mind that Goode's information all came from the perceptions of the mothers, including those that had remarried.

Paget and Kern (1960) carried out a mailed survey which offered social work services to divorced individuals. One of their three categories was services available to children. Of 195 respondents, the child-centered category ranked the lowest in frequency of requests. Initially 22% of respondents requested interviews concerning their children but only about half of these parents actually followed through. Five per cent of the total pool of respondents came in to the agency and talked about problems relating to visiting. These were mothers who complained that the child's contacts with the non-custodial father were destructive.

In a recent Oregon study (Griffith, et al, 1970), visiting was the central post-divorce area which was examined. This research, carried out in Multnomah and Benton Counties, reached the conclusion that it was not feasible to

contact a representative sample of divorced parents through telephone listings or old addresses available at the time of divorce one to five years earlier. Nevertheless, twenty-four interviews focused on visiting problems were carried out on a non-representative sample of divorced parents. This interviewing provided the ground work necessary to move from broad concerns toward a highly structured questionnaire or interview schedule. Findings from these original loosely-structured interviews suggested that "frequent" visiting meant "once-a-week" for recently divorced parents and "twice-a-month" for those divorced several years. This local study also concluded that frequent visiting was not necessarily associated with child-centered parental behavior. In a number of cases the high contact group was involved in vindictive struggles, arguments about child support, or reconciliation efforts. Those parents divorced for three to five years were more likely to have less frequent visiting but a better quality of visiting. In the biased sample interviewed, these older parents, who were also divorced longer, were not engaged in the old bitter conflicts which had racked the marriage. Another important tentative conclusion of this preliminary investigation was that the children themselves, usually by age eight, played a significant role in the decisions influencing the visiting pattern.

F. Statement of Purpose

The present descriptive study was broadly concerned about divorces which have an impact on minor children. It was intended to build on the previous research of Griffith, Hack, Murphy, Wieman, Williams, Van Lydegraf & Glaudin (1970) in describing the relationships between parents and children after divorce. It was the objective of the present research team to come closer to the goal of selecting a representative sample of divorced parents than was possible previously. Moreover, an attempt was made to develop a highly structured questionnaire and interview schedule growing out of the earlier experience with semi-structured interviews.

Data to be collected in the present study were to be much more specific and much less impressionistic. Although it was considered desirable to obtain a general picture of the family dissolution as early in the divorce process as possible, special consideration was given to issues pertaining to the visiting relationship of the minor child and the non-custodial parent. In addition, the present research not only intended to gather descriptive content about divorcing parents and their children, but to give primary emphasis to assessing the reliability of the findings. To recapitulate, the purpose of this study focused on the following immediate goals:

- 1) To sample a representative group of divorcing parents of minor children early in the divorce process.
- 2) To construct a highly-structured questionnaire which would describe divorcing parents, their relationship, attitudes, visiting arrangements and the adjustment of the minor children.
- 3) To determine the reliability of data gathered by means of a mailed questionnaire which taps this content.

II. METHOD

A. Overall Research Strategy

The basic strategy of the study was to compare responses to a mailed questionnaire completed by divorcing parents with the responses of a sub-sample of parents who were interviewed. The mailed questionnaire, emphasizing description of the visiting relationship of a minor child and a non-custodial parent, was distributed during a one-month period to couples who filed for divorce at the Multnomah County Circuit Court. Questionnaires returned by these subjects provided the data for describing families at this stage of dissolution. An estimate of the reliability of each questionnaire item was made in terms of per cent of agreement between a parent's mailed reply and his interview answer.² The interview data were collected without interviewer knowledge of the previously volunteered information. The respondent was informed of this fact to maximize his freedom to respond in the interview without straining artificially toward consistency.

B. Questionnaire Construction

A 59 item Minor Child Questionnaire was constructed with almost all questions coded in a multiple choice fashion

---

²Since the returned questionnaires included 27 complete couples in the sample, it will be possible to make an additional estimate of reliability for some items. This analysis was not completed for the present report.

(Appendix A). Many of the questions were maintained in their present form in order to be consistent with previous studies. The Minor Child Questionnaire consisted of the following broad categories:

- 1) Demographic - Items 1 to 13 described the subject in terms of age, race, occupation, education, and income. The questions were based on earlier survey carried out by the Family Services Department. (Karr, 1964.)
- 2) Parents' Relationship - Items 14 to 33 depicted the marriage relationship, separation, attitudes and stability of the partners. These items were drawn from a variety of sources. (Goode, 1956; National Center for Health Statistics; Karr, 1964; Griffith, et al, 1970.)
- 3) Visiting Arrangements - Items 34 to 58 focused on custody and visiting with an attempt to reveal both current behavior and expectancies. The section included attitudes, practical details, projected concerns, and the role that the court should play. By necessity, almost all of these questions were new with the exception of the few available from Goode's research.

- 4) Children's Identification - The last item of the questionnaire identifies all the children from the present marriage by name, sex and age.

C. Questionnaire Respondent Sample

1) Selection and Approach to Subjects: The original pool of individuals consisted of all those who filed for divorce at the Multnomah County Courthouse between February 10th and March 10, 1971. These people were listed the day of filing in the fee book; however, it was usually one week later before a divorce file was sufficiently complete to provide the necessary information for sample selection. To be selected from the total pool, the divorce file information had to meet the following criteria:

- a. The family must include at least one child under the age of 18.
- b. There had to be at least one address available for a parent.

Questionnaires were mailed individually to the mother and father if just one address was given. In some cases there were two addresses, one of which may have been a place of business. Several cases permitted mailing to just one party to the divorce. There were also instances where divorcing parents with minor children showed no address so those families were excluded from the sample. As soon as it was determined that an individual was a divorcing parent

with a minor child, he or she was mailed a Minor Child Questionnaire with an explanatory letter from Judge Jean Lewis (Appendix B1).

A total of 281 Minor Child Questionnaires were mailed to subjects meeting the criteria. Those that received the questionnaires did so within two weeks of the original filing. Twelve cases were eliminated from the sample because the parties no longer resided at the listed address. Six other cases were eliminated because reconciliation had taken place. Therefore, 263 subjects meeting the criteria may be assumed to have received the Minor Child Questionnaire. If the questionnaire was not returned within two weeks, a follow-up procedure was carried out consisting of telephone calls (Appendix B2) and letters (Appendix B3). Telephone numbers were obtained for 37 non-respondent subjects and 21 of them were reached after a minimum of three calls. This group included the six reconciled couples; of the remaining 15, eight subsequently returned the questionnaires. Of 136 follow-up letters sent to subjects with no telephone listing or those living out of Portland, only five became legitimate respondents. Finally, 114 Minor Child Questionnaires were returned representing approximately a 44% respondent rate. Of these, 108 were returned by April 15, 1971 and were used as the N for evaluating almost all of the results.

2) Demographic Characteristics: The 108 respondents who completed the mailed Minor Child Questionnaire coincidentally fell into equal numbers of mothers and fathers. Although the range of respondent characteristics was very broad, the average parent was in his early 30's, had been married about ten years, had two children and had completed high school as seen in Table 1.

TABLE 1

MEAN DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

	Mothers N = 54	Fathers N = 54
Age	30.67	33.18
Length of Marriage	9.77	10.51
Number of Children	2.09	2.09
Years of Education	12.5	12.5

a. Mother Respondents: Almost all (96%) of the respondents were Caucasian and the majority indicated they were Protestants. Typically their present marriage took place when they were 20 years old while only a quarter reported a previous marriage. Although more than half (59%) were employed, they had usually worked for the most recent

employer less than a year and earned approximately \$2000 per year. Almost two-thirds of the mother respondents had been separated from their husbands for more than a month but about the same percentage said they had lived in the same residence for at least a year. Half reported that they had been separated before and had discussed divorce with their husbands from one to two years prior to filing.

b. Father Respondents: The same identical high percentage of father respondents described themselves as Caucasian (96%) and again the majority stated they were Protestants (56%). The men had married at age 22 or 23 with only a few (11%) reporting a previous marriage. Approximately 85% said they were employed. Two-thirds revealed that they earned at least \$6,000 per year. They had usually worked for their present employer less than five years (60%). A little more than half of these men (62%) had been separated from their wife more than a month; almost half (40%) had been separated before while discussion about divorce had first occurred about a year and a half ago. The identical percentage who said they were separated more than a month also reported they had lived at their present address for less than a year.

D. Interview Sub-Sample

1) Selection and Approach to Subjects: The interview sub-sample of 30 divorcing parents was drawn from the 54 fathers and the 54 mothers who returned a completed questionnaire. To reduce the variability of arrangements, only those respondents who fit the pattern of mother-custody of at least one child were considered eligible for an interview. Questionnaires showed that 91% of the respondents fit into this arrangement. There was the additional practical criterion of selecting only those respondents who live within the Portland Metropolitan Area. Again 91% of the revised pool met the geographical criterion so that the combined restrictive criteria reduced the potential N from 108 to 88. These 88 names were divided into three groups with equal sex ratios for the three research interviewers to contact. To reduce experimental bias, the interviewer knew only the name, address, telephone number and mother-custody facts. He had no knowledge of the respondent's answers to questionnaire items.

Since 94% of the respondents meeting the custody and geographical criteria had provided telephone numbers, this provided the avenue of approach. A minimum of three calls was made to the given numbers and as many as eight were made to some before a case was classified as "unreachable." When telephone contact was made, the interviewer identified him-

self, explained the reason for calling and attempted to arrange an appointment time on the Portland State University campus. (Appendix B4.)

Table 2 shows the pattern of attrition from the pool of questionnaire respondents first restricted by selection criteria and then further modified by the process of making telephone contact or eliciting cooperation.

