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Chapter I
Introduction

Divorce and single-family constellations are increasingly prevalent phenomena. Although debate ensues over efforts to explain their genesis, the trend is beyond controversy.

Given present estimates, as much as 40% of the child population will, at some point, live in single-parent households created by divorce (Bane, 1978, Kenniston, 1979). In real numbers, this is equivalent to approximately 12 million children currently residing in divorced families increasing at the rate of 1 million per year (Baker, et al, 1981, Bloom, 1981). These numbers are ominous because of the differential risk for developmental insult that divorce engenders for both adults (Bloom, Asher and White, 1978) and children. Amassing evidence points to both clearly identifiable short term as well as to long term effects that are visible 2, 6 and even 20 years later.

The evidence of heightened risk converges from a variety of studies including: the disproportionate overrepresentation of children of divorce in clinical populations (Kalter, 1976; Westman, 1972; Schoettle and Cantwell, 1981) and large scale epidemiological surveys of child psychopathology (Gersten, Langer, et al., 1979, Zill, 1978), the increased proclivity for antisocial conduct (Felner, 1978; Glueck and Glueck, 1950; Kellam, 1977; Rutter, 1971), and a host of specific role
conflicts unfolding years later (Kulka and Weingarten, 1979).

Despite the large number of vulnerable children at risk and the serious public health issues this seems to entail, little systematic research has actually been done. Reviews of the existing work (Herzog and Sudia 1973; Lamb, 1978; Shinn, 1978) are unsatisfactory because they have examined the impact of global "father absence", collapsing wide heterogeneity in family structures and situations into a single category. Not surprisingly, as conditions causing and following father absence vary widely, these reviews present a mixed set of conflicting conclusions.

Research directed specifically at determining the particular impact of divorce or marital discord on children is more limited. Much of what is currently known about the effects of divorce on children is restricted to the findings of just two research projects (Hetherington, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980; Wallerstein and Kelly, 1975, 1976, 1979). Despite the paucity, the handful of existing studies do paint a rich picture of the clinical sequela of divorce in regard to the short term transitions and disruptions it casts upon children and parents. Yet, the wide variability in children's vulnerability to divorce remains particularly puzzling. As Hetherington notes: "...some children exhibit severe or sustained disruptions in development, others seem to sail through a turbulent divorce and stressful aftermath and emerge as competent well functioning individuals..." (Hetherington, 1979).
Although the existing literature reveals a richness in detail, it is limited in scope: explanations of differential vulnerability have been confined to the well worn variables of age, sex, and isolated parent-child interactions. Investigators concerned with the reactions of children to divorce, much as those concerned with the matter of risk/vulnerability in general, have tended to focus, for the most part, on characteristics of the individual (e.g., Anthony, 1974; Garmezy, 1978) in the effort to account for varied vulnerabilities. Neglected in large measure is the contribution of extra-familial variables and consideration of the manner in which the larger social environment impacts upon children's adaptation. The growing literature on the ecology of development points to numerous examples of the manner in which the extra-familial social environment bears directly upon children's individual coping and competency such as in the work of Trickett (1978) Kelly (1979) and Rutter (1979) on the impact of varied classroom environments.

As a function of their age, children find themselves increasingly embedded in a network of social interactions that have powerful effects quite separate from family influences (Hartup, 1976, 1978, 1980). Longitudinal evidence suggests that peer relationships in childhood, in particular, are an especially important risk marker of disturbance and competency in adulthood (Asher, 1980; Roff, Sells and Golden, 1972; Hartup, 1978; Glidewell, 1969). In this vein, the goal of the present investigation is to examine the relationship between the quality of the child's extra-familial social support network and coping with parental divorce. Specifically, the question being considered is: given the risk
and stress created by parental divorce, does the extent to which the child possess a stable network of supportive and satisfying peer interactions mitigate or buffer the effects of divorce and serve to reduce vulnerability?

Conceptually, this investigation of the relationship between children's support systems and coping with parental divorce draws heavily on the model of development articulated by Bronfenbrenner (1976, 1979) with his strong social-ecological focus. Bronfenbrenner has developed a structural topography of interactions between the developing child and various levels of the social environment. In this model, developmental processes are related to increasingly indirect linkages between the person and the social environment. The most basic level is termed the "microsystem" and refers to "...a pattern of activities roles, and interpersonal relations experienced by the developing person in a given setting with particular physical and material characteristics...".

The other levels of the social environment are termed meso-, exo- and marco- systems, respectively. In an example related to divorce, Hetherington found a spillover effect for the mother's support network on her children. She found that when the mother experiences a sense of support for herself, children emerge as better parented (Hetherington, 1976). This represents an exosystem effect defined as "... one or more settings that do not involve the developing person as an active
participant but in which events occur that affect, or are affected by, what happened in the setting containing the developing person..."

The present investigation operates at the "mesosystem" level aimed at "...the interrelations among two or more settings in which the developing person actively participates, such as for a child, the relations among home, school, and neighborhood peer group..."
Review of the Literature: The Effects of Divorce on Children

When divorce is conceived of as a multi-dimensional phenomenon evolving over time, rather than a single event, the most revealing studies are longitudinal in nature.

Foremost is the work of Mavis Hetherington and her associates (Hetherington, Cox and Cox, 1978, 1979) who followed the progress of 72 preschool children; 36 from divorced families and 36 from intact nuclear families over a 2 year period commencing with the divorce. In this paradigmatic investigation of applied developmental inquiry, a multi-method, multi-measure approach tapped a wide variety of child and adult variables. Children were assessed directly via behavioral observations in the home and school and by parent, teacher and peer ratings. Observational measures were obtained during free play periods and structured classroom times. Results were reported for the periods 2 months, 1 year and 2 years post divorce. Intact families were assessed for the degree of marital conflict and separated into groups of high, low, and moderate conflict. This provided the opportunity to assess the separate impact of the divorce event, from the usual confound of marital conflict.

During the first year following divorce, Hetherington found that children of divorced families were functioning less well than children in all types of intact families and appeared: "... more oppositional, aggressive, lacking in self control, distractible, demanding of help and attention in both the home and school than were children in families with high rates of marital discord..." In the next year, however, this
pattern changed so that children from high conflict intact families displayed greater disturbance.

After two years following divorce, few differences were found between girls from divorced families or low conflict intact families. This was not so, however, for boys. Boys of divorced families although functioning better than in the first year following divorce, were still more dysfunctional than boys in low conflict intact families.

Hetherington also found that divorce does not necessarily imply an end to inter-parental conflict. When divorced families were further examined along the conflict dimensions and separated into high or low parental conflict (as with the intact families) and the child results reexamined, children from high conflict divorced families displayed more problems at all time periods, except for girls at the two year period who were no worse off than those in high conflict intact families. This led Hetherington to conclude: "...If intense marital conflict continues after divorce, particularly for boys, the effects can be more deleterious than when it occurs in nuclear families...".

In addition to these general findings, Hetherington also examined more specific changes in children's interactions at home and school. At home, there is particular strain in the mother-son relationship which seemed to be best described by what Patterson (1978) has called in another context, "a pattern of mutual coercion". In school, boys from divorced families were more isolated, verbally aggressive, had less mature play than their peers from intact families. When they were
engaged with other children, it was more likely to be with either younger boys or girls. This pattern of high verbal and low physical aggression is different from the pattern at 2 months post divorce where both high verbal and physical aggression was found.

Hetherington posits that peers respond to this initial physical aggression and negative bids for attention by high rates of ignoring, aversive opposition, and hostile verbal and non-verbal responses. Although boys from divorced families want to interact, peers are not accepting their intentions, possibly because they remember a history of earlier aversive interactions. Not surprisingly, boys from divorced families are less popular with peers and become even more isolated in the second year following divorce despite significant improvements in their social conduct.

In a pattern of dysfunction similar to that of their children, parents demonstrated feelings of incompetency, anxiety, depression and rejection. This was particularly pronounced for mothers of boys. One factor influencing mother's adjustment was their employment status. In comparison to unemployed mothers, those employed prior to separation were better adjusted and felt less isolated.

In interactions with their children, divorced parents made fewer maturity demands, communicated less well, were less affectionate and used more negative sanctions. By two years after divorce, parenting improved, yet significant differences between divorced and
intact families remained.

The effects of visitation was dependent on the relationship between the parents: when frequent visitation was accompanied by agreement on child rearing, low conflict, and positive attitudes toward each other as parents, the child's adjustment and mother-child adjustment was significantly better. When frequent visitation took place with disagreements between parents, child adjustment was negatively affected.

Wallerstein and Kelly (1979,1980) also conducted a longitudinal investigation of the effects of divorce reporting findings at time periods immediately following separation, 18 months and 5 years post divorce. This is the only longitudinal study following children of different ages. The methodology involved intensive interviews and brief clinical intervention with the 60 families and 131 children in their sample in Marin county( San Francisco).

Initially, children of all age groups seem disturbed by divorce; reacting notably with fears, anxieties, and sadness. This was hypothesized to be related to the intrapsychic turmoil of these children marked by the following "...(a) heightened sense of vulnerability, sadness at the loss of the protective structure of the family, guilt over fantasized or actual misdeeds, worry over distressed parents, anger at the parents, shame regarding the parent's behavior, a sense of being alone, and a concern with being different ..." Younger latency children (aged 7-9) manifested depression whereas older latency children (aged 9-12) were more likely to be intensely angry.
At 18 months post divorce, preschool children seem to fare the worst, with 50% reported to be dysfunctional. Latency children were somewhat better off as a group, with 25% reported to be dysfunctional. Factors underlying poor adjustment were identified as continued family disorganization, extreme levels of anger in the custodial parent, and insufficient contact with the non-custodial parent. Boys were reported functioning less well than girls at all ages. Only 10% of the children expressed any form of relief by the divorce, even though at least 30% had actually witnessed extreme marital violence and physical abuse.

At the end of the five year period, 34% of the children were determined to be "doing well", 29% were in the middle range of functioning and 33% were doing "quite poorly". No single variable or factor was implicated in either good or poor adjustment configurations. Instead, a complex pattern of factors operating in various combinations accounted for the observed variation in coping. Although sex and age proved to be important correlates in the periods immediately and 18 months following divorce, this was less so the case at the 5 year period.

The factors that emerged as important correlates were identified as: 1) The extent to which the parents had been able to resolve and put aside their conflicts and angers and to make use of the relief from conflict
provided by divorce. 2) The course of the custodial parent's handling of the child and the resumption or improvement of parenting within the home 3) The extent to which the child did not feel rejected in relationship with the noncustodial parent or visiting parent, and the extent to which this relationship had continued on a regular basis and kept pace with the child's growth 4) The range of personality assets and deficits which the child brought to the divorce, including the child's history within the predivorce family and the capacity to make use of his or her resources within the present, particularly intelligence, the capacity for fantasy, social maturity, and ability to turn to peers and adults 5) The availability to the child of a supportive human network 6) The absence of continuing anger and depression in the child 7) The sex and age of the child (Wallerstein and Kelly, 1980 page 207).

Although much of the literature reviewed here suggests that the dysfunction of children of divorce is related to family dysfunction as opposed to divorce per se, Wallerstein and Kelly found some children who were the most dysfunctional in the period immediately following divorce had the warmest and more closely knit families prior to divorce. Thus, the divorce event itself, signalling the end of the nuclear family as they had known it, was quite salient. Similarly, the pre-divorce functioning of the child did not predict functioning at the five year period. As they put it "...some who maintained in a conflict ridden marriage succumbed in the post separation period...". Some children who were quite troubled in the unhappy marriage improved when this relationship ended.
Variability in functioning seemed to be the rule, especially in younger children. Change in functioning was more frequent in the lowest functioning group where 75% were improved at the 5 year mark. However, 50% of this group had received some form of treatment including services offered by the authors directly. In the group of "very well adjusted" children, 66% were still doing quite well 5 years later. Although age predicted outcome at 5 years less well than immediately after or 18 months post divorce, it was associated with other important results at the 5 year period. Both boys under age 8 and girls under age 12 received better mothering and enjoyed more frequent visiting from the father. Although their initial vulnerability was high, younger children "...emerged as better parented, thus offsetting their initial vulnerability...". Kurdek, Blisk and Siesky (1980, 1981) conducted the only other longitudinal study found in the literature. Subjects were 58 boys and girls aged 8-17 from families divorced for 4 years followed over a two year time period. These investigators examined the relationship between children's understanding and feelings about the divorce event in a social cognitive sense, and parent ratings of divorce specific and global child adjustment. They also examined the variables of age, frequency of contact with non-custodial parent, locus of control, and level of interpersonal reasoning.

