

ABSTRACT

Divorce-Related Parental Concerns and Outcomes from the Perspectives of Young Adult Children of Divorced Parents

Elizabeth Coe, Psy.D.

Mentor: Keith Sanford, Ph.D.

The current project sought to examine young adult children's perceptions of six types of concerns that parents may have during a divorce: concerns about power, malice, finances, esteem, child rejection, and custody. Three hundred thirteen young adults who reported experiencing parental divorce between the ages of 10 and 17 were asked to complete an online survey assessing their perceptions of parental concerns, acrimonious parent interactions, parent-child relationships, and well-being. Although there was a lack of distinction between perceived concerns about power and malice, these scales demonstrated several expected associations and results were fairly robust, suggesting that young adults' perceptions of their parents' concerns regarding conflict (encompassing both power and malice) are important. The perceived custody concerns scale demonstrated a unique pattern of results in which it was associated with higher parent acrimony but also with higher parent-child warmth, suggesting that young adults' perceptions of parents' custody concerns are also important, and different from other types of concerns. Hypotheses regarding the finances, esteem, and child rejection scales were unsupported or poorly supported, however, which raises questions about the extent

to which it is meaningful to assess young adults' perceptions of these types of concerns. Overall, the hypothesis that young adults would be able to distinguish between six types of divorce-related parental concerns was not supported. Rather, the results suggest that young adult children of divorced parents may perceive parental concerns with less specificity, as only two distinct and meaningful general categories of concerns were identified: concerns related to inter-parent conflict and custody.

Divorce-Related Parental Concerns and Outcomes from the Perspectives of Young Adult
Children of Divorced Parents

by

Elizabeth Coe, B.A., M.S.C.P.

A Dissertation

Approved by the Department of Psychology and Neuroscience

Charles A. Weaver III, Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Psychology

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

Keith P. Sanford, Ph.D., Chairperson

Sara L. Dolan, Ph.D.

Christine A. Limbers, Ph.D.

Thomas A. Fergus, Ph.D.

Jon E. Singletary, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School

December 2017

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2017 by Elizabeth Coe

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	vii
Acknowledgments.....	viii
Dedication.....	ix
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Parental Concerns from the Perspectives of Young Adult Children of Divorced Parents.....	2
Parental Concerns.....	4
Acrimonious Parent Interactions.....	10
Parent-Child Relationships.....	11
Well-Being.....	14
Overview of the Study Rationale and Plan.....	15
Chapter Two: Method.....	17
Participants.....	17
Procedures.....	19
Measures.....	22
Demographic Information.....	22
Perceived Parental Concerns.....	23
Acrimonious Parent Interactions.....	24
Parent-Child Relationships: Warmth.....	26
Parent-Child Relationships: Shared Involvement.....	27
Well-Being.....	29
Chapter Three: Results.....	30
Preliminary Analyses.....	30
Confirmatory Factor Analysis.....	34
Correlations.....	37
Differences between Correlations.....	41
Regressions.....	42
Chapter Four: Discussion.....	45
Limitations and Directions for Future Research.....	51
Conclusions.....	53
Appendix.....	55
Appendix A: Study Questionnaire.....	56
Demographics.....	56
Perceived Parental Concerns.....	56
Shared Involvement.....	58

Retrospective Outcomes.....	59
Acrimony Scale.....	60
Perceptions of Parents Scales.....	60
Current Outcomes.....	61
Acrimony Scale.....	61
Perceptions of Parents Scales.....	62
Well-Being.....	63
References.....	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges of Study Variables.....	31
Table 2: Correlations between Demographic Variables and Perceived Parental Concerns.....	32
Table 3: One-way ANOVA results for Perceived Parental Concerns and Participant Relationship Status.....	32
Table 4: One-way ANOVA results for Perceived Parental Concerns and Divorce Mediation Use.....	32
Table 5: Inter-Scale Correlations between Perceived Parental Concerns Scales.....	33
Table 6: Confirmatory Factor Analysis Standardized Factor Loadings.....	35
Table 7: Confirmatory Factor Analysis Correlations between Latent Factors.....	37
Table 8: Correlations between Perceived Parental Concerns and Criterion Variables.....	38
Table 9: T-values from T-tests for Differences between Correlations between Perceived Parental Concerns and Retrospective and Current Outcomes.....	42
Table 10: Beta Weights for Perceived Parental Concerns Predicting Criterion Variables.....	44

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Keith Sanford; without his guidance and wisdom this project would not have been possible. I would also like to thank the committee members who contributed their time and ideas to this project from proposal to defense: Dr. Sara Dolan, Dr. Christine Limbers, Dr. Thomas Fergus, Dr. Jon Singletary, Dr. John Klocek, and Dr. Samantha Vo. Finally, I would like to thank the students of the Baylor Psy.D. program, especially the Cohort of 2017 and the members of Dr. Sanford's research lab, for their support and solidarity throughout our time together.