TABLE 2
ATTRITION PATTERN FROM QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS
TO INTERVIEW SUBJECTS

	Mother	Father	Total
Questionnaire Respondents	54	54	108
Revised Pool From Custody and Geographic Criteria	44	44	88*
Telephone Contact Made	30	26	56
Appointment Made	20	17	37
Interview Completed	17	13	30

*Telephone contact revealed that two additional mothers and two additional fathers had reconciled since the questionnaire was completed so the revised pool of subjects for interview was actually 84 at most.

Appointments were usually made one week to ten days after the questionnaire had been returned and a month to six weeks after the divorce petition had been filed. The N of

30 interviews was reached on April 28th for subjects filing between February 10th and March 10th. Although almost all interviews were conducted at Portland State University, a few cooperative people who were unable to reach Portland State University, were interviewed in their homes. The purpose and procedure of the interview were carefully explained to each subject as the relationship was structured in the beginning of the contact following a standard outline (Appendix B5). The interviewer attempted to get the best possible grasp of the subject's response to a questionnaire item. This required clarifying and probing in some instances. Each subject was encouraged to elaborate on his situation, to ventilate, to make suggestions about the questionnaire, and to give his opinions about the divorce process. The standard was to gain the kind of information available to a clinician using a structured interview schedule. The contact took from a half hour to one hour and 15 minutes. Immediately after the interview, a brief impressionistic summary was written reiterating the interviewer's perception of the parent.

2) Demographic Characteristics of Interview Sample

TABLE 3

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF INTERVIEW SAMPLE

	Mothers N = 17	Fathers N = 13
Age	31.65	32.00
Length of Marriage	10.24	10.90
Number of Children	2.12	2.08
Years of Education	12.88	14.15

Typically both the mothers and fathers who were interviewed were employed. Mothers reported earnings at about the \$4000 to \$6000 level annually. In keeping with their high average educational level, fathers reported at the \$15,000 to \$20,000 level modally. Very few of these mothers (3) or fathers (1) were married before. All of the women and all but one of the men had been separated from their current spouse at least one month. Approximately one-half of the women and one-third of the men had been separated previously. Twelve of the men had lived at their current address less than six months while 14 of the women had lived at their current address at least one year.

III. RESULTS³

A. Questionnaire Content

1) Parent's Relationship: Fourteen per cent of the respondents were still living together three to six weeks after filing for divorce; however, one to three months' separation was the mode. The pattern of the responses showed that the wife typically filed for divorce and that she expressed little interest in reconciliation, whereas 44% of the husbands stated an interest in resuming the marriage. Three-fourths of the respondents denied that they would marry someone else during the year following their divorce. The data showed that nervousness, depression, bad temper, lack of affectional expression, and sex problems were commonly mentioned descriptions of self or spouse. Nevertheless, there was a sex difference in these symptoms or complaints in that alcohol abuse was more likely to be attributed to the fathers, while the subjective possibility of having a "nervous breakdown" was associated more with the mothers (54%). Despite these indicators of stress, only one respondent in ten admitted that he still wanted the partner to be "punished." Approximately 75% of respondents denied that they had ever wished the spouse to be punished. A similar breakdown applied to the rating of current "bitter-

---

³Appendix A contains the item-by-item frequency of response given by the mail sample respondents.

ness": about one in ten reported much or very much bitterness while seven out of ten claimed little or no bitterness. About the same proportion of respondents, three out of four, saw the relationship between the divorcing parents as "friendly" or "businesslike."

2) Discussion About Visiting: Almost no discussion about visiting had taken place between the parents as reported by approximately 25% of both men and women. Although the typical category chosen to describe this discussion was "some," about a third of the parents believed that they had had "much" or "very much" discussion on this topic. The pattern of responses for both fathers and mothers fell into categories suggesting relatively little discussion between parents and children about visiting in that "almost none" was the modal response. Mothers reported somewhat more discussion with their children about visiting the non-custodial parent than fathers did. Although there was a sprinkling of responses indicating that discussion about visiting had taken place with friends, relatives, and counselors, about half the respondents said that they had discussed visiting with a lawyer. Half the respondents said they had discussed visiting with no one at all. In addition, three-fourths or more of the respondents expressed no desire to discuss visiting with a professional counselor although there may have been a little more interest on the

part of fathers (26%). This is not to say that the same proportion of parents believed they had a "very clear" agreement about visiting. In fact, three out of four did not report this. While about half the respondents thought they had at least a "general agreement," a full third of the parents said they had "no agreement" about visiting.

3) Custody and Care: More than four-fifths of the mothers had the children living with them. Almost all the mothers expected the children to live with them after the divorce was granted, while about a quarter of the fathers reported they expected to gain custody. Only 6% of the respondent mothers were not in a household with at least one of the minor children; 9% of the fathers said they lived with at least one minor child and the mother was absent. In supplementing the parents in child care, baby sitters and relatives were reported most frequently. Mothers (25%) commonly said that the parent was "always at home" to care for the children while one in eight related that the children "look after themselves." Fathers reversed the order of these categories: 18% said the parent was "always at home"; 24% said the youngsters "look after themselves." According to both mother and father respondent data, a total of only three respondents marked any "fairly regular" use of pre-schools, nursery schools or day care centers.

4) Visiting and Expectancies

a. Frequency and Arrangements: About half the respondents reported that the fathers were visiting their children at least once a week. One in five or six visited about once or twice a month. The father respondent sample reported somewhat more contact with the children than mothers described. For example, only 4% of fathers said there was no visiting while 16% of mothers checked the category "no visiting" between father and child. According to both mother and father respondents, the modal expectancy of father-child visiting was about once a week. However, a mild directional difference in mother-father respondent replies was again noted. More fathers expected to have custody and to visit more than once a week while none said they expected to contact their children less than once a month in the future. About 10% of mothers believed their husbands would see the children less than once a month in the future. Both mother (83%) and father (78%) respondents, however, seemed to believe they were in agreement about visiting frequency in stating that the mother concurred in the amount of contact they planned. Nearly three-quarters of parent respondents expected these visits to take place mainly on weekends. A very similar pattern of response was given by mothers and fathers about the arrangements for these visits; there should be a special day such as Saturday or the visit

should be "any convenient time as long as there is a telephone call first." Few respondents believed it was necessary to pin down exact hours or, on the other hand, to be so permissive as to allow "drop ins" without warning.

b. Meaning of Visiting: The significance of the father's visits with his children was considered to be "very important" by less than half of the mother respondents but by more than 80% of the fathers. The majority of both parents' responses communicated the belief that the most important purpose of these visits was to make the child feel secure and loved. Neither was there marked disparity in other categories depicting the meaning of visiting, including the small percentages of parents giving much weight to "fathers' rights." Furthermore, the modal response of both mothers (40%) and fathers (30%) was that the father should be able to visit his child even if he never makes support payments. This may be a dimension with polarized attitudes since the next most common response category related fathers' rights to "regular" support payments rather than intermediate choices such as "fairly regular," "some," or "seldom."

c. The Child's Role in Visiting: In considering the children's role and reaction to visiting, there was much in common in the preferences of the mother and father respondents with the exception of the age at which the child should help make visiting decisions. Although the modal response

of all parents was age "13 and older," about half of the fathers believed a child should help make such decisions by age 10 while only a quarter of the mothers agreed. The same trend may be seen in that more mother than father respondents believed a child "should not help make main decisions." A common response for all parents was that the child loved the father "the same" since separation and that the child was neither "easier nor harder to handle" after a visit. While parents agreed that the child loved the father no less since separation, 29% of the mothers marked that the children "don't seem to think about" the father. By contrast this was a low frequency response category selected by father respondents.

d. Visiting Problems: It was only the exceptional parent (8%) who expected "many" or "very many" problems in the visiting of the children. The modal response for both fathers and mothers was "very few" with the fathers expressing this optimistic view even more frequently. In the same vein, an overwhelming percentage of parents expressed the desire for the court to play no role in working out visiting agreements or simply to order the customary "reasonable" visiting privileges. Despite their small numbers, two or three times as many fathers said that the court should provide counselors to help work out visiting arrangements;

twice as many fathers wanted the court to play an active role in spelling out details of visiting and seeing to it that the parents lived up to them.

The types of visiting problems that were expected by the respondents were assessed under headings of arrangements, the visit itself, and attitudes about visiting, i.e., special concerns such as drinking. Between a third and a half of the respondents reported they expected no problems in any of the dimensions examined. Fathers marked the "none" category more than mother respondents under each of the headings but this was especially true of the "attitude" heading. In that classification of problems, almost half the mothers expressed concern about fathers "questioning" children during visits. They also checked drinking, driving, and "other women" as sensitive points a little more frequently. More than a third of the father respondents indicated that there might be a problem in keeping the visits from becoming "just routine."

B. Reliability of Questionnaire Items

1) Source of Variance: A discrepancy in the response given on the mailed questionnaire and on the same item during the interview might derive from several sources: a) ambiguity of the question and response categories; b) indecision or flux in the subject; c) appropriate changes in the

subject's perceptions reflecting situational changes during the elapsed time between the two responses; d) situational response set in completing a mailed questionnaire versus a face-to-face encounter; e) interviewer error or bias. The research team focused primarily on the error variance stemming from the questionnaire per se in order to work toward a revised Minor Child Questionnaire. Therefore, an attempt was made to take "realistic" changes into account in scoring agreement or non-agreement between mailed and interview behavior. An obvious example is that the length of time the parents were separated should average about a month more at the time of the interview.