In the initial measurement, better adjusted children were characterized as older, having less contact with the non-custodial parent, having higher levels of interpersonal reasoning (indexed by Selman's
procedure), higher internal locus of control, and had a custodial parent self-rated as less competent.

Results at the second measurement period, 2 years later, or 6 years post divorce, revealed a very similar pattern of results. Comparisons of children's divorce specific adjustment to global functioning were made by comparing children's divorce adjustment scores with scores on the Personality Inventory for Children. This revealed children with less negative feelings about the divorce had fewer problems on scales tapping social skills, anxiety and general adjustment. Similarly, parent ratings of children with fewer divorce related problems had lower scores on the scales of depression, social skills, achievement, and general adjustment.

Kurdek et. al. also compared children's divorce specific and global adjustment in relation to interparent stress and conflict. They found higher stress levels in the custodial parent were related to increases on PIC scales tapping depression, withdrawl, hyperactivity, achievement, deliquency, anxiety, and general adjustment. Continued parental conflicts were also negatively related to children's global and divorce specific adjustment. These findings support those of Wallerstein and Kelly on the detrimental impact of continued parental conflict. This study is of interest because of the attempt to separate divorce specific adjustment from global psychological functioning. Unfortunately, the presentation of results seems to suggest a causal linkage between the parental stress /discord variables and adjustment. However, without measures of global adjustment prior to divorce this conclusion is not
warranted.

Concerning the role of social cognitive variables, a positive relationship was found between interpersonal reasoning and divorce adjustment. As Kurdek et al. note, this relationship had been suggested by other investigators (i.e., Wallerstein and Kelly and Hetherington) but no data had been reported.

The authors fail to explain the curious finding that positive post divorce adjustment related to less frequent visitation and custodial parent lower in competency, except to say that less contact with the non-custodial parent may serve to reduce reconciliation hopes.

Hess and Camara (1979) studied a group of 16 children aged 9-11 from intact families and families divorced between 2 to 3 years. Family predictor variables were parental harmony on child rearing issues, and the quality of the child's relationship with each parent separately and together. For divorced families, degree of contact with the non-custodial parent (father) was also assessed. The child outcome variables were stress, social relations with peers, aggression and work style. Data were obtained from interviews with parents and checklists given to both parents and teachers. Although operationalized descriptions of the child measures and family process variables was lacking, this study did provide a interesting approach to understanding the effects of marital divorce and discord on children.

At the level of group comparison, children from divorced families were found to display greater levels of stress, less productive work styles
and were more aggressive than were children from intact families. However, greater variability within each family type than between was found on the family process variables. This led to the conclusion that family process variables are significant in predicting children's functioning, more so than the simple fact of divorce: parental harmony on child rearing issues related as closely to outcome as did divorce.

Even more important than parental harmony was the individual relationship between parent and child. Children who had positive relationships with both parents were the least disturbed followed by those who had one positive relationship with either parent and those with no positive relationship with either parent. The finding that a positive relationship to either parent (custodial or non-custodial) predicted adjustment stands in contrast to Hetherington's report that buffering effects were only found for the relationship with the custodial parent such that a positive relationship with the absent father did not buffer the effects of a poor relationship with the mother. However, the analyses of process variables and child outcome was carried out on the divorced families only precluding useful comparison.

Although this study adopted an interesting approach, the conclusions reached about the relative import of family process vs. family type and quality vs. frequency of visitation are not warranted. These variables may not be independent of divorce and because group comparisons on family process variables were not reported, it may be that divorced
families are skewed in the direction of dysfunction on the process variables. To offer conclusions about the relative import of family status vs. family process variables as if they were independent variables, one needs to demonstrate this in fact is the case.

In a sample of preschool children, Hodges, Wechlser, and Ballantine (1979) investigated the relationship between the variables of time since separation, frequency of contact with non-custodial parent, age of parents, mobility (or number of geographic relocations), and financial resources on child behavior problems indexed by parent/teacher ratings and direct observation. Their sample included 52 preschool boys and girls, 26 from intact families and 26 from divorced families in Boulder, Colorado. At the level of group comparison, Hodges et al. predicted divorced children would show greater aggression, dependency and withdrawn behavior. More specifically, they predicted that for children from divorced families, longer time since separation and more frequent contact with the non-custodial parent would be related to better adjustment. They also predicted that limited financial resources, younger parents and geographic mobility would predict negative adjustment. Their results revealed some interesting twists and further confounds to an already confused literature.

Comparisons of children of divorced vs. intact families on the dimensions of aggression, dependency and withdrawal revealed few significant differences. Specifically, children of divorced families
were found to withdraw more in structured interactions with peers.

The length of time since separation and frequency of contact with the non-custodial parent were largely unrelated to any of the child behaviors except that more frequent visitation was correlated with higher aggression at school and less cooperation with the mother at home. More robust was the finding of a significant relationship between teacher rated dependency/general maladjustment, parent rated anxiety, depression, and aggression with the trivariate combination of limited financial resources, relative youth of the parents and geographic mobility was present. This "cumulative stress" correlate was found only for the children of divorced families.

These findings expand the literature by suggesting it is not the simple fact of divorce that creates maladjustment but a series of stressors associated with divorce. This is in accord with Rutter's (1973, 1979) finding that although one stress is not necessarily associated with child disturbance, as the number of stressors becomes additive, a multiplicative relationship to disturbance is created.

Zill (1978) reported the effects of a large scale survey study employing a multi-stage stratified probability sample in 180 locations across the country. In total, 2,279 children identified from a wide variety of family types were interviewed along with their parents and teachers. Across the sample, 73% of children lived in intact two-parent families; 12% lived in mother alone families usually created by divorce/separation; 2.1% lived in father alone households. The
remainder lived in mother-other combinations such as step-parent, 
grandparent or other adults.

Zill found that the incidence of being seen by the custodial parent as 
needing or receiving psychological care was a function of family status. 
Both children of divorced and unhappy intact families were significantly 
more likely to be rated in need of or receiving help than children in 
happy intact families. There was little difference between children 
living with the mother alone and mother-other combination on the need 
for help variable, supporting Kellam's (1977) earlier report that 
step-parent families are associated with significant risk for 
dysfunction.

In addition to the need for help, Zill also examined specific behaviors 
through parent and teacher reports. This revealed children of divorced 
or unhappy intact families displayed a significantly greater proportion 
of aggressive behavior as rated by both teacher and parent. However, 
the teacher and parent ratings revealed only moderate agreement on the 
aggressive behavior of particular children (r=.23). This indicates that 
although divorce or marital conflict places children at risk for 
aggressive disturbances, it may not occur both at school and home. The 
similarity in children's aggressive disturbance in divorced and unhappy 
intact families led Zill to conclude that parental conflict not parental 
absence, leads to child disturbance.

At this point, Zill's approach is very similar to that of other 
investigations. However, Zill examined another dimension heretofore 
ignored by considering the relationship between family configuration and
children's perceptions of their families in terms of feeling rejection/neglect within their families. This revealed children of divorced families were significantly more likely to feel rejected with their needs not met than children residing in happy intact families. Children in unhappy intact families were even more likely than children of divorce to feel rejected. This led Zill to conclude that it is not the number of adults at home that relates to children's happiness but the quality of the relationships. Although this is an important study because of its scope and comparison of greater variety in non-intact family types, it is difficult to integrate with the rest of the literature because the instruments used were unique and of unknown psychometric validity.

Felner, Ginter, Boike, and Cowen,(1978) examined patterns of behavior in children from divorced, intact and single parent families created by death. Comparisons were carried out with a sample of children referred for clinical services and with a non-referred sample. This was done to sort out the confounds created by studying adjustment only by "treated prevalence" estimates (such as in Kalter's, 1976) study by including comparisons with untreated (unreferred) groups to yield an estimate of functioning by "true" prevalence criteria.

Adjustment was measured by teacher rating scales developed by the authors for the Rochester primary prevention project. In the referred sample, children from divorced families were rated significantly more aggressive
and generally more maladjusted than children referred from intact families. Children from single-parent families created by death had higher levels of anxious-withdrawn behavior. In the sample of non-referred children, those from divorced families evidenced greater levels of acting-out behavior and problems in social conduct with peers compared to the other two family types.

In a study focusing on the impact of custody practices, Warshak and Santrock (1979) examined adjustment as a function of the sex of the custodial parent. In this study, 24 children in father custody, 24 in mother custody and 24 residing in intact families were compared to a variety of child and parent interviews, structured observations and teacher reports. The authors controlled for family size, SES and ordinal status. Overall, there were few group differences. Nevertheless, subtle differences did emerge casting new light on the previous findings of sex differences in dysfunction.

These authors found that opposite sex custody is associated with poorer adjustment for both sexes. Girls living with fathers demonstrated more demanding and less independent behavior than girls living with their mothers. Boys living with fathers demonstrated more mature behaviors and were more socialized than boys living with their mothers. In both family types, parents high in attentive and authoritative styles, had more positive interactions with their children.
Most of the studies reviewed so far, have examined the effects of divorce on the basis of short term differences not exceeding 5 years post divorce. Few investigators have examined the longer term effects of divorce. However, two studies were located that did study long range effects. Although these are not prospective designs, they do provide a sobering tentative findings.

Farber and Primavera (1981) studied patterns and correlates of adjustment in a sophisticated, multi-method study of 65 college students of divorced parents attending Yale University. In their regression analyses, they found a variety of variables; distance from home, personal coping styles, family cohesion and the use of family members for support related to their composite adjustment criteria.

Greater distance from home predicted poorer adjustment for both men and women. Neither the child's present age or amount of time since separation was related to adjustment. In terms of the recurring theme of sex differences; this study yields new light on the issue through finer grained analyses. This revealed no simple sex differences on global adjustment, but there were subtle effects depending on the specific criteria of adjustment. They found, for example, that women from divorced families displayed greater levels of anxiety and depression whereas men had lower levels of self-esteem. The impact of parental remarriage revealed mixed effects. The group whose parents had remarried had more positive self concepts in regard to self worth in groups whereas those whose parents remained single had more positive self-concept in
the realm of individual worth.

Kulka and Weingarten (1979) examined the impact of parental divorce and separation in their sample of nearly 5,000 subjects as part of a much larger survey study of American mental health (cf. Veroff, 1981). At the level of simple group comparisons, few differences between adults from divorced and intact families were found. However, in younger adults, those from divorced families reported being significantly less happy with their lives overall. When sex differences were examined, experiencing parental divorce was related to several variables for men. This included seeing their childhood as the unhappiest time of their lives, experiencing greater levels of anxiety, and a greater tendency to feel an impending nervous breakdown.

Powerful findings for both sexes were found on variables tapping role specific adjustment as spouses and parents. At this level of analysis, adults of divorced families reported experiencing more marital problems and a greater likelihood to actually divorce themselves. In terms of the parenting role, fathers from divorced families reported less investment in the parenting role whereas the opposite was true for women. No differences in the perceived adequacy as a parent or problems interacting with their children were found as function of experiencing parental divorce.

Since this study is based totally on self report data obtained by telephone interview, self-presentation confounds may account for these results. For example, it may be that adults of divorced backrounds are
more likely than adults from intact families to report their own marital disharmony. Nevertheless, taken together with the results of the Farber and Primavera study, it does appear that experiencing divorce as a child does portend something of the nature of adulthood in certain delimited areas of personality functioning and in the roles of parent and spouse.

Summary

At the outset, the most salient finding emerging from this select review of the literature is that divorce is not inevitably associated with any fixed set of consequences for all children. Since divorce is a marker variable of a multifaceted process evolving over time rather than a static event, response to divorce is complex and reflects the subtle transaction of multiple variables.