2) Scoring Agreement Criteria: Stringent criteria were used in scoring agreement between mailed and interview responses so that bias would be in the direction of a rigid test of items. On almost all items, the identical response category had to be chosen in the two situations although in many cases the change might be minor. This procedure was probably inappropriate for five-point scale items; however, Appendix C also includes the product-moment r 's for these five items. In all instances where an item was omitted on either the mailed questionnaire or the personally administered one, "non-agreement" was recorded. Also where an individual insisted on marking more than one response category in either measurement situation, this was considered

"non-agreement." On a few questions, a definite degree of leeway was established in determining concordance. These were question #4 (age), #14 (length of marriage), and #15 (age at marriage) where a difference of one year or less was scored as agreement. On question #13 (income), a discrepancy of \$1000 was tolerated. On question #19 (length of time elapsed since divorce was first discussed), three months deviation was permitted for periods of a year or less; six months for periods of more than a year. In a number of instances, the subject's non-verbal and indirect verbal behavior during the interview was at odds with his category selection in terms of interviewer judgement; nevertheless, the interviewee's formal decision was used in the data analysis.

3) Percentage of Agreement: A determination of agreement or non-agreement was made for 46 items. The average percentage of agreement was 80% with a range of 40% to 100%. If the 80% agreement cut-off is arbitrarily established as the lower limit for "good agreement," 25 of the analyzed questionnaire items met the criterion while 21 must be considered "fair" or "poor." Table 4 shows the breakdown of the "good," "fair," and "poor" items when they are classified as calling for "factual information" versus "feeling or opinion." Most of the "factual" items met the 80% agree-

ment criterion and most of the "feeling or opinion" items met the standard of "fair" degree of agreement.

TABLE 4
PERCENTAGE OF AGREEMENT FOR FACTUAL VS. FEELING
OR OPINION ITEMS

	Good 80% to 100%	Fair 60% to 79%	Poor 40% to 59%	Total
Factual Items	18	1	1	20
Feeling-Opinion Items	7	12	7	26
Total Items	25	13	8	46

An analysis of the percentage of agreement between mailed and interview responses was carried further to examine the content of the same 46 items. Table 5 shows the five broad content categories and the numbers of items which met the standard for "good," "fair" and "poor" agreement. Demographic items, of course, produced the highest proportion of high-agreement items. Two-thirds of the parent relationship items also met the 80% agreement criterion. Some of the low-agreement items in the other content categories were five-

point rating scale items; nevertheless, these ratings all produced statistically significant r 's with a .55 median value.

TABLE 5
PERCENTAGE OF AGREEMENT FOR ITEMS
IN CONTENT CATEGORIES

	Good 80% to 100%	Fair 60% to 79%	Poor 40% to 59%	Total
Demographic	7	1	0	8
Parent Relationship	12	5	1	18
Visitation Discussion	1	1	2	4
Custody Practical Expectancies	2	0	1	3
Present and Expected Visiting	3	6	4	13
Total	25	13	8	46

C. Sample Representativeness

1) Minor Child Questionnaire (MCQ) Mail Sample: The demographic characteristics of the mail sample respondents were described above under II. The age, length of marriage, and number of children for the Minor Child Questionnaire respondents were compared with other statistics from Oregon as shown in Table 6. The Oregon Bureau of Vital Statistics (BVS) report for 1968 pertained to all divorces, but the 1969 Benton County figures (Griffith, et al, 1970) described only the divorces where minor children were involved. There was a substantial similarity between the Minor Child Questionnaire mail respondent sample and the other two as inspection of the table shows. Including all divorces in Oregon, the median age for husbands was 34.8 years and 31.8 years for wives in 1965, which again suggested that the Minor Child Questionnaire mail sample respondents did not markedly deviate on that dimension.

The median duration of marriages was 7.2 years nationally in 1965 but 5.9 in Oregon including all marriages; modal points were one year and 10 to 12 years of marriage. For the same year nationally, the mean number of children per decree was 1.32. These base rates from the National Center for Health Statistics (1969) raise the question of the Minor Child Questionnaire sample being married longer and having

more children but it must be recalled that the Minor Child Questionnaire respondent sample systematically eliminated marriages without minor children.

TABLE 6
AGE, YEARS MARRIED, AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN
OF OREGON SAMPLES

	MCQ 1971		BVS 1968		Benton 1969	
	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father
Age	30.67	33.18	30.90	34.70	31.30	34.30
Years Married	9.77	10.5		8.59		10.15
Number Children	2.09	2.09		2.13		2.05

The educational level of the Minor Child Questionnaire respondents was typically high as observed in Table 7, especially for fathers. Two samples which were drawn from the Family Services Department in 1964 (Karr) and in 1968 (Glaudin) are remarkably similar educationally. Although these samples did include some childless couples, these Family Services Department clients were not unusually young or briefly married. It seems more likely that the 48% of Minor Child Questionnaire father respondents who had been

exposed to some college experience represented a biased sample of divorcing parents; probably the 29% of Minor Child Questionnaire mother respondents who reported some college training also represented a sample bias. Relatively high income levels which were reported appear correlated with the biased educational level of respondents.

TABLE 7
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS

	MCQ 1971		FSD 1968		FSD 1964	
	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father
High School Graduate or Less	71%	52%	77%	71%	80%	72%
Some College or More	29%	48%	23%	29%	20%	28%

2) Interview Sub-Sample: The attrition of subjects from the original pool through the Minor Child Questionnaire mail sample to the Minor Child Questionnaire interview sub-sample provided further opportunity for sample bias as shown in Table 8. However, the factors of age, years of marriage and number of children reported for the interview sample were similar to the total Minor Child Questionnaire sample as shown in Table 8 below.

TABLE 8
AGE, YEARS MARRIED AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN
OF MAIL SAMPLE AND INTERVIEW SUB-SAMPLE

	Mail Sample		Interview Sample	
	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers
Age	30.67	33.18	31.65	32.00
Years Married	9.77	10.51	10.24	10.90
Number Children	2.09	2.09	2.12	2.08

On the other hand, if the mail sample respondents were educationally biased, the interview sub-sample was also biased by definition. Further, the attrition of subjects noted above in Table 8 produced the opportunity for aggravation of the non-representativeness of interviewees. Table 9 probably shows that this was the case in terms of education level. The mean number of years of education for mothers interviewed was 12.88 and 14.15 for fathers.

TABLE 9
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF MAIL SAMPLE
AND INTERVIEW SUB-SAMPLE

	Mail Respondents		Interviewees	
	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers
High School Graduate or Less Education	71%	52%	59%	38%
At Least Some College	29%	48%	41%	62%

IV. DISCUSSION

A. Visiting

The data provided by the sample of parents of minor children painted a benign picture in the first few weeks after a divorce petition is filed. Little difficulty was anticipated by the majority in maintaining a visiting relationship between the child and the non-custodial parent. Large numbers of respondents reported that they were able to cooperate in a friendly or businesslike manner rather than being embittered. Visiting was described as occurring on at least a weekly basis by most of the parents. Many said they expected visiting to be weekly, mainly on a special day such as Saturday, but that visiting might take place at any convenient time as long as a telephone arrangement was made first. Although the parent respondents emphasized that visiting was important, especially for the sense of love and security in the child, they overwhelmingly expressed the desire to work out visiting arrangements for themselves with the court playing a minimal role. The traditional ordering of "reasonable" privileges appeared to meet the parents' needs.

There were several danger signals in the results which suggest that the parent respondents may be engaging in denial and pollyanna optimism doomed to disillusionment in

many cases. First of all, the results showed that discussion between parents about visiting was modest at best. Moreover, few parents reported that they had reached a clear agreement about visiting while one-third admitted they had reached no agreement. If Goode (1956) was correct in relating the amount of discussion to successful outcomes, many parents have disappointments ahead. Father respondents especially seemed to have high hopes for maintaining a very active, significant visiting relationship in contrast to the record of the "fading father" described in the literature. (Eckhardt, 1968.) Does this early-phase level of aspiration correlate with disillusionment and subsequent withdrawal? Still another point where the parents may be in for a shock is the role the children themselves will play in determining the visiting pattern. Parents in the present study expected children to contribute little to important visiting decisions during middle childhood whereas Griffith, et al (1970), found that most children had an active voice by age eight or ten.

Not all the data were benign. For instance, it was common for the interviewers to note more signs of bitterness in the parents than they admitted. In some instances it was observed that this was aggravated by events in the adversary process, such as the allegations of the formal complaint,

which occurred after the parent completed the mailed questionnaire. In addition, there were hints that mothers and fathers viewed the visiting differently in a number of instances: the mothers believed visiting to be less important; to be a threat in terms of the father questioning the child; and to pose hazards associated with wine, women and song. In keeping with Goode's finding (1956), some mothers confided in the interview that the importance of the father visiting would be sharply reduced if the mother remarried. Fathers, for their part, expressed a "responsible" attitude about the purpose of visiting and were more likely than mothers to state that fathers should earn their relationship by support payments; however, several communicated a change of heart during the interview after they had been hit with high support demands in the negotiation process. As for the visiting itself, fathers were a little concerned about routinizing the relationship with the child in the visiting arrangement.

B. Questionnaire Reliability

Since the results showed an 80% average agreement between mailed questionnaire responses and subsequent interview responses, the general reliability of the questionnaire appears encouraging. Factual questions, as might be ex-

pected, had higher reliability than items calling for opinion or feeling, so they should enjoy greater confidence in interpretation. A number of questionnaire items dealing with visiting and visiting expectancies had lower reliability so the data describing visiting must be more cautiously viewed. This may be due in part to the fact that visiting patterns and expectancies sometimes undergo rapid changes so that some variance here could be attributed to the uncertainty of the respondent as much as the ambiguity of the questionnaire.

The comparison of mailed responses with interview reactions provided the basis for revising the Minor Child Questionnaire. Some additional questions will be included in the revised Minor Child Questionnaire as the result of interview experience. These will elicit such information as the parents' expectations in regard to the amount of child support payments and the possibility of a custody fight. A few items will be dropped completely. A number of items should be greatly improved with minor changes in wording. Some of these questions require additional response categories or instructions which permit multiple responses. A number of illustrative changes may be cited as follows:

1. The question on religious preference requires a "none" category.
2. Questions on income must clarify separate or joint income.