To illustrate some of this complexity, consider one reported predictor of children's response to divorce, that of the mother's post-divorce adjustment. Wallerstein and Kelly, among others, have suggested the child's post-divorce functioning is related directly to the mother's positive coping. However, as Hetherington cogently argues, depend on the subtleties of how mother's coping is considered. She found some mothers who have achieved positive coping by returning to school, work or by becoming involved in other "self-acultalizing" activities, have children with "the most frequent, intense and enduring signs of emotional disturbance". On the other hand, if mother's positive coping
is promoted by parenting support by the father, positive child effects are found. Unfortunately, the full range of these subtleties is, at best, only partially understood.

Despite considerable variety in populations, methods, and measures conceivably leading to a variety of potentially obscuring artifacts, a common thread does emerge, at least with respect to the short term effects. The pattern is one of initial disequilibrium during the first year with negative effects peaking toward the end of the first year linked to a variety of developmental disruptions and disturbance in areas including sex-typed behavior, academic achievement, and social relationships. In the second year, conditions improve, but remain strained. Most frequently, disturbance is evident in the form of aggressive conduct problems, strained interpersonal relations with parents and peers, and feelings of rejection-depression.

Explanations of the predominance of aggressive symptoms are of two varieties. One suggestion is that the aggressive behavior is a defense against reactive depression (Hetherington, 1979). The other is a social learning explanation based on modeling effects. The modeling argument is based on the notion that since divorce typically involves the display of anger and hostility, children learn this as their own strategy of response (Felner, 1975, 1978).
Consensus about the longer term impact of parental divorce/marital discord is less clear because the few studies that have considered longer term effects have not examined the same time periods or ages. A cautious conclusion is that some long term effects are visible but how severe this interruption in coping/competent functioning is remains unclear.

Despite some convergence of findings in the literature, wide variability in both quality and quantity of response is the most frequent observation. Again Hetherington says it best, "some children exhibit severe or sustained disruptions in development, others seem to sail through a turbulent divorce and stressful aftermath and emerge as competent well functioning individuals...".

The underlying processes of vulnerability are only partially understood. The two most widely examined correlates of vulnerability so far have been sex and age. Most studies reveal boys fare worse across time, presumably because they seem to receive poorer parenting (i.e., more negative sanctions, less positive attention), greater exposure to parental battles, and also because parents of boys stay in an unhappy marriage longer (Glick, 1978 as cited in Hetherington, 1979). Thus boys are exposed both to greater amounts and varieties of stressors. However, this conclusion has been called into doubt by the Warshack and Santrock study of the deleterious effects of cross-sex custody. This work suggests the reported sex differences may be confounded by the preponderance of mother custody.
The impact of age is also complex. Studies of short-term effects using cross-sectional samples tend to suggest younger children (preschool) are the most vulnerable. This finding is attributed to the young child's greater dependence on parents, limited extra-familial contacts and cognitive egocentrism. Egocentrism is thought to create a disturbing sense of personal responsibility for causing the divorce. However, the longitudinal evidence of Wallerstein and Kelly suggests that the younger group receives better parenting and emerges after the 5 year period, less devasted than school-age children or adolescents. Again, the most reasonable conclusion is probably that of Hetherington, "...It is more accurate to say that coping styles and the evolution of patterns of adjustment over time differ for children of various ages rather than that adjustment is easier or more difficult for some age groups than others...". Thus, younger children tended to show disruptions in developing trusting interpersonal relations while older children show disruptions in attitudes toward authority and in forming positive peer relations (Hetherington, 1979).

The question yet to be adequately addressed is the explanation of the variability of response on both short and particularly, long term
coping. We have but a meager empirical base of prospective data from which conceptualizations of process can be constructed. Most investigators have cast relatively simple, static questions comparing the effects of discord vs. the divorce event for example. This seems rather limited for understanding divorced children's functioning because it is hard to conceive of divorce without discord. Yet some have concluded that it is not divorce per se, but marital discord that is causal (Hess and Camara, 1979, Rutter, 1971).

Perhaps the question should be that given discord, what is the additional impact of divorce? On this point, the unique contribution of Wallerstein and Kelly's clinical study shines through. They found: "few of all the children in our study thought that their parents were happily married, yet the overwhelming majority preferred the unhappy marriage to the divorce...many of the children, despite the unhappiness of their parents, were in fact relatively happy and considered their situation neither better nor worse than that of other families around them. They would, in fact, have been content to hobble along. The lightening that struck them was the divorce and they had not been aware of any great need to come in from the storm" (Wallerstein and Kelly, 1979).

For some families, divorce may signal a further erosion in parent-child relations and child functioning in general. For others, the divorce may represent a lessening of family-induced stress and lead to improved parent-child relationships. To add even greater complexity, both longitudinal studies report little continuity between parent-child
relationships pre and post divorce. Thus, the divorce event does seem to be a potent factor around which families reorganize themselves.

More enlightening information has resulted from studies of cumulative stress (Hodges, et al, 1978) and from the longitudinal studies (Wallerstein and Hetherington). From this work it seems long term functioning is most closely tied to the quality of the on-going environment of the child as suggested by Hetherington: 1) changes in the quality of parent-child interactions, 2) increased salience of the custodial parent, 3) the lack of availability of the non-custodial parent and the presence of fewer significant adults in the household.
**Social Support Systems and Coping**

Investigation into the relationship between an individual's vulnerability to psychological disorder and qualities of the social environment reveals that social support systems are an important correlate of successful coping and adaptation (Cassel, 1976; Nuckolls, 1972). Although definitions and operational measurement of social support vary widely, causing confusion in the literature, most are similar to the composite definition offered by House (1979): "...people may be said to have social support if they have relationship with one or more persons which is characterized by relatively frequent interactions, positive and generally strong feelings, and especially perceived ability and willingness to lend emotional, instrumental or appraisal support in times of need...".

Existing naturalistic studies that have examined the relationship between stress and psychological disorder consistently indicate that individuals who have higher levels of social support tend to be more functional on a broad array of clinical dimensions (Andrews, et al, 1978; Cassel, 1976; Lin et al, 1979; Mitchell and Trickett, 1980). One study in fact, reports a significant relationship between levels of social support and mortality itself (Berkman and Syme, 1977).

Although the notion of support systems has generated appeal, serious conceptual and methodological issues preclude its full embrace. In a review of the literature, Heller (1979) offers what he terms the "social
competence" alternative. This suggests the linkage between support systems and disorder is an artifact of an individual's social competency which accounts for both the individual receiving less social support and having greater levels of disorder. This may be a simplification because this frames the issue as if the social support is either totally independent of individual social skill or merely equivalent to it. An alternative suggestion might be that the availability of social support reflects both characteristics of the individual and of those around him interacting in a complex fashion yet to be unraveled. Work so far however, has been exploratory and correlational in nature, precluding definitive statements.

Another substantial issue, aside from the "social competence" problem and various measurement issues (see Barrera et al, 1981 or Mitchell and Trickett, 1980 for a review) is focused on the competing "main effects" vs. "buffering effects" models of the impact of social support.

The "main effects" notion of social support suggests a direct effect of social support on adjustment independent of stress level. This implies greater levels of support are related directly to lower levels of dysfunction. Alternately, the "buffering effects" notion suggests social support has a moderating effect on dysfunction as a function of the presence of psychological stress. As Kahn (1977) puts it, "social supports are likely to be protective only in the presence of stressful circumstances".
A recent study by Wilcox (1981), who tested the "buffering effects" hypothesis in a random sample of 320 individuals is typical of research in this area. This study is an improvement over previous work because the measurement of social support included both a quantitative index of the number of persons providing support as well as a qualitative measure based on the availability of specific supportive functions. The social support measures were used in combination with a life events inventory to predict two distress variables. The results supported the "buffering effects" hypothesis: at lower levels of life change, support had little relationship to the criterion variables. In short, although the exact mechanism of action is far from agreed upon, social support systems appear to be an important component of the multivariate risk/vulnerability process in adults.

In contrast to the growing literature with adults, work on children's support systems is practically non-existent. Only a few studies exist. One report by Rosen (1980, 1981) is a descriptive study of children's choices for supports in different situations. Children aged 8-14 were given a variety of different crises vignettes involving family, school and peer crises. Children were asked "how upset would they feel," "what would they do," and "where would they go for help" in response to these vignettes. Younger children tended to turn to family members more often than older children who utilized peers more frequently. In addition to age, family type also related to the seeking of support.
Children from intact families more frequently used family members for assistance than those from single parent households who turned less to external sources of support and relied more on themselves. Utilization of peer supports did not vary across family type. Although not assessed in this study, it is interesting to wonder if perhaps this finding implies that children had similar access to peer supports or if the stigma of divorce reduced the availability of peer supports just when children might be most likely to use peers in the place of diminished family resources.

Sandler (1980), in a study of 71 lower SES kindergarten through 3rd grade children, examined the relationship between social support, (operationalized as the presence of one or two parents and presence or absence of an older sibling), life stress and adjustment measured by the Louisville Behavior Checklist. The results suggested that having two custodial parents and/or an older sibling could buffer the impact of stress on children's adjustment.

In a study examining the relationship between social support and coping with parental divorce among late adolescent college students, Farber and Primavera (1981) considered both the frequency and perceived helpfulness of support in relation to a multitude of self-report indices of adjustment. They found that individuals who more often turned to peers for support had poorer self concepts in the domain of social relations as opposed to those who relied more on themselves. Particularly complex
was the finding that individuals more frequently turning to family members for support were self-rated as more anxious and depressed. Yet, when family support was perceived as more helpful, individuals were self-rated less depressed. The authors concluded that this reflects the difference between the quality and quantity of support.

Although no data have been reported on the relationship between children's support systems and coping with parental divorce, the major divorce researchers have speculated about it. Hetherington (1979a,1979b) has suggested peer relationships may give the child "...opportunities to find support systems and alternate sources of satisfaction and personal growth outside the home which may mitigate deleterious effects of divorce...". She also reports on the supports of boys in particular: "...boys may be exposed to more stress, frustration and aggression and have fewer available supports..." (Hetherington, 1979, underscore added). Her data on the noxious behavior of boys after divorce may in fact account for these diminished peer resources and contribute to continued dysfunction.

Wallerstein and Kelly, however, see peer supports as much less significant "...Children did not feel that turning to friends for comfort helped to ease their sadness or fears...;...distress at home spilled into the relationships with friends...; ...for children and adolescents in all groups except for the older boys, children did not use their friends to escape from an unhappy, conflict-ridden household...;...friends are not "instead of" but "in addition to"...;..."
children whose lives were relatively conflict-free and whose families were supportive were those best able to turn to friends, then the friendship group cannot be thought of as resource...". Yet, they also acknowledge "...peers were useful not so much for sharing confidences as for providing activities and welcome distance from the household unhappiness...". These last few comments seem to reflect not the lack of importance of peer supports but a confusion in the differing contents of support for adults and children.

The content of support may indeed reflect a developmental process where sharing of confidences in a verbal manner is more of an adult form of support whereas providing "activities" (i.e., play) and distance from the family could be the form of supportive interactions for children of school age. Given this potential apriori bias for particular contents of support, their conclusions are subject to question.
Hypotheses

The following specific hypotheses based on the review of the literature were the focus of this investigation.

1. Children from divorced families will be more dysfunctional than children from non-divorced families on the PIC profile scales of Delinquency, Depression, Hyperactivity and Social Skills.

2. Differences in the quality, but not quantity, of social support, particularly that of peers, will be related to differences in psychological functioning. It is predicted that as the quality of social support increases, dysfunction will decrease for children of divorced and non-divorced parents.

3. It is predicted that the quality of peer support will have a buffering effect on dysfunction such that peer support will have a stronger relationship to dysfunction for children of divorced families than for children of intact families.

4. For the children from divorced families, it is predicted that the more time since divorce or separation will be associated with lower levels of dysfunction.

5. For the children from divorced families, it is predicted that increased frequency of visits from the non-custodial parent will be
associated with lower levels of dysfunction.

6. It is predicted that increased numbers of moves and school changes will be associated with disruptions in social support provided by both peers and teachers.
Chapter II

Method

Fifty Seven Caucasian boys in grades four through six served as subjects in this study. 26 of these children came from families that had experienced parental divorce/ separation. The mean length of time since separation for this group was 52.82 months with a standard deviation of 35.00 months. The range of time since separation varied between 8 and 118 months. The mean length of time since legally defined divorce was 36.34 months with a standard deviation of 37.50 months. The range of time since divorce varied between one and 108 months. The frequency of visitation by the non-custodial parent varied between zero and fifteen times per month with a mean of 4.82 visits.

Twenty two of the children resided with the mother, three with the father and one in a joint physical custody arrangement. In ten of the families, the custodial parent remained single. In fifteen of the families the custodial parent was currently remarried. In one family, the custodial parent had been remarried twice. Although the small numbers precluded separate assessment of the effects of remarriage, available evidence in the literature suggests remarriage does not moderate the risk of psychopathology engendered by divorce (Kellam,1977; Zill,1978).

Thirty-one children came from intact, never divorced families. The mean age of the total sample was 10.7 years with a standard deviation of 4.1 months. The mean ages, separately by family type, were 10.9 years with a
standard deviation of 5.6 months and 10.5 years with a standard
deviation of 3.7 months for the divorced and non-divorced groups
respectively.

Subjects were drawn from two different populations. Forty subjects,
both from divorced and intact families, attended 12 elementary schools
in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

Recruitment was achieved by sending home 900 letters describing the
study to parents of all males in grades 4-6. Males were chosen both as
a practical consideration and because the divorce literature indicates
boys are more vulnerable to risk created by marital disruption
(e.g., Hetherington, 1979). From this total population of 900 children,
55 families agreed to participate. Out of this group of 55 families,
complete data were obtained on 46.

The second population, consisting of 10 divorced subjects, was located
through public court records of the western district of the Los Angeles
County Superior Court. From these records, 265 families that had boys
in grades 4-6 (and resided in the same areas as the school subjects)
were mailed the information describing the study. Follow up phone calls
were made to 50 of these families. In all, 20 families agreed to
participate and of these, complete data were obtained for 10 subjects.
Although SES was not systematically assessed, both populations resided in the same geographic areas. In a few cases, some divorced families received letters twice, once from the court sample mailing and the other from the school recruitment.

The communities in which the subjects resided included those of Malibu, Topanga Canyon, Brentwood, Pacific Palisades, Bel-Air, Woodland Hills, Encino, Tarzana and Santa Monica, California. All of these communities represent fairly homogenous upper-middle to upper level income groups. All subjects were reportedly making satisfactory progress in regular classroom placements. Unexpectedly, several of the families (approximately ten) had some connection to one of the mental health professions either as service providers, academics or consumers.

Measures
In addition to background information, four separate measures were used in this study. Two of these measures were developed by the investigator to assess both child and parent perceptions of social support. The Rosen Children's Perception of Social Support Inventory (CPSSI) was also used to assess children's perceptions of social support. The Personality Inventory for Children (PIC) was selected as the criterion measure for the assessment of children's psychological functioning.
Social Support

In light of the exploratory nature of this study and the limited development of social support instruments, social support was operationalized broadly. For each subject, three separate measures of social support were administered. Two of these measures were administered to each child subject. These instruments assessed children's perceptions of peer, family and teacher support. The third measure answered by the parent, assessed each parent's perception of their child's peer and teacher supports. These measures are described more fully in the section below.

Child Measures

One of the two measures of children's perceptions of social support was developed by the investigator. This instrument was designed to measure both quantitative (number of supportive relationships perceived) and qualitative (perceived helpfulness of available support) aspects of social support systems. Although some evidence has suggested the usefulness of the quantitative approach (e.g., Hirsch, 1979, 1980; Cochran and Brassard, 1979; Wilcox, 1981), other evidence suggests that no simple relationship exists between the quantity of supportive ties and coping (Kahn, et al., 1979, House, et al., 1978). In light of this, the field has shifted to conceptualizing support in terms of its perceived adequacy or quality (Schaefer, et al., 1981; Moos, 1979, 1980; House, 1980). Consequently, the primary purpose of the measure developed for this study was to assess the qualitative aspects of social support.
In terms of specific structure, this instrument is composed of two sections. In the first section, children are asked to describe recent events they have experienced in which they felt sad or upset. This is done to generate a set of concrete referents for the support questions to follow.

After the list of life events is generated, subjects are asked "When this (event named) happens, who are the people that help or make things better for you?". Each source named by the child is recorded and the relationship of the source to the child (e.g., parent, peer, etc.) recorded. After the child stops naming sources, the interviewer makes further inquiry by the prompt "Are there any other people that help?". After eliciting a final list of support sources, the child is told he will then be asked to rate the helpfulness of each source. At this point, the investigator presents a picture depicting a graphic representation of the 5 point rating scale in bar graph format. Children are told they can choose any point on the scale (1-5) for their response. To insure that each subject understands the task, each is asked to rate rides at Disneyland by selecting one ride for each scale value. After the subject demonstrates understanding of the rating scale, each is asked to rate each support source they named on the 1-5 scale. Following this, section 2 (containing 11 specific support questions) is administered.

In total, this section yields five separate scores. Two of the scores reflect the quantitative dimension of social support (i.e.,: the total number of support sources and the number of peer support sources). Three
of the scores tap the qualitative aspect of social support. These are the total rated support, average rated support (i.e., total rated support divided by the number of support sources), and average rated peer support (i.e., total peer rated support divided by the number of peer support sources) scores.

The second section of this instrument consists of 11 items measuring solely the quality of peer and teacher support. Based on a review of the literature, the categorization developed by House (1979) was selected. House conceptualized the various forms of supportive behavior as representing four categories. These are emotional (e.g., esteem, affect, concern, listening) appraisal (e.g., affirmation, feedback), informational (e.g., advice, suggestions, information) and instrumental (e.g., aid in kind, time, money). Separate review of the developmental literature on peer relations revealed that children in the age range of this study also perceive helpfulness along these dimensions (Barnett et al., 1982; Bigelow, 1977; Mannarino, 1978; Selman, 1981).

Section two is administered by asking the child to rate how much his peers or teachers provide him the support function tapped separately by each of the 11 items on the 1 (not much) to 5 (very much) scale. The ratings for the quality of peer and teacher items are then separately summed.

In total, this instrument requires the child to make two evaluations about the quality of peer support he/she perceives. The first in section 1 is a global judgment of each support source (e.g., "How helpful is X on the 1-5 scale?") and the second, in section 2, is more
specific, pertaining to specific supportive behavior provided by sources named (e.g., "How much do your friends give you ideas, suggestions or advice on how to handle problems?").

The other measure of children's perceptions of social support chosen for inclusion in this investigation was the Children's Perception of Social Support Inventory (CPSSI) developed by Rosen, (1980, 1981). This device was included because it has demonstrated psychometric properties. The CPSSI consists of 45 true-false items designed to index the extent to which children perceive family members and peers as supportive. Fourteen of these items tap peer supportiveness, 23 tap family supportiveness and 8 items were designed to assess the extent to which the child is willing to seek support or help. For the purposes of the present investigation, this last scale was not used. Family and Peer support are scored as the total number of items answered in the positive support direction. An equal number of items indicating high support are answered in true and false directions.

In an initial study, Rosen found the test-retest reliability over a 5 week period was .81 for family scale and .64 for the peer scale. The estimate of internal consistency using Cronbach's coefficient Alpha was .78 for the family scale and .77 for peer scale (Rosen, 1981). To assess convergent validity, Rosen computed correlations between family and peer support scores and the frequency in which family members or peers were chosen for help in 16 hypothetical crises vignettes. The
correlation between the CPSSI family support scores and the frequency of selecting family members in the vignettes was .64 and the correlation between the CPSSI peer support scores and selection of peers in the vignettes was .56.

Parent Ratings

Parents rated the quality of teacher and peer support on a modified version of section 2 of the instrument developed for children's perceptions by the investigator. Item content was the same except for modification of person and tense. In addition to these items, parents were also asked a limited number of demographic questions that included an estimate of the number of peers available in the neighborhood, number of older sibs, and number of moves and school changes the child had experienced within the last 5 years. These variables were included because of their reported significance in a previous study of children's social supports (Sandler, 1978, 1979). Based on a review of the literature, a limited number of variables related to divorce were also included; length of time since separation/divorce and frequency of visitation by the non-custodial parent.
Psychological Functioning

The Personality Inventory for Children (PIC) was selected as the criterion measure of children's psychological functioning. The PIC was chosen for several reasons, primarily because of the useful division of the profile into 12 distinct clinical scales. These are Achievement, Intellectual Screening, Developmental, Somatic, Depression, Delinquency, Hyperactivity, Family Relations, Withdrawal, Anxiety, Psychosis, and Social Skills. These profile scales were developed using a combination of content oriented and empirical strategies. More recently, the PIC has also been divided into factor scales of (I) Undisciplined/poor self-control, (II) Social incompetence, (III) Internalization/Somatic Symptoms and (IV) Cognitive development. In light of the nature of this study, the profile scales of Intellectual Screening, Developmental Problems and Psychosis and factor scale IV (Cognitive Development) were not examined.

The PIC was also selected because of its well documented reliability (Wirt et al., 1977, Lachar and Gdowski, 1979) and more importantly, because of its established predictive validity (DeHorn, Lachar, and Gdowski, 1979, Kurdek, Blisk, and Siesky, 1981; Leon, Kendall and Garber, 1980). This is an important feature because many of the studies in the literature on the effects of divorce on children have used relatively obscure measures developed for the idiosyncratic needs of the particular study. This has had the unfortunate effect of further complicating an already complex literature.
In terms of structure, the PIC consists of 600 true-false items answered by a parental informant. Each scale's raw score is converted to a T score based on norms for age and sex. Higher T scores reflect greater disturbance on every scale. In addition to the profile scales and factor scales already described, the PIC also contains three validity scales designed to assess the informant's response style in terms of defensiveness and deviancy. Using the cutoff scores developed by Lachar and Gdowski (1979), all of the PIC's completed by parents were in the valid range.

Procedures

The measures were administered during the first four months of the school year. Subjects from the school population were seen individually in an interview that lasted between 20 to 30 minutes for each child. After an initial warm-up period that lasted 5 minutes, children were told the investigator was interested in "kids ideas about the helpfulness of friends" and that their responses would be kept confidential. The order of administration was the same for all subjects which began with the measure developed by the investigator. The investigator read each item to the child. This was followed by administration of the CPSSI. After the interview was complete each subject was given an OSU pencil. After data was collected on a particular child, the parent was mailed both the PIC and the parent rating of support questionnaire along with
instructions explaining their use (appendix B).

Subjects in the divorce population were interviewed individually in their homes. The administration procedure was the same as for subjects in the school population. After the child was interviewed, the PIC and support questionnaire was left with the parent to mail back to the investigator.
Chapter III

Results

This chapter reporting the data analysis is divided into three sections. In the first, the means of the various social support and PIC variables are presented along with tests of the hypotheses. In the section that follows, the results of the simple correlations among the social support variables and the PIC scores are examined in terms of the associated hypotheses. In the last section, the multiple regression analyses of the predictor support variables on the criteria PIC scales are considered in regard to the primary hypotheses of the investigation.