3. Questions referring to "previous separation" should specify "from present spouse."
4. The five-point rating scales need to include a "none" category such as "almost none" and "none," "very few" and "none."

Thus, pre-testing has made it possible to vastly improve the Minor Child Questionnaire. In a number of instances, however, changing the wording of an item may increase the number of respondents marking it properly but may also provide an opportunity for evasion for others who might otherwise make a more definitive choice. For example, asking "who wants the divorce more" should probably include a "same" response category; but, adding a "don't know" category to the questions on reconciliation may dilute the predictive value previously established. (Karr, 1964.) It must be kept in mind that something is both gained and lost in making the decisions involved in revising a questionnaire. Some decisions to revise an item should be based on empirical prediction even though respondents are critical of it.⁴

C. Sampling Representativeness

Results appear to show that the present sampling procedure vastly improved upon previous methods (Griffith,

---

⁴The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory is the most frequently implemented clinical instrument used with computerized predictive validity; yet, many of its questions seem odd or naive.

et al, 1970) so that respondents were not atypical in respect to age, length of marriage and number of children. On the other hand, it appears that the present procedure selected respondents who were above average in education and probably in socioeconomic status. This sample bias introduces a significant limitation in interpreting the results from the study of both the content and the reliability findings.

In terms of content, one obvious expected difference between a well-educated sample of respondents and a less privileged group is the problem of money per se in the visiting arrangement. "Too little money" was not frequently indicated as a barrier to visiting by the respondents in the present study where fathers were more commonly concerned with the psychological issue of a "routine" parent-child relationship. The high level of education, especially of the interview sub-sample which formed the basis of the reliability estimate, probably biased the quality of responses in a positive direction, i.e., a less educated sample would probably have greater difficulty in comprehending the items and responding reliably. Lezak (1968) found that respondents who completed high school were consistent in filling out a Personal History Questionnaire, in terms of the criterion of a subsequent interview, but that those with less than a high school education made a number of errors.

The significance of the sample bias may be mitigated by further analysis of the data. First of all, the mail sample respondents should be broken down into sub-samples by dichotomizing at the high school graduation level. Then an item-by-item comparison of the number omitted or answered in a given direction may be carried out. Secondly, the reliability of selected items should be examined in terms of the consistency of the sub-sample of 27 husband-wife pairs who provided data. In addition to providing a new approach to the reliability estimate, this sub-sample may represent a sufficient range educationally to permit a correlation to be established between the number of years of schooling and the reliability index.

The procedure for eliciting the cooperation of a large, representative sample of divorcing parents with minor children requires further improvement. Several points in the process need to be checked. A bias may have been introduced right from the start in terms of those divorce files which had addresses listed. Next, of course, the "other half" of the sample which did not respond despite receiving the questionnaire represents an important source of bias. Although the return rate was satisfactory for a mailed questionnaire, it was hoped that the official letter from the court would stimulate an unusually high level of cooperation. A better grasp of the subjects who did not

respond (who are they?) and increased understanding of their reasons is a necessary step; otherwise, further innovation in the basic approach to divorcing parents is needed.

D. A Dilemma of Preventive Mental Health

Findings from the research team's respondents present a basic dilemma in terms of the best interests of the minor children involved. The data suggest that most parents may be engaging in a significant amount of denial of the pain of family dissolution in divorce. This phenomenon has been a common one in coping with serious illness and death. (Short and Wilson, 1969; Kubler-Ross, 1969.) In any event, it is clear that the parents expressed the view that the court should play a minimal role. Similarly very few were interested in professional help concerning the relationship of the minor child and his absentee parent which is compatible with the San Marin County research. (Paget and Kern, 1960.) Apparently most parents believed that "everything was fine" and the parent-child relationship was a "private" matter. These parents still expect to be the sole determiners of the child's fate as long as they are within the bounds of the same laws that apply to other parents. This attitude may represent a serious obstacle to preventive mental health measures. Although the minor children experiencing family dissolution are in a high risk group, their parents may tend to deny this until there is a crisis.

When the large numbers of divorces are considered, even the relatively low percentage of parents who expressed a desire for professional help represent a great demand for services and opportunity for preventive psychiatry. A full quarter of the father respondents stated this interest while 17% of mothers did so. The fathers might be guided away from the process of unrealistic expectations and subsequent disillusionment. Mothers probably need emotional support in that an entire half admitted that they had experienced the subjective feeling of being on the verge of a "nervous breakdown" at some point.

The evidence of the lack of discussion certainly points the way for one type of intervention. Less than half of the respondents reported that they had talked about visiting arrangements even with their lawyers! The apparent denial of the need to discuss the divorce with the children is another opportunity for mental health education. It is not unusual for parents to try to protect children from tragedies only to increase the child's anxiety and sense of uncertainty. There is every reason to believe that the children experiencing the loss of family ties may manifest an unrecognized depression under these circumstances. Some of the potential preventive measures should directly include the children. In considering the possibility of direct services to children it is interesting to consider the

family constellations of the respondent sample and the distribution of children by age as shown in Tables 10 and 11.

TABLE 10
SIZE OF FAMILY

N = 88

Number of Children	Percentage
One Child Family	29%
Two Children	38%
Three Children	20%
Four or More	13%

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY AGE GROUP

N = 181

Age Group	Number
0 to 2+	35
3 to 5+	37
6 to 8+	38
9 to 11+	31
12 to 14+	20
15 to 17+	20

Just as "divorce counseling" may be useful to separating adult partners, "family divorce therapy" may be especially beneficial to the children. The possibility of initiating this type of service in the future should certainly be examined.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Buss, A. H. Psychopathology. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Coddington, R. Dean. "The Significance of Life Events as Etiologic Factors in the Diseases of Children: I. A Survey of Professional Workers." Unpublished paper, Ohio State University, College of Medicine, 1970.
- Despert, L. "Children of Divorce," Dolphin Books. New York: Doubleday, 1962.
- Eckhardt, K. W. "Deviance, Visibility and Legal Action: The Duty to Support," Social Problems, XV, 1968.
- Glaudin, V., B. Griffith, G. Hack, E. Murphy, A. Wieman, A. Williams, and E. Van Lydegraf. Post-Divorce Visitation of Minor Children: An Exploratory Study. Portland: Portland State University, 1970.
- Glueck, S. and E. T. Glueck. Family Environment and Delinquency. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.
- Goode, W. J. After Divorce. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1956.
- Grollman, E. A. Explaining Divorce to Children. Boston: Beacon Press 1969.
- Hammersley, Richard. Personal communication. Portland, 1970.
- Hansen, R. W. and S. J. Goldberg. "Casework in a Family Court," Social Casework, XLVIII, July, 1967.
- Hunt, M. M. The World of the Formerly Married. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publishing, Inc., 1967.
- Kubler-Ross, Elizabeth. On Death and Dying. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969, pp. 52-58.
- Landis, J. T. "The Trauma of Children When Parents Divorce," Marriage and Family Living, XXII, February, 1960.
- Leslie, G. R. The Family in Social Context. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Locke, H. J. Predicting Adjustment in Marriage. New York: Henry Holt, 1951.

Multnomah County Juvenile Department Annual Report, Donald E. Long Home, Portland, Oregon, 1969.

Paget and Kern. Counseling Services to Parents and Children Involved in Divorce Proceedings. San Bernardino, California, 1960.

Pollack, J. "When Parents Separate," Today's Health, XLV, June, 1967.

Rosenberg, M. Society and the Adolescent Self Image. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Schwartz, A. C. "Reflections on Divorce and Remarriage," Social Casework, XLIX, April, 1958, pp. 213-217.

Short, M. J. and W. P. Wilson. "Roles of Denial in Chronic Hemodialyses," in Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 20, April, 1969, pp. 433-437.

Steinzor, B. When Parents Divorce: A New Approach to New Relations. New York: Pantheon Books, 1969.

Wadlington, W. "The Courts and Children's Rights," Children, XVI, July, August, 1969, pp. 138-142.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

1. Questionnaire and Results From The Mailed Questionnaire
For The Mother of a Minor Child

Today's Date _____

1) Name _____

2) Address _____

3) Telephone _____

4) Age $\bar{X}$ = 30.67 years   S = 7.75 years   N = 53

5) I am: N = 54

1. White.....	(52)	96%
2. Negro.....	(1)	2
3. Oriental.....	(1)	2
4. American Indian.....	( )	
5. other.....	( )	

6) Mark the one that applies to you: N = 53

1. Protestant.....	(33)	62%
2. Catholic.....	(12)	23
3. Jewish.....	(0)	
4. other.....	(8)	15

7) How long have you lived at your current address?   N = 51

1. less than 6 months.....	(13)	26%
2. less than 1 year.....	(5)	10
3. less than 5 years.....	(18)	35
4. more than 5 years.....	(15)	29

8) Please indicate the amount of schooling you have completed: N = 53

1. 0-6 years.....	(0)	
2. 7-9 years.....	(2)	4%
3. 10-12 years.....	(5)	9
4. high school graduate...	(31)	58
5. college - 1 year.....	(4)	8
6. college - 2 years.....	(6)	11
7. college - 3 years.....	(1)	2
8. college graduate.....	(1)	2
9. post graduate.....	(3)	6

 $\bar{X}$ = 12.5 years

9) Are you presently employed? N = 54

yes.....	(31)	57.4%
no.....	(23)	42.6

10) What kind of business or organization do (or did) you work for?

---

11) What is (or was) your job? What kinds of work do (or did) you do?