Mean scores of the Predictor Variables (Social Support)

The mean scores for each of the social support variables for the total sample and separately, by family type, are presented in tables 1 and 2 respectively. To determine whether there were differences in levels of social support as a function of family type, a multi-variate analysis of variance (MANOVA) using Wilk's criterion (Lambda) was performed separately on the child and parent predictor variables. Neither was significant at the p<.05 level. However, at the less stringent p<.10 level a trend for the child predictors was evident. Since the
overall MANOVA was not significant, the significant univariate analyses of the child predictors were considered tentative. The univariate results revealed that children from divorced families have diminished peer support resources both in terms of the number of available peer supports and the global quality of support provided by these fewer sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE</th>
<th>N = 56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. C.P.S.S.I. Peer Support</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. C.P.S.S.I. Family Support</td>
<td>20.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of Peer Support</td>
<td>42.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of Teacher Support</td>
<td>26.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of Support Sources</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of Peer Support Sources</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Total Rated Support</td>
<td>19.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Average Rated Support</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Average Rated Peer Support</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Quality of Peer Support</td>
<td>38.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Quality of Teacher Support</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Number of Moves</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Number of School Changes</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Number of Children in Neighborhood</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Number of Siblings</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2
MEAN SCORES OF
THE PREDICTOR VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVORCED</th>
<th>NON-DIVORCED</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=26</td>
<td>N=31</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (CHILD MEASURES)

1. C.P.S.S.I. Peer Support 11.07 11.83 1.25  
2. C.P.S.S.I. Family Support 19.50 20.51 3.06  
3. Quality of Peer Support 41.42 42.80 .63  
4. Quality of Teacher Support 26.30 27.41 .85  
5. Number of Support Sources 4.42 5.45 3.16  
6. Number of Peer Support Sources 1.26 2.61 9.21**  
7. Total Rated Support 17.65 21.77 3.16  
8. Average Rated Support 4.11 3.99 .42  
9. Average Rated Peer Support 1.97 3.01 5.65*  

(Section One)

#### (PARENT MEASURES)

10. Quality of Peer Support 38.53 38.83 .02  
11. Quality of Teacher Support 20.50 19.30 .60  

** = p .01  * = p .05

(CHILD MEASURES)

\[ \text{Wilks L} = .746 \quad F(9,47) = 1.77 \quad \text{(Non-Significant)} \]

(PARENT MEASURES)

\[ \text{Wilks L} = .865 \quad F(6,49) = 1.27 \quad \text{(Non-Significant)} \]
Mean scores of the Criterion Variables

The mean scores for each of the PIC profile and factor scales for the total sample, and separately by family type, are presented in Table 3. As with the predictor variables, MANOVA's were performed separately on the PIC profile and factor scales to test for the effect of family type. The MANOVA for the factor scales failed to reach significance. The MANOVA for the PIC profile scales, however, did yield a significant effect for family type (F(10,46) = 2.19, p < .05). In order to clarify the results obtained from this MANOVA, the univariate analyses were then considered. This revealed significant differences on the Adjustment (F(1,56) = 4.22, p < .05), Family Relations (F(1,56) = 16.47, p < .001), Delinquency (F(1,56) = 3.91, p < .05) and Hyperactivity (F(1,56) = 4.01, p < .05) scales.

On each of these scales, children from divorced families were more dysfunctional than children from intact families. Contrary to the hypothesis and the trend in the literature, no differences were found on the Depression or the Social Skills scales.

In order to determine if the differences on the profile scales were indicative of clinical distinctions between groups, subjects were dichotomized into clinical vs. non-clinical groups if the subject had a score above the cutoff (developed by Lachar and Gdowski, 1979) on any one of the profile scales. The Chi-Square statistic was then used to
test for significant differences as a function of family type. This analysis indicated that children from divorce families were significantly more likely to have at least one profile scale in the clinical range ($X_{df=1} = 5.05, p<.05$). To determine more precisely which scale(s) accounted for this finding, separate Chi-Squares were performed on each profile scale for a total of 10 separate analyses. None of these analyses reached significance. It would appear that in a sample of this size, the frequency of dysfunction at clinical levels is too low on any one scale to permit significant differences to emerge. This suggests that the significant results found on the combined Chi-square is due to differences between groups on a combination of several scales.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DIVORCED N=26</th>
<th>NON-DIVORCED N=31</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>60.30</td>
<td>53.19</td>
<td>4.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>47.73</td>
<td>44.45</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic Concerns</td>
<td>50.42</td>
<td>49.51</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>55.26</td>
<td>53.24</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Relations</td>
<td>57.65</td>
<td>45.19</td>
<td>16.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>57.76</td>
<td>51.90</td>
<td>3.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>49.14</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>56.69</td>
<td>54.45</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity</td>
<td>54.88</td>
<td>50.45</td>
<td>4.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>50.23</td>
<td>51.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = p .001  
** = p .01 
* = p .05

WILKS L = .67  F(10,46) = 2.19*
TABLE 4

CHI-SQUARE OF PIC SCORES
(BY FAMILY TYPE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>DIVORCED</th>
<th>NON-DIVORCED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROW PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC SCALE IN</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>35.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.03</td>
<td>68.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>64.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CLINICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC SCALE IN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.71</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>35.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINICAL RANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>54.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² (1) = 5.05, p < .05
Intercorrelations among Predictor Variables

Peer Support

The correlation matrix of the social support variables is presented in Table 5. Considering children's perceptions first, the most important finding was that the various measures of the quality of peer support (i.e., the two indices contained in the measure developed by the investigator and the Rosen CPSSI) are all quite modestly correlated with each other (CPSSI and section 1 of the investigator's measure, $r=.30, p<.05$, CPSSI and section 2 of the investigator's measure, $r=.52, p<.01$, section 1 and section 2 of the investigator's measure, $r=.31, p<.05$). This suggests each measure of the quality of peer support is, to a limited degree, tapping a similar dimension. This also provides a preliminary index of convergent validity for the measures developed by the investigator.

By comparison, the relationship between children's perceptions of the quantity and quality of peer support is considerably weaker. Significant correlations were evident however between the number of peer support sources and both the CPSSI ($r=.42, p<.05$) and the global quality of peer support in section 1 of the investigator's measure ($r=.63, p<.001$). As the number of peer support sources increases, perceptions of the quality of peer support also increases. The specific quality index of peer support on the investigator's measure was not related to any of the quantitative indices.

Comparison of the relationship between child and parent perceptions of peer support revealed an even more limited pattern of correlation,
restricted solely to the qualitative dimensions. The child ratings of the quality of peer support on the CPSSI was the only child measure to correlate with the parent ratings (CPSSI and parent rating, r=.35, p<.05) Parent ratings were unrelated to any of the child ratings along the quantitative or qualitative dimensions on the measure developed by the investigator.

**Teacher Support**

In addition to perceptions of peer support, parents and children also agree to a limited extent about the quality of supportiveness provided by teachers (r=.36, p<.01). Parent ratings of teacher support also relate positively to children's global ratings of their peer supports (r=.27, p<.05). This result suggests that parents are somewhat attuned to the support their children receive, but that children seem to make finer discriminations between sources of support as revealed in the lack of correlation between child ratings of peer and teacher support.

**Family Support**

Children's perceptions of family support measured on the Rosen CPSSI is related positively to each of the measures of the quality of peer support on both the CPSSI and one of the two indices on the instrument developed by the investigator (CPSSI family and peer scale, r=.47, p<.05,
Demographic Variables and Social Support

The relationship between the demographic variables of frequency of moving and changing schools and the social support variables was quite limited. Specifically, an inverse relationship was found between the frequency of moving and children's perceptions of the number of total support sources (r = -.27, p < .05) and both the number (r = -.29, p < .05) and global quality (r = -.26, p < .05) of peer supports. There were no significant correlations between the frequency of moving and parent perceptions of their children's support systems. This suggests that children are more sensitive to the effects of relocating on peer supports.

Similarly, the frequency of school changes was inversely related to children's global ratings of the quality of peer support (r = -.37, p < .05) and parent's ratings of the quality of teacher support (r = -.26, p < .05). As the number of school changes increases, children perceive peers as less helpful and parent's perceive that their children receive less teacher support. Interestingly, children's perceptions of the quality of teacher support was unrelated to changing schools. However, as was found with moving, children see their peer supports adversely affected by school changes.
In terms of the overall pattern, the present results suggest that social support is far from being a unitary phenomenon. Instead, the perception of social support varied along several parameters. Perhaps the most important of which is the distinction between quantitative (i.e., number of support sources) and qualitative (perceived adequacy of support) perceptions of social support. The present results revealed quite modest correlations between these dimensions when the global qualitative indices (CPSSI and section 1 of the measure developed by the investigator) were considered. When the more specific quality of support measure (section 2 of the measure developed by the investigator) was considered, no relationship to the quantitative indices was evident.

In addition to differences in perceptions of social support as a function of the qualitative/quantitative dimension, intercorrelations among the measures of support were also dependent on the source of support (i.e., peer, family, or teacher) being examined. When the same support source is considered, there is limited agreement among the various scores. Between different sources, however, there was very little evidence of correlation. This suggests perceptions of social support are differentiated between various social resources.

Moreover, agreement about the levels of support received also depended on whether children's or parent's perceptions are considered. Parents and children agree to only a very limited extent about the levels of teacher and peer support, when the global, but not specific indices were
compared. This relatively poor pattern of agreement between parent and child perceptions may reflect the different experiences each have separately with peers and teachers.
### Table 5

**Correlations among Social Support Variables (Predictors)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. C.P.S.S.I. Peer Support</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. C.P.S.S.I. Family Support</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of Peer Support (Section Two)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of Teacher Support</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of Support Sources</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td>.90***</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of Peer Support Sources</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Total Rated Support</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Average Rated Support</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Average Rated Peer Support</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(CHILD MEASURES)*

*(INVESTIGATOR’S INSTRUMENT)*

*(PARENT MEASURES)*

---

**Notes:**

- *** = p < .001
- ** = p < .01
- * = p < .05
Interrelation between Predictor and Criterion Variables

The correlations between the social support variables and the criterion PIC scores are presented in table 6. In accord with the hypotheses, children's perceptions of the quality of peer support was related to several of the PIC profile and factor scales. As children's perceptions of the quality of peer support is lower (in a similar fashion for both the CPSSI and the investigators measure), elevations are found on the PIC Achievement (CPSSI, r=−.32, p<.05, section 1 of the investigator's measure, r=−.42, p<.05, section 2, r=−.33, p<.05), Social Skills (CPPSI, r=−.32, p<.05, section 2 of the investigator's measure, r=−.33, p<.05), Delinquency (section 1 of the investigator's measure, r=−.30, p<.05, section 2, r=−.30, p<.05), Adjustment (section 1 of the investigator's measure, r=−.40, p<.05), Factor 2-Social Competency (CPSSI, r=−.36, p<.05, section 2 of the investigator's measure, r=−.32, p<.05) and Factor 3-Internalization/Somatic Concern (CPSSI, r=−.33, p<.05, section 2 of the investigator's measure, r=−.33, p<.05) scales. As children's perceptions of the quantity of peer supports is lower elevations were found on the Adjustment (r=−.31, p<.05), Achievement (r=−.35, p<.05), and Factor 1 (undisciplined/poor self-control) (r=−.22, p<.05) scales.

The pattern of correlation between parent ratings of the quality of peer support and PIC scores is similar to that of child perceptions. As the quality of parent rated peer support increases, scores on the PIC scales of Adjustment (r=−.27, p<.05), Somatic Concerns (r=−.28, p<.05), Depression (r=−.31, p<.05), Withdrawal (r=−.33, p<.05), Anxiety
(r=-.28,p<.05), Social Skills (r=-.61,p<.01), Factor 1-Undisciplined/poor self-control (r=-.31,p<.05), Factor 2- Social Competency (r=-.54,p<.01), and Factor 3-Internalization/Somatic concerns (r=-.26,p<.05) all decrease.

Although the correlations between peer support and PIC scores reflect the predicted results, the relationship of both family and teacher support to PIC functioning yields unexpected results. Contrary to prediction, child ratings of family support did not correlate significantly with any of the PIC profile or factor scales. However, this may be due to the restricted range of scores with a mean of 20.01 and a maximum value of 23.00 possibly creating a ceiling effect.

Child and parent ratings of teacher support do correlate with PIC scores, but in different directions. As child ratings of teacher support increase, elevations are found on the PIC Somatic Concern (r=.35,p<.05), Depression(r=.28,p<.05), Anxiety(r=.27,p<.05), Hyperactivity(r=.32,p<.05), and Factor 3-Internalization/somatic concern (r=.26,p<.05) scales.

As parent ratings of teacher supportiveness increase, the only significant finding was a decreased elevation on the Achievement scale (r=-.27,p<.05).
TABLE 6
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIAL SUPPORT (PREDICTORS) AND PIC (CRITERION) VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ADJUSTMENT</th>
<th>ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>SOMATIC CONCERNS</th>
<th>DEPRESSIONS</th>
<th>FAMILY RELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(CHILD MEASURES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.S.S.I. Peer Support</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.S.S.I. Family Support</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Peer Support</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teacher Support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Support Sources</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Peer Support Sources</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rated Support</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rated Support</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rated Peer Support</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PARENT MEASURES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Peer Support</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teacher Support</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = p .001
** = p .01
* = p .05
### Table 6

**Correlations Between Social Support (Predictors) and PIC (Criterion) Variables**  
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delinquency</th>
<th>Withdrawal</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Hyperactivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Child Measures)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.S.I. Peer Support</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.S.I. Family Support</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Peer Support</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teacher Support</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Support Sources</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Peer Support Sources</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rated Support</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rated Support</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rated Peer Support</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Parent Measures)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Peer Support</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teacher Support</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = p .001  
** = p .01  
* = p .05
### Table 6
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIAL SUPPORT (PREDICTORS) AND PIC (CRITERION) VARIABLES
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Undisciplined/Poor Self-Control</th>
<th>Social Competence</th>
<th>Internalization/Somatic Disorders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSK</td>
<td>Factor I</td>
<td>Factor II</td>
<td>Factor III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Child Measures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.S.S.I. Peer Support</td>
<td>-.46***</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.S.S.I. Family Support</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Peer Support</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teacher Support</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Support Sources</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Peer Support Sources</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rated Support</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rated Support</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rated Peer Support</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Parent Measures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Peer Support</td>
<td>-.61***</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.54***</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teacher Support</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = p < .001  
** = p < .01   
* = p < .05
The correlations between the divorce specific variables of time since separation, time since divorce and frequency of visitation with the criterion PIC profile and factor scores are presented in table 7.

The variables of time since separation and frequency of visitation by the non-custodial parent were not significantly related to any of the PIC scores. Time since divorce however, was related to a limited number of the PIC scales. As the time since divorce increases, elevations were evident on the profile scales of Adjustment ($r=0.46, p<0.05$), Somatic Concerns ($r=0.42, p<0.05$), Achievement ($r=0.41, p<0.05$), Delinquency ($r=0.42, p<0.05$) and Factor scale III (Internalization/somatic concern) ($r=0.51, p<0.01$).

Taken together, this pattern of results suggests the divorce specific variables are only peripherally related to psychological functioning in the present sample of children of divorce. Most puzzling was the finding of a positive correlation between time since divorce but not time since separation with some of the PIC scores. Although it is unclear exactly why this was so, one possibility could be due to the mean difference in time between separation and divorce which was approximately one year. The significant finding with time since divorce might, therefore, reflect the emergence of early disruptions in the divorce process as described so well by Hetherington (1979). Because time since separation represented a longer period of time, short term differences in
functioning over time could have been submerged by the long term stabilization of functioning as more time accrues washing away early differences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Time Since Separation</th>
<th>Time Since Divorce</th>
<th>Visitation by Non-Custodial Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic Concerns</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Relations</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor I (Undiscipline/Poor Self-Control)</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor II (Social Competence)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor III (Internalization)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic Disorders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = p .001  
** = p .01  
* = p .05
Multiple Regression Analyses of the Criterion Variables

In order to understand more fully the relationship between social support and PIC measured clinical functioning, stepwise multiple regression was employed to determine which social support predictors best account, in hierarchical ordering, for the PIC profile and factor scale scores (insert table 8 about here). In order to reduce the ratio of the number of predictors to the number of subjects, regressions for the child and parent predictors were performed separately on each of the profile and factor scales for a total of 23 separate regressions. In the present analyses, the criterion for a variable to be entered into the equation was preselected at the $p<.05$ level of significance. To test the buffering hypothesis, multiple regressions were again performed on each of the PIC profile scales using child and parent ratings. In each regression, the variables entered included the significant support variables (obtained from the stepwise regressions), family type, and the interaction term(s) of family type and the support variable(s). On only one criterion variable, hyperactivity, did the interaction term reach the $p<.05$ level of significance.

Adjustment

This scale was designed as a general measure of poor adjustment. In accounting for this form of global dysfunction, only one child
predictor met the model criteria. This was the average rated peer support (section 1 of the investigator's measure) which accounted for about 16% of the variance ($F_{1,55} = 10.82, p < .01$). Similarly, when parent predictors were entered, quality of peer support also emerged, accounting for .% of the variance ($F_{1,55} = 4.32, p < .05$).

**Achievement**

This scale was designed to identify children who achieve poorly despite normal intellectual abilities. The regression on the Achievement scale with the child predictors yields an equation including (in order of their entry): average rated peer support, average rated total help and quality of peer support. The final $R^2$ for the equation is .34 ($F_{1,55} = 8.97, p < .001$) accounting for about 34% of the variance.

With the parent variables entered as predictors, only ratings of teacher support emerged in the equation with $R^2$ of .07 ($F_{1,55} = 4.47, p < .05$). Comparison of the squared multiple correlation coefficients between parent and child predictors suggests peer support as perceived by children best accounts for achievement problems.

**Somatic**

This scale taps a variety of health-related problems and complaints. The stepwise regression for the child predictors yields an equation with a single predictor, perception of teacher support ($R^2 = .12, F = 6.77, p < .01$). Analyses of the parent variables results in an equation with
two predictors; number of school changes and quality of peer support
\((R^2=.20, F=6.77, p<.01)\).

**Depression**

This scale was designed to measure depressive states in accord with the GAP(1966) criteria. When regression is performed using the child predictors, both teacher and peer support are entered in the equation \((R^2 = .17, F=5.46, p<.01)\). When parent variables are entered, peer support emerged as the only predictor to meet the \(p<.05\) criteria for entry \((R^2 = .09, F=5.76, p<.05)\). Both peer and teacher support are linked to affective dysfunction, where greater levels of peer support is related to less depression and greater levels of teacher support is related to more depression.

**Family Relations**

Not surprisingly, family type emerged as the best predictor of this scale measuring family conflict \((R^2 = .22, F=15.34, p<.001)\). This validates the obvious finding that divorce and separation accompany family dysfunction. No support predictor from either child or parent ratings entered the equation.

**Delinquency**

The regression of the child predictors on this scale measuring conduct
problems, yielded an equation with a single predictor, average rated peer support \((R^2=.09, F=5.39, p<.05)\). No parent predictor met the criteria for entry into the equation.

Withdrawal

This scale was designed to reflect avoidance from social contact and the desire to remain isolated and distrustful of others. The best support predictor of these problems is parent rated peer support \((R^2 = .10, F=6.51, p<.05)\). No child predictor was able to satisfy the \(p<.05\) criterion for entry into the equation.

Anxiety

This scale was designed to index anxiety as manifested in limited frustration tolerance, exaggeration of problems and concerns and irrational fears and worries. In accounting for this form of disorder, the child predictors of teacher and peer support (section 2 of the investigator's measure) emerged in final equation \((R^2=.16, F=5.25, p<.01)\). Greater levels of peer support predicted lower levels of anxiety. Contrary to hypothesis, greater levels of teacher support predicted more anxiety. Accounting for anxiety related problems in terms of parent predictors yielded peer support as the sole predictor \((R^2=.08, F=4.65, p<.05)\).
Hyperactivity

This scale was constructed to measure the presence of the constellation of symptoms known as the Hyperactivity syndrome. In accounting for this band of symptoms from child predictors, both teacher support and family type emerged in the final equation ($R^2=.17, F=5.68, p<.01$). Receiving more teacher support and living in a divorced family predicted greater levels of hyperactive behavior. No parent predictors were significant at the $p<.05$ level.

Social Skills

This scale is directed toward measurement of ineffective social relationships as manifested in level of participation, self-confidence and social comprehension. Among the child predictors, the CPSSI rating of quality of peer support achieved entry accounting for 21% of the variance ($R^2=.21, F=14.86, p<.001$). Similarly, among the parent predictors, quality of peer support emerged as the sole significant variable ($R^2=.38, F=33.02, p<.001$).

PIC Factor Scales

In order to reduce the number of correlated criteria variables, stepwise regressions were performed using three factor derived scales (externalization, internalization, social competence). Factor 4 measuring intellectual and cognitive problems was not assessed.
Factor 1

This factor scale reflects undisciplined/poorly controlled behavior along the lines of Achenbach's (1978) externalizing dimension. The best predictor of this form of disorder was parent rated peer support ($R^2=.10, F=10.59, p<.05$). No child variable met the criteria for entry into the equation.

Factor 2

This factor reflects problems in friendships, excessive shyness and depression. Similar to the regression on the Social Skills profile scale, the child predictor of CPSSI peer support emerged in the equation ($R^2=.13, F=8.07, p<.01$). The parent predictor of peer support also emerged as a significant predictor ($R^2=.29, F=21.96, p<.001$).

Factor 3

This factor scale reflects a combination of internalizing and somatic complaints along the lines of previous factor approaches to children's problems (Achenbach, 1978, Quay, 1979, etc.) The child variables yielded an equation with two quality of peer support (CPSSI and section 2 of the investigator's measure) and teacher support predictors ($R^2=.26, F=6.12, p<.001$). Again, when parent variables were entered, only quality of peer support emerged in the final equation ($R^2=.07, F=4.22, p<.05$).
TABLE 8
STEPWISE REGRESSIONS FOR 13 PIC CRITERION VARIABLES 
USING CHILD RATINGS AS PREDICTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>VARIABLE ENTERED</th>
<th>MULTIPLE R²</th>
<th>R² INCREASE</th>
<th>F INCREASE</th>
<th>FINAL REGRESSION WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADJUSTMENT SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE**

1 Average Rated Peer Support (Section One) .16 - - 10.82** -3.13

Intercept - - - 64.50

**Achievement Scale as Criterion Variable**

1 Average Rated Peer Support (Section One) .185 - - 12.49*** -1.80

Average Rated Total Support .242 .057 4.05* 5.45

3 Quality of Peer Support (Section Two) .341 .099 7.96** - .56

Intercept - - - 51.97

**Somatic Concerns as Criterion Variable**

1 Quality of Teacher Support .13 - - 7.90** .80

Intercept - - - 28.46

*** = p .001
** = p .01
* = p .05
### TABLE 8
STEPWISE REGRESSIONS FOR 13 PIC CRITERION VARIABLES
USING CHILD RATINGS AS PREDICTORS
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>VARIABLE ENTERED</th>
<th>MULTIPLE R²</th>
<th>R² INCREASE</th>
<th>F INCREASE</th>
<th>FINAL REGRESSION WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DEPRESSION SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality of Teacher Support</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.73*</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quality of Peer Support (Section Two)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>5.46**</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FAMILY RELATIONS AS CRITERION VARIABLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family Type</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.34***</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DELINQUENCY SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Average Rated Peer Support (Section One)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.39*</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = p .001  
** = p .01  
* = p .05
TABLE 8
STEPWISE REGRESSIONS FOR 13 PIC CRITERION VARIABLES 
USING CHILD RATINGS AS PREDICTORS
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>VARIABLE-entered</th>
<th>MULTIPLE $R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ INCREASE</th>
<th>$F$ INCREASE</th>
<th>FINAL REGRESSION WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WITHDRAWAL SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Variable Entered the Model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANXIETY SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality of Teacher Support</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.26*</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quality of Peer Support (Section Two)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>5.25**</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HYPERACTIVITY SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality of Teacher Support</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.16*</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family Type</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>5.68**</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = p .001  ** = p .01  * = p .05
### Table 8