---

12) How long have you worked for your present or most recent employer? N = 42

1. less than 1 year.....	(24)	57.1%
2. less than 5 years.....	(14)	33.3
3. less than 10 years....	(4)	9.6
4. more than 10 years....	( )	

13) What is your income? N = 43

1. \$0 - \$2,000.....	(15)	34.8%
2. \$2 - \$4,000.....	(13)	30.2
3. \$4 - \$6,000.....	(11)	25.6
4. \$6 - \$8,000.....	(2)	14.7
5. \$8 - \$10,000.....	(1)	2.3
6. \$10 - \$15,000.....	(1)	2.3
7. \$15 - \$20,000.....	( )	
8. \$20 - \$30,000.....	( )	
9. \$30 - \$40,000.....	( )	
10. \$40 - \$50,000.....	( )	
11. \$50 - \$75,000.....	( )	
12. over \$75,000.....	( )	

14) How long have you been married to your present husband? $\bar{X}$ = 9.77 years S = 6.39 years N = 53

15) How old were you when you married your present husband? $\bar{X}$ = 20.20 years S = 4.00 years N = 50

16) Have you been married before? N = 54

yes.....	(13)	24.1%
no.. ..	(41)	75.9

17) How long have you been separated from your present husband? N = 54

1. We are not separated...	(4)	7.4%
2. 1 - 14 days.....	(5)	9.3
3. 15 - 30 days.....	(10)	18.5
4. 1 - 3 months.....	(22)	40.7
5. 4 - 6 months.....	(4)	7.4
6. 7 - 12 months.....	(4)	7.4
7. over 1 year.....	(5)	9.3

18) Have you been separated before? N = 53

yes.....	(27)	50.9%
no.....	(26)	49.1

19) How long ago did you and your husband first talk about getting a divorce? $\bar{X}$ = 22.08 months S = 32.60 months N = 45

20) Who filed for this divorce? N = 54

you.....	(42)	77.8%
your husband.....	(12)	22.2

21) Who wants a divorce more? N = 47

you.....	(38)	80.8%
your husband.....	(9)	19.2

22) Do you want to reconcile? N = 53

yes.....	(5)	9.4%
no.....	(48)	90.6

23) Do you believe your husband wants to reconcile? N = 47

yes.....	(17)	35.2%
no.....	(30)	64.8

24) If a divorce is granted, do you think you will be getting married to someone else during the coming year? N = 54

1. yes.....	(5)	9.3%
2. no.....	(42)	77.7
3. not sure.....	(7)	13.0

- 25) If a divorce is granted, do you think your husband will be getting married to someone else during the coming year? N = 54

1. yes.....	{ 6 }	11.1%
2. no.....	{ 18 }	33.3
3. not sure.....	{ 30 }	55.6

- 26) Place an "X" by all the problems that apply to your husband. You may mark more than one. N = 57

1. nervousness.....	(22)			
2. depression or "blues".....	(22)	0	1	2 or more
3. bad temper.....	(31)	7	4	46
4. coldness or lack of showing affection.	(34)			
5. sex problems.....	(22)			
6. heavy drinking or alcoholism.....	(23)			
7. drug abuse or addiction	(2)			
8. poor work record...	(8)			
9. poor health.....	(5)			
10. none of these problems.....	(7)			

- 27) Place an "X" by all the problems that apply to you. You may mark more than one. N = 56

1. nervousness.....	(35)			
2. depression or "blues".....	(22)	0	1	2 or more
3. bad temper.....	(15)	10	18	28
4. coldness or lack of showing affection.	(8)			
5. sex problems.....	(12)			
6. heavy drinking or alcoholism.....	(1)			
7. drug abuse or addiction.....	(0)			
8. poor work record...	(0)			
9. poor health.....	(8)			
10. none of these problems.....	(10)			

- 28) Have you ever had a nervous breakdown? N = 54
yes.....	{ 5 }	9.3%
no.....	{ 49 }	90.7
- 29) Have you ever felt you were going to have a nervous breakdown? N = 52
yes.....	{ 28 }	53.8%
no.....	{ 24 }	46.2
- 30) Has your husband ever had a nervous breakdown? N = 54
yes.....	{ 4 }	7.4%
no.....	{ 50 }	92.6
- 31) Have you ever wanted your husband to be punished? N = 51
1. yes, still do.....	{ 5 }	9.8%
2. yes, not anymore.....	{ 9 }	12.6
3. no.....	{ 37 }	72.6
- 32) At the present time, do you feel bitter toward your husband? N = 54
1. very much bitterness...	{ 3 }	5.6%
2. much bitterness.....	{ 3 }	5.6
3. some bitterness.....	{ 11 }	20.4
4. a little bitterness....	{ 9 }	16.7
5. no bitterness.....	{ 28 }	51.9
- 33) At the present time, how would you describe your relationship with your husband? N = 47
1. friendly.....	{ 21 }	44.7%
2. business-like.....	{ 13 }	27.7
3. angry and silent.....	{ 2 }	4.2
4. angry and fighting.....	{ 2 }	4.2
5. other.....	{ 9 }	19.2
- describe _____
- 34) How much discussion have you had with your husband about visiting your children? N = 52
1. almost none.....	{ 12 }	23.1%
2. little.....	{ 10 }	19.2
3. some.....	{ 12 }	23.1
4. much.....	{ 8 }	15.4
5. very much.....	{ 10 }	19.2

- 35) How much discussion have you had with one or more of the children about visiting? N = 48

1. almost none.....	(18)	37.5%
2. little.....	(5)	10.4
3. some.....	(17)	35.4
4. much.....	(5)	10.4
5. very much.....	(3)	6.3

- 36) Who has given you advice or counseling about the visiting of the children? You may mark more than one. N = 53

1. friends.....	(6)			
2. relatives.....	(4)			
3. lawyer.....	(26)	0	1	2 or more
4. minister, priest		24	14	15
or rabbi.....	(3)			
5. medical doctor.....	(2)			
6. social worker.....	(2)			
7. psychiatrist.....	(2)			
8. psychologist.....	(4)			
9. Family Services				
Department of the				
Multnomah County				
Court.....	(1)			
10. no one.....	(24)			

- 37) Would you like to have professional advice or counseling about the visiting of the children? N = 52

yes.....	(9)	17.3%
no.....	(43)	82.7

- 38) Have you and your husband reached an agreement about visiting your children? N = 51

1. very clear agreement.	(13)	25.5%
2. general agreement...	(15)	29.4
3. some agreement.....	(6)	11.8
4. little agreement....	(0)	
5. no agreement.....	(17)	33.3

39) Are any of your minor children (18 and under) living with you now? N = 53

1. no.....	(3)	5.7%
2. yes, I'm living with my husband and children.....	(6)	11.3
3. yes, at least one of my children is living with me.....	(44)	83.0

40) At present, when the children are not in school, does anyone help take care of them in addition to the parents? N = 48

1. baby sitter comes in once in a while.....	(5)	10.4%
2. baby sitter comes in fairly regularly.....	(5)	10.4
3. neighborhood baby sitter's home fairly regularly.....	(8)	16.7
4. nursery school or pre-school fairly regularly.....	(1)	2.1
5. day care center fairly regularly.....	(1)	2.1
6. relatives.....	(10)	20.8
7. no, children look after them- selves.....	(6)	12.5
8. no, parent is always at home.....	(12)	25.0

41) If a divorce is granted, where do you expect the children to live? N = 54

1. with my husband.....	(2)	3.7%
2. with me.....	(50)	92.6
3. at least one with my husband and at least one with me.....	(2)	3.7
4. other..... explain	(0)	

42) If a divorce is granted, do you expect your husband to work for pay outside the home? N = 42

1. yes.....	(29)	69.1%
2. no.....	(3)	7.1
3. not sure.....	(10)	23.8

43) How frequently has your husband visited the children during your separation? N = 49

1. not separated.....	(3)	6.1%
2. separated but all children are with him.....	(2)	4.1
3. more than once a week.....	(11)	22.5
4. about once a week.....	(10)	20.4
5. about twice a month.....	(6)	12.3
6. about once a month.....	(4)	8.2
7. less than once a month.....	(2)	4.1
8. every few months.....	(3)	6.1
9. on special occasions and vacations only.....	(0)	
10. less than once a year.....	(0)	
11. none.....	(8)	16.2

44) During your separation, what has been the effect of your husband's visiting the children? N = 46

1. no separation.....	(3)	6.5%
2. no visiting.....	(5)	10.9
3. all the children live with him..	(2)	4.4
4. children are all too young to show any effect.....	(7)	15.2
5. makes them easier for me to handle.....	(0)	
6. makes them harder for me to handle.....	(11)	23.9
7. same, not easier or harder for me to handle.....	(18)	39.1

45) During your separation, what are the children's feelings toward your husband? N = 48

1. no separation.....	(3)	6.3%
2. they seem to love him more.....	(1)	2.1
3. they seem to love him the same..	(30)	62.5
4. they seem to love him less.....	(0)	
5. they don't seem to think about him.....	(14)	29.1

46) How frequently do you expect your husband to visit the children in the future? N = 41

1. expect them all to live with him..	(3)	7.3%
2. more than once a week.....	(3)	7.3
3. about once a week.....	(18)	43.9
4. about twice a month.....	(9)	22.1
5. about once a month.....	(4)	9.8
6. less than once a month.....	(0)	
7. every few months.....	(1)	2.4
8. on special occasions or vaca- tions only.....	(1)	2.4
9. less than once a year.....	(1)	2.4
10. none.....	(1)	2.4

47) Do you want your husband to visit the children? N = 48

1. not at all.....	(2)	4.2%
2. I want him to visit less fre- quently than he expects to visit.	(2)	4.2
3. I want him to visit more fre- quently than he expects to visit.	(4)	8.3
4. I want him to visit about the same as he expects to visit.....	(40)	83.3