**Stepwise Regressions for 13 PIC Criterion Variables Using Child Ratings as Predictors**

(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>VARIABLE ENTERED</th>
<th>MULTIPLE R²</th>
<th>R² INCREASE</th>
<th>F INCREASE</th>
<th>FINAL REGRESSION WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Skills as Criterion Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C.P.S.S.I. Peer Support</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.07**</td>
<td>- 1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor I Scale Entered as Criterion Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Variable Met Criteria For Entry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor II Scale Entered as Criterion Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C.P.S.S.I. Peer Support</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.07**</td>
<td>- 1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = p .001  
** = p .01  
* = p .05
### TABLE 8
STEPWISE REGRESSIONS FOR 13 PIC CRITERION VARIABLES
USING CHILD RATINGS AS PREDICTORS
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE ENTERED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² INCREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F INCREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL REGRESSION WEIGHT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACTOR III SCALE ENTERED AS CRITERION VARIABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>VARIABLE ENTERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C.P.S.S.I. Quality of Peer Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quality of Teacher Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quality of Peer Support (Section Two)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *** = p .001
** ** = p .01
* * = p .05
TABLE 8
STEPWISE REGRESSIONS FOR THE PIC CRITERION VARIABLES
USING PARENT RATINGS AS PREDICTORS
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>VARIABLE ENTERED</th>
<th>MULTIPLE R²</th>
<th>R² INCREASE</th>
<th>F INCREASE</th>
<th>FINAL REGRESSION WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUSTMENT SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality of Peer Support .08 -</td>
<td>4.32*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept - - - 75.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACHIEVEMENT SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality of Teacher Support .08 -</td>
<td>4.47*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept - - - 55.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOMATIC CONCERNS AS CRITERION VARIABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of School Changes .13 -</td>
<td>8.11**</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quality of Peer Support .20 .07</td>
<td>6.77**</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept - - - 59.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = p .001 ** = p .01 * = p .05
### TABLE 8
STEPWISE REGRESSIONS FOR THE PIC CRITERION VARIABLES USING PARENT RATINGS AS PREDICTORS
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MULTIPLE R²</th>
<th>R² INCREASE</th>
<th>F INCREASE</th>
<th>FINAL REGRESSION WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPRESSION SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality of Peer Support</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.76*</td>
<td>- .47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAMILY RELATIONS SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Variable Met The Criteria For Entry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DELINQUENCY SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Variable Met The Criteria For Entry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WITHDRAWAL SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality of Peer Support</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.51*</td>
<td>- .35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = p .001  ** = p .01  * = p .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>VARIABLE ENTERED</th>
<th>MULTIPLE R²</th>
<th>R² INCREASE</th>
<th>F INCREASE</th>
<th>FINAL REGRESSION WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality of Peer Support</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.65*</td>
<td>- .39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANXIETY SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE**

No Variable Met The Criteria For Entry.

|      |                  |             |             |            |                         |

**SOCIAL SKILLS SCALE AS CRITERION VARIABLE**

| 1    | Quality of Peer Support | .38         | -           | 33.02***   | - .78                   |
|      | Intercept              | -           | -           | -          | 81.38                   |

**FACTOR I SCALE ENTERED AS CRITERION VARIABLE**

| 1    | Quality of Peer Support | .29         | -           | 21.96***   | - .70                   |
|      | Intercept              | -           | -           | -          | 77.75                   |

*** = p .001  ** = p .01  * = p .05
### TABLE 8

**STEPWISE REGRESSIONS FOR THE PIC CRITERION VARIABLES USING PARENT RATINGS AS PREDICTORS**

(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>VARIABLE ENTERED</th>
<th>MULTIPLE R²</th>
<th>R² INCREASE</th>
<th>F INCREASE</th>
<th>FINAL REGRESSION WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Peer Support</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.96***</td>
<td>-.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACTOR II SCALE ENTERED AS CRITERION VARIABLE**

|      | Quality of Peer Support | .07 | - | 4.22* | -.40 |
|      | Intercept | - | - | - | 68.39 |

### Footnotes

- *** = p < .001
- ** = p < .01
- * = p < .05
Summary of Results Bearing on the Hypotheses

I. Hypothesis 1 states that: "Children from divorced families will be more dysfunctional than children from non-divorced families on the PIC profile scales of Delinquency, Depression, Hyperactivity and Social Skills". This prediction received mixed support. As predicted, children from divorced families evidenced greater levels of disturbance in general adjustment, delinquency and hyperactivity. Differences in depression or social skills problems were not significant, running counter to prediction. It is clear, however, children from divorced families exhibit greater levels of pathology on several important dimensions of functioning.

II. Hypothesis 2 states that: "Differences in the quality, but not quantity of social support particularly that of peers, will be related to differences in psychological functioning. It is predicted that as the quality of social support increases, dysfunction will decrease". This hypothesis also received support in a complex pattern of results. Peer support indexed by various combinations of parent and child measures predicted functioning on each PIC profile and factor scale except for Family Relations. Teacher support did predict functioning on several scales, but the direction of this relationship was contrary to prediction for children's perceptions. Children who perceive more teacher support are also more dysfunctional. Parent perceptions of
teacher support revealed the predicted inverse relationship.

III. Hypothesis 3 stated that: "In addition to the prediction of a main effect of social support on functioning (Hypothesis 2), it is also predicted that peer support will have a buffering or interaction effect on dysfunction such that peer support will have a stronger effect on dysfunction for children of divorced families". This hypothesis did not receive support. On only one scale, Hyperactivity, did an interaction of family type and support emerge. Consequently, it appears that social support has a main effect on psychological functioning for both children of divorced and intact families.

IV. Hypothesis 4 stated that: "for the divorced subjects, it is predicted that more time since divorce or separation will be associated with lower levels of dysfunction. This hypothesis was not supported. More time since divorce was associated with greater levels of general maladjustment, achievement problems, delinquent conduct and somatic concerns. Interestingly, time since separation was not related to any of the clinical functioning variables.

V. Hypothesis 5 stated that: "... for the divorced subjects, it is predicted that more visits from the non-custodial parent will be associated with lower levels of dysfunction." This hypothesis
was not supported. Frequency of visits was not associated with any of the PIC criterion variables.

VI. Hypothesis 6 stated that: "increased numbers of moves and school changes will be associated with disruptions in social supports provided by both peers and teachers." This prediction was supported. Moving and school changes related to children perceiving fewer and less helpful peer supports. In addition, increased schools changes related to parent perceptions of less teacher support.
Chapter IV

Discussion

The basic goal of this investigation was to examine the relationship between resources in the social environment and psychological functioning in children who have experienced parental divorce. Although the extant literature has implicated numerous variables related to children's coping with divorce, impoverished conceptualizations and uncertain instruments have constrained our understanding of the divorce process.

For the most part, conceptualizations about the factors influencing coping have been restricted to a limited set of intra-familial variables. The more comprehensive conceptualization of the effects of divorce including the contribution of a variety of social-ecological variables has only recently been attempted (e.g., Colleta, 1978; Clingempeel, 1982; Hetherington, 1979). It was with a social-ecological framework in mind that the present investigation examined the relationship between one aspect of the social network, that of social support systems and coping (psychological functioning) with parental divorce. In light of the confusion surrounding this construct, social support was operationalized in several ways. Specifically, both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of social support were examined.

The extant literature on the effects of social support for adults has focused on the hypothesis that social support has a moderating or
"buffering" effect on coping a function of stress. This investigation adopted this general notion in a more narrow focus: parental divorce was the sole dimension of stress considered. Subjects from both divorced and non-divorced families were included to determine if social support would have a "buffering" effect on clinical adjustment as a function of experiencing parental divorce. The inclusion of non-divorced subjects also allowed the opportunity to replicate previous findings of differences in children's behavior in relation to family type.

To avoid the problems of measurement that have plagued the existing studies of the effects of divorce on children, the Personality Inventory for Children (PIC) was selected to promote predictive validity of the observed findings.

In terms of the findings, the central hypothesis of this study, which posited an inverse relationship between the quality of social support and psychological dysfunction received support in both the correlational and regression analyses. This was evident for both child and parent predictors. The quality of peer support was a significant predictor on every clinical and factor scale with the exception of the Family Relations and Hyperactivity scales. This suggests that peer support is indeed important and relates to clinical functioning broadly. In this investigation, social support was not limited to isolated dimensions of dysfunction as other studies in the literature have reported (e.g.,
Although the quality of peer support consistently predicts functioning, the quantity of support failed to emerge in any of the regression analyses. This replicates the work of other investigators that have compared differences between the quantity of support sources and the perceived helpfulness or quality these sources provide on clinical functioning (e.g., House, et al, 1979; Moos, 1980, 1981; Schaefer, 1981). It appears that how many supports one has is much less important than how adequate support is perceived. In fact, the critical number as some have found, may be just one. Another important dimension that could be examined in future work is the effect of utilization or perceptions of the availability of support on coping.

The quality of teacher support, to a lesser degree than with peer support, also emerged as a significant predictor of psychological functioning. The relationship of teacher support to functioning however, is less robust than with peer support and is largely limited to internalizing symptomatology. Interestingly, the direction of the relationship varied as function of whether child or parent perceptions were used as predictors. Results with parent perceptions were in accord with the hypothesized inverse relationship. Children's perceptions of teacher support, however, revealed the opposite effect. Greater levels of child perceived teacher support was associated with greater levels of child disturbance.

In accounting for this unexpected finding, one possibility might be that overworked public school teachers are only able to deliver support
to those few who they feel most need it: children who already are
displaying neurotic like behavior. Children who display conduct related
problems are also troubled, but may be more aversive to teachers and
thus fail to receive higher levels of support. Teacher support thus
appears to arise "after the fact" and does not serve to prevent
problems. The differences between children's and parent's perceptions
of teacher support also suggests a developmental difference between
parents and children in what represents supportiveness from teachers.
As one subject put it "... Teachers don't help, they just teach..."

The findings concerning family support also pose some problems in
interpretation. In the present analyses, family support did not relate
to any of the criterion measures of disturbance. Conclusions are
occluded however, because of the apparent ceiling effect on the family
support measure.

This finding is particularly problematic. It is unlikely that family
support has no bearing on children's functioning. In fact, the
longitudinal studies of the effects of divorce indicate that on-going
family supportiveness may be the key factor in long term adjustment
(Hetherington, 1979). Perhaps the pervasive import of family support,
in part, explains the genesis of a ceiling effect. Since family support
is so necessary and keenly perceived, it may have been quite difficult
for children to admit to an unknown stranger (identified as a
psychologist no less) failures in their most intimate relationship.
Thus, a strong social desirability set may have resulted in a ceiling
effect. It is most certainly socially undesirable to have poor family
interactions. Another possibility might be that admitting to oneself the lack of family support is too painful causing defensive denial and "ideal family" responses. More work on this issue, less dependent on children's verbal self-reports, is clearly indicated to sort out this issue.

The present findings must also be balanced against several general limitations. Since the present sample consisted only of boys, ten to twelve years of age, generalization of the findings to girls or boys at other ages is unwarranted. Indeed, based on the work with adults, it is likely that the support/adjustment relationship varies significantly as function of sex and age (e.g., Schaeffer, 1981). The volunteer nature of the present sample that only represented about 5% of the total families contacted is also a problem. It is not known in what ways these families are different or similar to those families who chose not to participate, except that several had ties to the mental health professions. Social class is also an issue, with the present subject pool representing a very affluent, upper SES group. In terms of measurement issues, the inclusion of a measure of marital functioning beyond the simple divorce distinction would have been valuable to sort out the buffering hypothesis. In the regression analyses, the small sample size might have reduced the likelihood of more variables entering the final equations.

In terms of limitations related to the procedures, it is likely that the interview format which had the investigator directly recording each subject's responses maximized the likelihood of social desirability
The discussion now shifts to integrating the present results with the social support and divorce literatures. In regard first to the social support literature, the present findings support the extension to children of the linkage between support systems and coping. The present findings are also consistent with the only other study assessing the relationship between support systems and adjustment in a population coping with parental divorce (e.g., Farber and Primavera, 1981). In regard to the competing "main effects" versus "buffering" hypotheses, the present results provided evidence only for a direct main effect of support with little evidence of any "buffering" observed. However, the test of buffering hypothesis was limited to a dichotomized dimension, divorce vs. non-divorced family type. This notion of a buffering effect of peer social support for children coping with divorce was based on the idea that since divorce is frequently associated with disruptions in previously positive parent-child relationships and on-going family support (at least on the short term), peer support resources might emerge to become more salient and fill the gap for these children.

Another approach could have been to measure marital conflict on a continuous dimension in both divorced and non-divorced families. This would have allowed the opportunity to test the separate impact of marital conflict and the divorce event on the social support/adjustment relationship. Nevertheless, the present data suggests that peer support is not "instead of" but "in addition to" as some have argued (e.g., Wallerstein and Kelly, 1980).
Although the buffering hypothesis which posited that the correlational relationship between peer social support and functioning would differ as a function of family type was not supported, significant mean differences were found between groups. Specifically, children of divorced families tended to have both fewer and less helpful (i.e., poorer quality) peer supports. This finding supports the findings of Wallerstein and Kelly (1980) and Hetherington (1979), who found that peer relationships worsen in the aftermath of divorce. It is not clear, however, why this is the case.

It could be for a variety of reasons, possibly including the noxious social behavior that children of divorce display that Hetherington has noted, or because of the "stigma" of divorce held by peers. It could also be that since children from divorced families both move and change schools frequently, differences might reflect the effect of being uprooted from one's support system. This might also contribute to the failure to find a buffering effect in that just when peer support might begin to have a differential impact (buffering) on children's adjustment, the intimate ties are often broken by geographic relocations.

Another important issue is that given the significant association between peer support and clinical status, what is the causal nature of this relationship? The present investigation was exploratory in nature and not designed to address the issue of causality. Unfortunately, this is a weakness in much of the support systems literature. However, even though the large majority of the studies are correlational designs, such
as this one, some seem to have concluded that social support acts as to cause differences in functioning. Clearly, the alternative idea, that levels of disturbance create different levels of support is also tenable. Only one study in the literature, by Turner, (1981) has specifically addressed this issue. This study utilized a cross-lagged prospective design which permitted the testing of causal hypotheses. Turner found the cross lagged correlations between support at time 1 and functioning at time 2 were about the same as the correlations between functioning at time 1 and support at time 2, (r=.40). Thus, the quality of social support both influences and is influenced by, levels of functioning. This suggests that both the simple "main effects" model and the equally primitive "social competence alternative" are inadequate to explain the data. Instead, a complex reciprocal processes seem to be operative in which the influences of psychopathology, social skills, and social supports are bi-directional.

Although not specifically directed toward the effects of support systems, an experiment by Furman and Hartup (1979) provides indirect evidence that peer support systems may directly influence functioning. In this study, preschool children who displayed poor social functioning were given special time to play with younger and same age peers. Experience with the younger peers, in particular, had the effect of improving subsequent social functioning.

To add even greater complexity to this issue, other individual characteristics are probably salient in creating peer supports such as physical attractiveness or physical prowess (for boys). Future work
might use prospective designs so that the relationship between children's peer supports and functioning over time (as parents become embroiled in the divorce process) could be examined. Future work might also investigate more specifically how different forms of social support relate to functioning. Is it informational support which might enhance problem solving or perhaps emotional support which causes one to feel valued and important?

More complete understanding of the nature of social support systems needs to consider the setting influences (i.e., extra-individual) on perceptions of social support. The work on the social climate of schools and classrooms (e.g., Kelly, 1979; Trickett, 1978) provide a preliminary glimpse of how different school environments may promote or inhibit the development of supportive interactions. This line of investigation might be expanded to specifically address peer support systems.

In terms of the divorce literature, the present results replicate the trend in the literature which suggests that children of divorce are at differential risk for psychopathology. In the present investigation, children from divorced families evidenced poorer general adjustment and greater specific disturbances in conduct (e.g., Delinquency and Hyperactivity). This confirms the pattern in the literature in which children of divorce have been found to be differentially vulnerable both to global psychopathology and aggressive disorders in particular (e.g., Felner, 1975; Felner et al., 1978; Hetherington, 1979; Schoettle and
Cantwell, 1980; Zill, 1978). Interestingly, there were no significant differences between groups on the internalizing dimensions of disorder as Wallerstein and Kelly (1980) have suggested based on their clinical impressions.

The present investigation, as is the case with much of the extant literature, does not provide much understanding about why this pattern of disturbance is so characteristic of children of divorce. It is not clear, for example, whether these differences reflect the specific effects of divorce, marital conflict, or, if divorce is simply a marker variable for more basic distortions in parent-child relationships. Hetherington's work, however, does suggest that the divorce can signal a breakdown in previously positive parent-child relationships and stimulate the genesis of a particularly insidious pattern of mutual coercion. The onset of this coercive process seems to evolve from the increased demands of children coupled with the diminished ability of the parent to meet their children's needs. If peers also become unavailable or less supportive, the child may have an all encompassing sense of isolation and rejection. Thus, it is not too hard to envision why children become so angry and defiant.

In view of the present results and the general trend in the literature, efforts to meet the needs of this population both by traditional service delivery and by preventative intervention such as through the enhancement of social support systems should be considered.


Felner, R., Ginter, M., Boike, M., and Cowen, E. Parental death or divorce and the school adjustment of young children. American Journal of Community Psychology, in press.


APPENDIX A

Letters to Parents
Dear Parent(s):  

I am a graduate student in psychology at Ohio State University, currently on internship in Los Angeles. I am writing to you about some research I am conducting...and I would like your help for my Ph. D. dissertation project.

My study is concerned with understanding children’s and adolescent’s views on the helpfulness of friends. The goal is to understand the link between children’s peer relations and coping behavior. More specifically, my study involves the following: the basic element is for parents to answer some questions by mail about their children in general terms and about their friendships in particular. In addition, there are some other questions. For example, how many other children live in your neighborhood? Also, I would like to meet with the children briefly (at school for about 15 minutes) to get the children’s own viewpoint on friendships. The teacher would also be asked to fill out a questionnaire, similar to the parents’ about the child’s friendships. All responses would be kept confidential.

If you have a boy in the 4th, 5th, 6th, or 7th grade and feel that you and your child are willing to participate, please return the attached permission form in the envelope provided. You and your child could of course, elect to terminate participation at any time.

I can offer little in return for your cooperation, however, your assistance could help psychologists achieve a better understanding than they now have of the helpfulness of friends to children. In exchange for your contribution of time is the satisfaction of knowing that someday, your help on this project may serve children of the future.

Thank you for considering my study. If you have any questions, please call me at (213) 475-0669.

Sincerely,

Chip Schreiber

CS:cam

Encls.

P.S. This project has been approved by the Research Branch of the Los Angeles Unified School District.
November 1981

Dear Parent(s):

Thank you very much for deciding to participate in my Ph.D. research project.

I am now in the process of interviewing the children and all that is needed to complete my project is receiving the questionnaires back from the parents. The parent component is necessary to make use of the child's interview. Returning the completed questionnaires (in the envelope enclosed) as soon as possible would be appreciated.

I realize that completing these questionnaires involves a considerable amount of your time but the parent portion of this study is a key element. Some day, with the contribution of your effort on this study, we will have a better understanding of the link between children's peer relations and coping behavior.

Enclosed are two separate questionnaires that I would like for you to respond to. The first one is a measure of Mothers' perceptions of their child's friendships. Please select one answer to each multiple choice question.

The second questionnaire is contained in a booklet with a separate computerized answer sheet entitled "Personality Inventory for Children". The instructions for answering this measure are on the cover of the booklet and on the answer sheet. Since this answer sheet will be scored by computer (anonymously), please use a Number 2 pencil. Please return the booklet as well as the answer sheets.

In order to assure comparability across the sample, I am requesting that Mothers only answer the questionnaires.

If you have any questions pertaining to the completion of the questionnaire, please contact me. If you would like a summary of the findings of this study, please indicate this.

Sincerely,

Chip Schretber
(213) 396-2628

encls.
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
APPENDIX B

Children's Perception of Social Support Measure
Support Network Interview
(child informant)

Protocol #
date run
Sch. code grade

I. Everyone gets angry, sad, or upset sometimes. Which are the kinds of things that happen to everyone that really upset you?

II. Who are the people that help the best when(x event above) happens?
(# sources source rated 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 average rating across sources)
Support Network Interview (child informant)

1. How much do your friends (other kids) share with you, let you borrow, or trade stuff with you (like food, skateboards, etc.)

2. How much do your friends (other kids) want to spend time with you (be with you) afterschool, during your lunchtime, recess or on weekends?

3. How much do your friends (other kids) (a) your teacher (b) tell you or show you that they like you and like to be around you?

   (a) ___ (b) ___

4. How much do your friends (other kids) like to do the same stuff or activities that you do, like the same ways to spend free time?

5. How much do your friends (other kids) (a) your teachers (b) listen to you, talk things over with you when you are trying to tell them about something really important or special, like a problem?

   (A) ___ (B) ___

6. How much do your friends (other kids) (a) your teachers (b) do stuff for you or help out in some way to make you feel better when you are really upset or have a problem?

   (A) ___ (B) ___

7. How well can your friends (other kids) (a) your teachers (b) tell when you are upset (or understand what is making you feel upset)?

   (A) ___ (B) ___

8. How much can you trust your friends (other kids) (a) your teachers (b) about really important things?

   ___ (b) ___
9. How much do your friends (other kids) (a) your teacher (b) give you ideas, suggestions or advice on how to handle problems or hassles? 
   ___(A)___(B)

10. If you really needed help some time, how much would you be able to count on or depend your friends (other kids) (a) your teachers (b) to back you up or help out?
   ___(A)___(B)

11. How much can you tell your friends (other kids) about really important stuff secrets (or your feelings)?
   ___

__________________ Name

Other comments:
APPENDIX C

Parent Perception of Social Support Measure
Support Network Interview (Parental Informant)

Protocol #_________
Date:___________
Child's Name:_________
Parent filling out form:

For all the questions to follow, please choose the number that best represents your response. All questions are answered on a 5 point scale where 1 is equal to "very little" and 5 is equal to "very much".

1. How much do your child's friends share with your child or trade things with him (e.g., gum, dessert, skateboards, baseball cards, etc.)?

   - very little 1 2 3 4 5 very much (Circle One)

2. How much do your child's friends want to spend time with him after school, weekends or during "free time" at school or at home?

   - very little 1 2 3 4 5 very much (Circle One)

3. How much do his friends tell your child or show him in some way that they like him and like to be with him?

   - very little 1 2 3 4 5 very much (Circle One)

4. How much do your child's friends like to do the same activities that your child does...like the same kinds of things or ways to spend "free time" (i.e., sports, games, T.V., group activities, music etc.)?

   - very little 1 2 3 4 5 very much (Circle One)

5(a) How much do his friends listen to your child, talk things over with him when he is trying to tell them about something really important or special (e.g., like problems at home, a new puppy, getting a great grade or a real bad grade etc.)?

   - very little 1 2 3 4 5 very much (Circle One)

5(b) How much does your child's teacher listen to him and talk things over with him when he is trying to tell them about something really important or special (e.g., like problems at home, a new puppy, about getting a great grade or a bad grade etc.)?

   - very little 1 2 3 4 5 very much (Circle One)

6(a) How much do your child's friends do things with him; spend time with him and try to help out in some way to try to make him feel better when he is upset, angry, sad or feeling ill?

   - very little 1 2 3 4 5 very much (Circle One)
6(b) How much does your child's teacher do things with your child, spend time with him and try to help out in some way to try to make your child feel better when he is really upset, angry, sad or feeling ill?

very little 1  2  3  4  5 very much (Circle One)

7(a) How well can your child's friends tell when your child is upset or understand why he may be upset?

very little 1  2  3  4  5 very much (Circle One)

7(b) How well can your child's teacher tell when he is upset or understand why he may be upset?

very little 1  2  3  4  5 very much (Circle One)

8(a) How much can your child trust his friends about really important things?

very little 1  2  3  4  5 very much (Circle One)

8(b) How much can your child trust his teacher about really important things?

very little 1  2  3  4  5 very much (Circle One)

9(a) How much do your child's friends give him ideas, suggestions, advice, on how to handle a problem or hassle?

very little 1  2  3  4  5 very much (Circle One)

9(b) How much does your child's teacher give your child ideas, suggestions, advice, on how to handle a problem or hassle?

very little 1  2  3  4  5 very much (Circle One)

10(a) If your child really needed help sometime, how much would he be able to rely upon his friends to back him up or help him out?

very little 1  2  3  4  5 very much (Circle One)

10(b) If your child really needed help sometime, how much would he be able to rely upon his teacher to back him up or help him out?

very little 1  2  3  4  5 very much (Circle One)

11. How much can your child tell his friends about really important things and expect them to keep it confidential?

very little 1  2  3  4  5 very much (Circle One)
Section 2.

1. How many times in the last 5 years has your child changed schools?

2. How many times in the last 5 years have you moved?

3. In your neighborhood, how many children are there of similar age to your child?

4. Please list the ages and sex of siblings:

Section 3. (For non-intact families only):

If divorced or separated, please indicate date of separation and date of divorce.

Please indicate frequency of average visitation by non-custodial parent if applicable (month, week, year, select one) (e.g., 2 times per week).

Thank you very much for your assistance with my research project.
APPENDIX D

Rosen Children's Perception of Social Support Inventory (CPSSI)
PLEASE NOTE:
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APPENDIX E

Personality Inventory for Children