48) When do you expect your husband to visit the children in the future? N = 44

1. mainly on weekends.....	(30)	68.1%
2. mainly during the week.....	(4)	9.1
3. mainly at special times like birthdays and holidays.....	(2)	4.6
4. mainly his vacation or the chil- dren's summer vacation.....	(3)	6.8
5. I do not expect him to visit.....	(3)	6.8
6. I expect the children to be liv- ing with him.....	(2)	4.6

49) What arrangements should be made for your husband's visits? N = 42

1. arrange special hours such as 12 noon to 5:00 p.m.....	(1)	2.4%
2. arrange special days such as on Saturdays.....	(8)	19.2
3. arrange special days such as holidays and vacations.....	(0)	
4. arrange any time that is convenient as long as there is a telephone call first.....	(27)	64.3
5. by just dropping in on the children any time.....	(2)	4.7
6. no visiting.....	(2)	4.7
7. I expect the children to be living with him.....	(2)	4.7

50) At what age do you think a child should help make the main decisions about visiting with your husband? N = 52

1. should not help make main decisions.....	(9)	17.3%
2. 13 and older.....	(22)	42.3
3. 11 to 12.....	(8)	15.4
4. 9 to 10.....	(5)	9.6
5. 6 to 8.....	(7)	13.5
6. 3 to 5.....	(1)	1.9

51) How important do you feel it is for your husband to visit the children in the future? N = 52

1. not important at all.....	(2)	3.8%
2. unimportant.....	(1)	1.9
3. not sure.....	(13)	25.0
4. important.....	(14)	26.9
5. very important.....	(22)	42.4

52) What do you believe is the most important purpose of your husband visiting the children? N = 40

1. no real purpose or value.....	(0)	
2. just to maintain contact between father and child.....	(5)	12.5%
3. help the child feel secure or loved.....	(27)	67.5
4. help train the child.....	(0)	
5. every father has a right to visit his child.....	(8)	20.0

53) What is the connection between your husband paying child support and visiting the children? N = 45

1. He should have the right to visit as long as his payments are regular.... (14) 31.1%
2. He should have the right to visit if his payments are usually regular.... (7) 15.5
3. He should have the right to visit as long as he makes some payments..... (2) 4.4
4. He should have the right to visit even if he seldom makes payments.... (3) 6.6
5. He should have the right to visit even if he never makes a payment.... (18) 40.0
6. I expect all the minor children to live with him..... (1) 2.3

54) What part should the court play in working out a visiting agreement? N = 45

1. none..... (8) 17.8%
2. order "reasonable" visiting privileges and leave details to parents.. (26) 57.8
3. provide counselors to help parents work out details of visiting agreements..... (2) 4.4
4. provide counselors for parents if problems arise in visiting agreements ..... (1) 2.2
5. spell out the details of visiting agreement after checking with the parents or their lawyers..... (4) 8.9
6. spell out the details of visiting agreement after checking with the parents and their lawyers and see to it that the parents live up to the agreement..... (4) 8.9

55) Do you expect any problems with your husband visiting the children? N = 52

1. very few..... (23) 44.2%
2. few..... (7) 13.5
3. some..... (18) 34.6
4. many..... (3) 5.8
5. very many..... (1) 1.9

56) What problems do you expect your husband to have in arranging visits with the children? You may mark more than one. N = 52

1. live too far away...	{ 9 }			
2. too little money....	{ 2 }	0	1	2 or more
3. agreeing on visiting times.....	(14)	24	21	8
4. picking up and returning the children.....	{10}			
5. none.....	{24}			
6. expect children to live with him.....	(1)			

57) What problems do you expect your husband to have while visiting the children? You may mark more than one. N = 51

1. where the visit takes place.....	(14)			
2. uncomfortable being with the children in a visiting situation.....	(11)	0	1	2 or more
3. things for the children to do.....	(12)	18	20	13
4. keeping the visits from becoming "just routine".....	{12}			
5. none.....	{ 8 }			

58) What problems do you expect to have with your husband's attitude about visiting the children? You may mark more than one. N = 52

1. about his drinking..	(11)			
2. about his friendship with other women.....	(12)	0	1	2 or more
3. about his automobile driving.....	{ 8 }	18	16	18
4. about religion.....	{ 4 }			
5. about questioning the children during a visit.....	{23}			
6. none.....	{18}			

- 59) List all your children from the present marriage starting with the oldest: N = 53

	<u>First Name</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Relationship</u>
1.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
2.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
3.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
4.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
5.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
6.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
7.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
8.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter

Number of children..... $\bar{X} = 2.09$

APPENDIX A

2. Questionnaire and Results From The Mailed Questionnaire
For The Father of a Minor Child

Today's Date _____

1) Name _____

2) Address _____

3) Telephone _____

4) Age $\bar{X} = 33.19$ years $S = 8.75$ years $N = 54$ 5) I am: $N = 54$

1. White.....	(51)	96.3%
2. Negro.....	(1)	1.9
3. Oriental.....	( )	
4. American Indian.....	(1)	1.9
5. other.....	(1)	1.9

6) Mark the one that applies to you: $N = 54$

1. Protestant.....	(30)	55.5%
2. Catholic.....	(10)	18.5
3. Jewish.....	( )	
4. other.....	(14)	26.0

7) How long have you lived at your current address? $N = 54$

1. less than 6 months.....	(25)	46.3%
2. less than 1 year.....	(9)	16.6
3. less than 5 years.....	(15)	27.7
4. more than 5 years.....	(5)	9.4

8) Please indicate the amount of schooling you have completed: $N = 54$

1. 0-6 years.....	(1)	1.9%
2. 7-9 years.....	(5)	9.3
3. 10-12 years.....	(5)	9.3
4. high school graduate...	(17)	31.5
5. college - 1 year.....	(8)	14.8
6. college - 2 years.....	(7)	12.9
7. college - 3 years.....	(2)	3.7
8. college graduate.....	(5)	9.4
9. post graduate.....	(4)	7.2

 $\bar{X} = 12.5$ years

- 9) Are you presently employed? N = 53
yes.....	(45)	84.9%
no.....	(8)	15.1
- 10) What kind of business or organization do (or did) you work for?
-
- 11) What is (or was) your job? What kinds of work do (or did) you do?
-
- 12) How long have you worked for your present or most recent employer? N = 52
1. less than 1 year.....	(5)	9.6%
2. less than 5 years.....	(26)	50.0
3. less than 10 years....	(12)	23.1
4. more than 10 years....	(9)	17.3
- 13) What is your income? N = 49
1. \$0 - \$2,000.....	(3)	6.1%
2. \$2 - \$4,000.....	(4)	8.2
3. \$4 - \$6,000.....	(9)	18.4
4. \$6 - \$8,000.....	(8)	16.3
5. \$8 - \$10,000.....	(10)	20.4
6. \$10 - \$15,000.....	(9)	18.4
7. \$15 - \$20,000.....	(5)	10.2
8. \$20 - \$30,000.....	(0)	
9. \$30 - \$40,000.....	(1)	2.0
10. \$40 - \$50,000.....	(0)	
11. \$50 - \$75,000.....	(0)	
12. over \$75,000.....	(0)	
- 14) How long have you been married to your present wife? $\bar{X} = 10.51$ years S = 7.15 years N = 54
- 15) How old were you when you married your present wife? $\bar{X} = 22.49$ years S = 4.01 years N = 53
- 16) Have you been married before? N = 53
yes.....	(6)	11.3%
no	(47)	88.7

- 17) How long have you been separated from your present wife? N = 53
1. We are not separated...	(10)	18.9%
2. 1 - 14 days.....	(3)	5.7
3. 15 - 30 days.....	(7)	13.2
4. 1 - 3 months.....	(14)	26.4
5. 4 - 6 months.....	(10)	18.9
6. 7 - 12 months.....	(6)	11.3
7. over 1 year.....	(3)	5.6
- 18) Have you been separated before? N = 54
yes.....	(21)	38.9%
no.....	(33)	61.1
- 19) How long ago did you and your wife first talk about getting a divorce? $\bar{X} = 17.24$ months S = 32.6 months
N = 45
- 20) Who filed for this divorce? N = 54
you.....	(12)	22.2%
your wife.....	(42)	77.8
- 21) Who wants a divorce more? N = 47
you.....	(10)	21.3%
your wife.....	(37)	78.7
- 22) Do you want to reconcile? N = 48
yes.....	(21)	43.8%
no.....	(27)	56.2
- 23) Do you believe your wife wants to reconcile N = 49
yes.....	(8)	16.3%
no.....	(41)	83.7
- 24) If a divorce is granted, do you think you will be getting married to someone else during the coming year?
N = 54
1. yes.....	(1)	2.0%
2. no.....	(43)	79.6
3. not sure.....	(10)	18.4

- 25) If a divorce is granted, do you think your wife will be getting married to someone else during the coming year? N = 53

1. yes.....	(6)	11.3%
2. no.....	(15)	28.3
3. not sure.....	(32)	60.4

- 26) Place an "X" by all the problems that apply to your wife. You may mark more than one. N = 57

1. nervousness.....	(33)			
2. depression or "blues".....	(36)	0	1	2 or more
3. bad temper.....	(28)	3	8	46
4. coldness or lack of showing affection.	(32)			
5. sex problems.....	(24)			
6. heavy drinking or alcoholism.....	(4)			
7. drug abuse or addiction.....	(3)			
8. poor work record...	(6)			
9. poor health.....	(9)			
10. none of these problems.....	(3)			

- 27) Place an "X" by all the problems that apply to you. You may mark more than one. N = 55

1. nervousness.....	(28)			
2. depression or "blues".....	(23)	0	1	2 or more
3. bad temper.....	(19)	6	16	33
4. coldness or lack of showing affection.	(15)			
5. sex problems.....	(7)			
6. heavy drinking or alcoholism.....	(6)			
7. drug abuse or addiction.....	(0)			
8. poor work record...	(3)			
9. poor health.....	(3)			
10. none of these problems.....	(6)			

- 28) Have you ever had a nervous breakdown? N = 52
yes.....	{ 1 }	1.9%
no.....	{ 51 }	98.1
- 29) Have you ever felt you were going to have a nervous breakdown? N = 53
yes.....	{ 11 }	20.8%
no.....	{ 42 }	79.2
- 30) Has your wife ever had a nervous breakdown? N = 50
yes.....	{ 5 }	10.0%
no.....	{ 45 }	90.0
- 31) Have you ever wanted your wife to be punished? N = 52
1. yes, still do.....	{ 5 }	9.6%
2. yes, not anymore.....	{ 7 }	13.5
3. no.....	{ 40 }	76.9
- 32) At the present time, do you feel bitter toward your wife? N = 53
1. very much bitterness...	{ 1 }	1.9%
2. much bitterness.....	{ 3 }	5.7
3. some bitterness.....	{ 6 }	11.3
4. a little bitterness....	{ 17 }	32.1
5. no bitterness.....	{ 26 }	49.0
- 33) At the present time, how would you describe your relationship with your wife? N = 48
1. friendly.....	{ 15 }	31.3%
2. business-like.....	{ 21 }	43.7
3. angry and silent.....	{ 10 }	20.8
4. angry and fighting....	{ 1 }	2.1
5. other.....	{ 1 }	2.1
describe		
-
- 34) How much discussion have you had with your wife about visiting your children? N = 53
1. almost none.....	{ 14 }	26.4%
2. little.....	{ 5 }	9.4
3. some.....	{ 17 }	32.1
4. much.....	{ 10 }	18.8
5. very much.....	{ 7 }	13.3

- 35) How much discussion have you had with one or more of the children about visiting? N = 49

1. almost none.....	(25)	51.0%
2. little.....	(5)	10.2
3. some.....	(9)	18.4
4. much.....	(6)	12.2
5. very much.....	(4)	8.2

- 36) Who has given you advice or counseling about the visiting of the children? You may mark more than one. N = 57

1. friends.....	(8)			
2. relatives.....	(9)	0	1	2 or more
3. lawyer.....	(22)	26	20	11
4. minister, priest or rabbi.....	(2)			
5. medical doctor.....	(0)			
6. social worker.....	(0)			
7. psychiatrist.....	(0)			
8. psychologist.....	(2)			
9. Family Services Department of the Multnomah County Court.....	(3)			
10. No one.....	(28)			

- 37) Would you like to have professional advice or counseling about the visiting of the children? N = 50

yes.....	(13)	26%
no.....	(37)	74

- 38) Have you and your wife reached an agreement about visiting your children? N = 54

1. very clear agreement..	(14)	25.6%
2. general agreement.....	(13)	24.1
3. some agreement.....	(5)	9.3
4. little agreement.....	(2)	3.7
5. no agreement.....	(20)	37.3

39) Are any of your minor children (18 and under) living with you now? N = 53

1. no.....	(39)	73.6%
2. yes, I'm living with my wife and children.....	(9)	17.0
3. yes, at least one of my children is living with me.....	(5)	9.4

40) At present, when the children are not in school, does anyone help take care of them in addition to the parents? N = 34

1. baby sitter comes in once in a while.....	(2)	5.9%
2. baby sitter comes in fairly regularly.....	(3)	8.8
3. neighborhood baby sitter's home fairly regularly.....	(4)	11.8
4. nursery school or pre-school fairly regularly.....	(1)	2.9
5. day care center fairly regularly.....	{0}	
6. relatives.....	{10}	29.4
7. no, children look after them- selves.....	{8}	23.5
8. no, parent is always at home.....	{6}	17.7

41) If a divorce is granted, where do you expect the children to live? N = 54

1. with my wife.....	{41}	75.9%
2. with me.....	{12}	22.2
3. at least one with my wife and at least one with me.....	{1}	1.9
4. other..... explain _____	{0}	

42) If a divorce is granted, do you expect your wife to work for pay outside the home? N = 53

1. yes.....	{39}	73.6%
2. no.....	{6}	11.3
3. not sure.....	{8}	15.1

43) How frequently have you visited the children during your separation? N = 54

1. not separated.....	(9)	16.6%
2. separated but all the children are with me...	(4)	7.4
3. more than once a week...	(12)	22.2
4. about once a week.....	(17)	31.5
5. about twice a month.....	(5)	9.3
6. about once a month.....	(4)	7.4
7. less than once a month..	(0)	
8. every few months.....	(0)	
9. on special occasions and vacations only.....	(0)	
10. less than once a year...	(1)	1.9
11. none.....	(2)	3.7

44) During your separation, what has been the effect of your visiting the children? N = 51

1. no separation.....	(9)	17.6%
2. no visiting.....	(2)	3.9
3. all the children live with me.....	(4)	7.8
4. children are all too young to show any effect.....	(11)	21.6
5. makes them easier to handle for the mother..	(3)	5.9
6. makes them harder to handle for the mother..	(4)	7.8
7. same, not easier or harder to handle for the mother.....	(20)	39.4

45) During your separation, what are the children's feelings toward you? N = 52

1. no separation.....	(10)	19.2%
2. they seem to love me more.....	(15)	28.8
3. they seem to love me the same.....	(24)	46.2
4. they seem to love me less.....	(1)	1.9
5. they don't seem to think about me.....	(2)	3.9

46) How frequently do you expect to visit the children in the future? N = 52

1. expect them all to live with me...	(11)	21.2%
2. more than once a week.....	(10)	19.2
3. about once a week.....	(20)	38.5
4. about twice a month.....	(8)	15.4
5. about once a month.....	(3)	5.9
6. less than once a month.....	(0)	
7. every few months.....	(0)	
8. on special occasions or vaca- tions only.....	(0)	
9. less than once a year.....	(0)	
10. none.....	(0)	

47) Do you think your wife wants you to visit the children? N = 46

1. She does not want me to visit with them at all.....	(2)	4.3%
2. She wants me to visit less fre- quently than I expect to visit.....	(7)	15.2
3. She wants me to visit more fre- quently than I expect to visit.....	(1)	2.2
4. She wants me to visit about the same as I expect to visit.....	(36)	78.3

48) When do you expect to visit the children in the future? N = 49

1. mainly on weekends.....	(35)	71.4%
2. mainly during the week.....	(2)	4.2
3. mainly at special times like birthdays and holidays.....	(1)	2.0
4. mainly my vacation or the chil- dren's summer vacation.....	(1)	2.0
5. I do not expect to visit.....	(0)	
6. I expect the children to be liv- ing with me.....	(10)	20.4

49) What arrangements should be made for your visits?
N = 47

1. arrange special hours such as 12 noon to 5:00 p.m.....	(1)	2.1%
2. arrange special days such as on Saturdays.....	(11)	23.4
3. arrange special days such as holidays and vacations.....	(0)	
4. arrange any time that is con- venient as long as there is a telephone call first.....	(24)	51.1
5. by just dropping in on the chil- dren any time.....	(3)	6.4
6. no visiting.....	(1)	2.1
7. expect the children to be living with me.....	(7)	14.9

50) At what age do you think a child should help make the
main decisions about visiting with you? N = 50

1. should not help make main deci- sions.....	(5)	10.0%
2. 13 and older.....	(14)	28.0
3. 11 to 12.....	(5)	10.0
4. 9 to 10.....	(10)	20.0
5. 6 to 8.....	(11)	22.0
6. 3 to 5.....	(5)	10.0

51) How important do you feel it is for you to visit the
children in the future? N = 53

1. not important at all.....	(0)	
2. unimportant.....	(0)	
3. not sure.....	(5)	9.4%
4. important.....	(5)	9.4
5. very important.....	(43)	81.2

52) What do you believe is the most important purpose of
your visiting the children? N = 37

1. no real purpose or value.....	(0)	
2. just to maintain contact between father and child.....	(7)	18.9%
3. help the child feel secure or loved.....	(23)	62.2
4. help train the child.....	(2)	5.4
5. every father has a right to visit his child.....	(5)	13.5

- 53) What is the connection between your paying child support and visiting the children? N = 46
1. I should have the right to visit as long as my payments are regular.... (12) 26.1%
  2. I should have the right to visit if my payments are usually regular.... (7) 15.2
  3. I should have the right to visit as long as I make some payments..... (1) 2.2
  4. I should have the right to visit even if I seldom make payments..... (2) 4.3
  5. I should have the right to visit even if I never make a payment..... (14) 30.4
  6. I expect all the minor children to live with me..... (10) 21.7
- 54) What part should the court play in working out a visiting agreement? N = 46
1. none..... (13) 28.3%
  2. order "reasonable" visiting privileges and leave details to parents. (15) 32.6
  3. provide counselors to help parents work out details of visiting agreements..... (4) 8.7
  4. provide counselors for parents if problems arise in visiting arrangements..... (5) 10.9
  5. spell out the details of visiting agreement after checking with the parents or their lawyers..... (0)
  6. spell out the details of visiting agreement after checking with the parents and their lawyers and see to it that the parents live up to the agreement..... (9) 19.5
- 55) Do you expect any problems in visiting the children? N = 49
1. very few..... (35) 71.4%
  2. few..... (5) 10.2
  3. some..... (5) 10.2
  4. many..... (2) 4.1
  5. very many..... (2) 4.1

- 56) What problems do you expect to have in arranging your visits with the children? You may mark more than one. N = 47

1. live too far away....	(6)			
2. too little money.....	(3)	0	1	2 or more
3. agreeing on visiting times.....	(13)	28	14	5
4. picking up and returning the children.....	(5)			
5. none.....	(28)			
6. expect children to live with me.....	(10)			

- 57) What problems do you expect to have while visiting the children? You may mark more than one. N = 57

1. where the visit takes place.....	(8)			
2. uncomfortable being with the children in a visiting situation.....	(11)	0	1	2 or more
3. things for the children to do.....	(5)	25	20	12
4. keeping the visits from becoming "just routine".....	(21)			
5. none.....	(25)			

- 58) What problems do you expect to have with your wife's attitude about your visiting the children? You may mark more than one. N = 57

1. about my drinking....	(2)			
2. about my friendship with other women....	(4)	0	1	2 or more
3. about my automobile driving.....	(1)	40	16	1
4. about religion.....	(2)			
5. about her questioning the children after a visit.....	(10)			
6. none.....	(40)			

- 59) List all your children from the present marriage starting with the oldest: N = 54

	<u>First Name</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Relationship</u>
1.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
2.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
3.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
4.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
5.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
6.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
7.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter
8.	_____	___	( ) son ( ) daughter

Number of children..... $\bar{X} = 2.09$

APPENDIX B

1. Letter From Judge Jean L. Lewis to Divorcing Parents
Explaining the Purpose of the Research

"Circuit Court of Oregon
"Fourth Judicial District - Dept. No. 12
"County Courthouse
"Portland, Oregon 97204

"Jean L. Lewis
"Judge

"Dear

"The Domestic Relations Department of the Circuit Court for Multnomah County is concerned with the welfare of children of divorced parents. Of special interest to us are the ways parents are able to work out a visiting arrangement between minor children and the parent who does not live with them. Many of these programs work very well. Other families constantly have problems. Since it is our responsibility to attempt to fix a visitation program that has meaning and value to the parties, we are interested in obtaining accurate information about what programs are successful and those that are not so that we might be of more assistance to other families in the future.

"We are cooperating with a research team from Portland State University, and I would appreciate your completing the enclosed questionnaire in order to aid the researchers in gathering specific information.

"The information that is being requested is for research purposes only. Your reply will be strictly confidential. Your completed questionnaire will go directly to the research team and will not be used or made available to the court. Your answers to the questions will not be seen by any Judge, attorney, or officer of the court. Your questionnaire will not be seen by your spouse.

"After the research workers have combined your answers with many others, general conclusions may be reached after several months of study.

"As a parent, I am sure you are as concerned as I about helping children adjust to divorce. I am counting on your cooperation to answer the questionnaire accurately and to mail it in promptly.

"Yours very truly,

"JEAN L. LEWIS
"Circuit Judge"

APPENDIX B

2. Interviewer: Follow-up Phone Call Requesting
That the Questionnaire Be ReturnedI. Introduction

My name is _____. I am part of the
Portland State Research Team working with Judge Lewis.

II. Ask them to return it if they received it.

Judge Lewis sent you a letter and questionnaire a few weeks ago. Did you receive it? We haven't received it back and were wondering if you had any questions about it? (Answer any questions to the best of your ability and try to convince them to return the questionnaire.)

Judge Lewis is most anxious to have these questionnaires returned as soon as possible so we can complete the research. Your answers are all strictly confidential and will not be seen by anyone other than the research team members.

We would appreciate it if you would fill out the questionnaire and return it this week. Thank you so much.

APPENDIX B

3. Follow-up Letter Requesting That
The Questionnaire Be Returned

MCA Research Team
School of Social Work
Portland State University
1632 S. W. 12th Ave.
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear

A letter and questionnaire were recently mailed to you from Judge Lewis regarding visitation of minor children after their parents file for divorce. The questionnaire was to be returned to the Portland State University research team which is recording the results. We have not received your questionnaire. Judge Lewis is most anxious to have these returned as soon as possible so that the team can complete the research.

As Judge Lewis stated in her letter this information is strictly confidential and will not be seen by anyone but the research team. Please send yours in this week.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Vincent Glaudin, Ph.D.
Director, MCA Research Team

VG:vc

APPENDIX B

4. Interviewer: Phoning To Make Interview AppointmentI. Introduction

My name is _____. I am part of the Portland State University Research Team working with Judge Lewis. You filled out a questionnaire a few weeks ago regarding visitation of minor children. We really appreciate your filling it out for us.

II. Asking them to come in for an appointment

We understand that often it isn't enough to fill out a questionnaire and that it is much more helpful to talk to someone in person. Therefore, we're asking everyone who filled out a questionnaire to come in for an interview. Like the questionnaire, it will be strictly confidential. We certainly would appreciate it if you could come in. (Arrange a time.)

Thank you so much. I'm looking forward to seeing you then.

APPENDIX B

5. Interviewer: At Beginning of InterviewI. Introduction

Hello, I'm _____. Won't you come in?

II. Small Talk to Put Interviewee at Ease

I hope you didn't have too much trouble finding this office, etc.

III. Explanation of Interview

You might have some questions about why I asked you here. (Pause - answer any questions.) As I said on the phone, we realize that a written questionnaire is often inadequate to really know a person, and we would like to hear in your own words the responses to our questions. Furthermore, you may be able to help us by adding things that are important or telling us where questions are unclear. Having gone through this experience yourself, you know better than we do what is important.

Also, we're checking on the clarity of the questionnaire and not on your consistency. There may be answers that you want to change. Please feel free to do so. If the situation has changed significantly in any way since you filled out the questionnaire it would help if you point that out.

I haven't seen your original questionnaire, so I don't know how you answered the questions the first time. The interviewers do not see any of the questionnaires before we interview.

Do you have any questions? If not, let's begin. I'd like you to help me fill this out.

IV. At Conclusion

Is there anything else you'd like to add or discuss?

Thank you so much for coming in. You have been most helpful and we really appreciate it.

APPENDIX C

Number, Percentage, and Correlation of Response Agreement
Between Mailed-in Questionnaires and the 30 Interviews

<u>No. of</u> <u>Question</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Number</u> <u>of</u> <u>Agreement</u>	<u>Percentage</u> <u>of</u> <u>Agreement</u>	<u>r</u>
4.	Age	30	100	
5.	Race	30	100	
6.	Religion	29	97	
7.	How long have you lived at your current address?	30	100	
8.	Please indicate the amount of schooling you have completed:	26	87	
9.	Are you presently employed?	28	93	
12.	How long have you worked for your present or most recent employer?	28	97	
13.	What is your income?	22	73	
14.	How long have you been married to your present wife (husband)?	30	100	
15.	How old were you when you married your present wife (husband)?	29	97	
16.	Have you been married before?	30	100	
17.	How long have you been separated from your pre- sent wife (husband)?	30	100	
18.	Have you been separated before?	27	90	

<u>No. of Question</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Number of Agreement</u>	<u>Percentage of Agreement</u>	<u>r</u>
19.	How long ago did you and your wife (hus- band) first talk about getting a divorce?	15	50	
20.	Who filed for this divorce?	29	97	
21.	Who wants a divorce more?	28	93	
22.	Do you want to reconcile?	25	83	
23.	Do you believe your wife (husband) wants to reconcile?	23	77	
24.	If a divorce is granted, do you think you will be getting married to some- one else during the coming year?	27	90	
25.	If a divorce is granted, do you think your wife (husband) will be get- ting married to some- one else during the coming year?	21	70	
28.	Have you ever had a nervous breakdown?	27	90	
29.	Have you ever felt you were going to have a nervous breakdown?	25	83	
30.	Has your wife (husband) ever had a nervous breakdown?	28	93	
31.	Have you ever wanted your wife (husband) to be punished?	23	77	

<u>No. of Question</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Number of Agreement</u>	<u>Percentage of Agreement</u>	<u>r</u>
32.	At the present time, do you feel bitter toward your wife (husband)?	19	63	.55
33.	At the present time, how would you describe your relationship with your wife (husband)?	22	73	
34.	How much discussion have you had with your wife (husband) about visiting your children?	16	53	.46
35.	How much discussion have you had with one or more of the children about visiting?	16	53	.55
37.	Would you like to have professional advice or counseling about the visiting of the children?	26	87	
38.	Have you and your wife (husband) reached an agreement about visiting your children?	20	67	.28
39.	Are any of your minor children (18 and under) living with you now?	29	97	
40.	At present, when the children are not in school, does anyone help take care of them in addition to the parents?	16	53	
41.	If a divorce is granted, where do you expect the children to live?	29	97	

<u>No. of</u> <u>Question</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Number</u> <u>of</u> <u>Agreement</u>	<u>Percentage</u> <u>of</u> <u>Agreement</u>	<u>r</u>
42.	If a divorce is granted, do you expect your wife (husband) to work for pay outside the home?	22	73	
43.	How frequently have you (has your husband) visited the children during the separation?	27	90	
44.	During your separation, what has been the effect of your (husband's) visiting the children?	17	57	
45.	During your separation, what are the children's feelings toward you (your husband)?	19	63	
46.	How frequently do you expect (your husband) to visit the children in the future?	18	60	
47.	Do you think your wife wants you (Do you want your husband) to visit the children?	24	80	
48.	When do you expect (your husband) to visit the children in the future?	21	70	
49.	What arrangements should be made for your (husband's) visits?	20	67	
50.	At what age do you think a child should help make the main decisions about visiting with you (your husband)?	12	40	

<u>No. of Question</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Number of Agreement</u>	<u>Percentage of Agreement</u>	<u>r</u>
51.	How important do you feel it is for you (your husband) to visit the children in the future?	21	70	.39
52.	What do you believe is the most important pur- pose of your (hus- band's) visiting the children?	13	43	
53.	What is the connection between your (hus- band's) paying child support and visiting the children?	20	67	
54.	What part should the court play in working out a visiting agreement?	16	53	
55.	Do you expect any problems with (your husband's) visiting the children?	25	83	.70