DEDICATION

To my undergraduate mentors, for inspiring a passion for psychological inquiry

To my clinical supervisors, for demonstrating that inquiry is enriched by intuition and in
the context of service to others

And to my family, for their unwavering love and support

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Divorce is a widespread phenomenon that affects more than 1 million children in the United States each year, with approximately 40% of all children experiencing parental divorce before they reach adulthood (Bradbury & Karney, 2014). Though divorce itself is not always strongly related to long-term functional outcomes, certain related phenomena, including the way that parents interact with each other and the relationships they have with their children, are important indicators of post-divorce family functioning (Amato, Loomis, & Booth, 1995; Clifford & Clark, 1995; Emery, 1982a; Long, 1987). Research has identified several types of concerns that parents may have during a divorce which are likely to influence outcomes such as parental interactions and parent-child relationships; namely, concerns about power, malice, finances, esteem, child rejection, and custody (Amato, 2000; Sanford & Rivers, in press). This is because concerns, like other types of cognitions, are likely to affect behaviors (Bandura, 1969; Beck, 2011; Ellis, 1959). This means that concerns are more than private, inward experiences – they are likely to be expressed and acted upon outwardly. Therefore, parental concerns are important, not merely as private cognitions experienced by parents, but also as enacted concerns that can be perceived by other family members.

If this is true, then it could be valuable to assess how other family members, such as children, perceive a parent's enacted concerns. For example, it is possible that young adult children from divorced families have meaningful recollections about what occurred during the divorce process, that they have perceptions of their parent's enacted concerns,

and that they can distinguish between dimensions of enacted concern that are similar to the dimensions of concern that parents experience. If parental concerns are important because they are enacted, then it is possible that children's perceptions of enacted concerns will be similar to parents' self-reported experienced concerns in correlating with outcome variables such as parental interactions, parent-child relationships, and well-being. However, before research can proceed with this line of investigation, it is essential to address an important question: is it possible to assess children's perceptions of parents' enacted concerns?

Parental Concerns from the Perspectives of Young Adult Children of Divorced Parents

There are several reasons why assessing parent's enacted concerns from the perspectives of young adult children might be possible and useful. First, children are sensitive to family conflict cues (Grych & Fincham, 1990; Lewis, Siegel, & Lewis, 1984), so they are likely to be attentive to signs of parental concerns during divorce, which may serve as markers of an ensuing or existing conflict. Second, in addition to being a type of private cognition, concerns are likely to affect behavior, which may be observable by children. That is, parental concerns are likely to be both experienced and enacted, and then perceived by children. For example, a divorcing parent with a concern about finances may seek additional income, decrease spending, or directly express finance-related worries to children – three types of behaviors that may be observed and interpreted by children. Research suggests that children are able to observe parents' behavioral changes and make interpretations about their meanings, even when the change-producing behavioral interaction occurs out of the child's view (Cummings & Davies, 1994; Davies, Myers, & Cummings, 1996; Grych, Seid, & Fincham, 1992). It

seems likely, then, that children will be able to observe parents' behaviors and make interpretations about meanings (in this case, parents' concerns) during parental divorce, a process which may occur well within the view of children. Third, although memory may be prone to several known errors, emotional salience is one of the strongest predictors of which childhood memories will persist into adulthood (Peterson, Morris, Baker-Ward, & Flynn, 2014). It follows that young adults are likely to be able to accurately recount their childhood perceptions of what occurred during parental divorce, which is typically an emotionally salient event. To increase the likelihood of obtaining accurate childhood recollections, it may be beneficial to assess young adults whose parents divorced before their 18th birthday but after their 10th birthday, a minimum cut-off based on a similar, previous study of children's perceptions of parental behaviors (Grych, Seid, & Fincham, 1992). Finally – regardless of accuracy – young adult children's perceptions of their parents' divorce-related enacted concerns are important to consider because children are the party most affected by parental divorce (Menin, 2000) and because childhood memories of caregiving may impact outcomes into adulthood (Narayan, Ippen, Harris, & Lieberman, 2017).

Because research regarding children's memory and meaning formation suggests that it is likely that young adult children of divorced parents will have meaningful recollections about what occurred during the divorce process, it may be possible and useful to assess young adult children's perceptions of parents' enacted concerns during divorce. If it is true that parents' enacted concerns will mirror their experienced concerns, young adult children should be able to identify similar types of concerns that have been previously identified by parent samples, and it should be possible to demonstrate similar

results, including similar distinctions between types of parental concerns and similar associations between parental concerns and outcome variables such as parental interactions, parent-child relationships, and well-being. The subsequent sections describe the types of divorce-related concerns that may be experienced and enacted by parents and perceived by young adult children, followed by a discussion of the outcomes these concerns are expected to be associated with.

Parental Concerns

Using self-report data from a sample of divorced parents, Sanford and Rivers (in press) identified six types of divorce-related concerns that parents may experience: concerns about power, malice, finances, self-esteem, child rejection, and custody. Though not an exhaustive list, a review of the literature and empirical data suggests that these six concerns may be particularly salient for divorcing parents (Sanford & Rivers, in press). The “concerns” identified by Sanford and Rivers (in press) agree and overlap with other constructs within the divorce literature, including Patterson’s (2002) “primary appraisals,” which are ways of identifying and defining the demands of a stressful situation, and particularly Amato’s (2000) “stressors” identified in the divorce-stress-adjustment model, all of which are expected to influence the way family members behave and adapt during and after divorce. These commonalities lend support to the framework and highlight how concerns, in addition to being a type of private, inward experience, are likely to be enacted outwardly and perceived by others. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that young adult children may be able to distinguish between the same six types of concerns that parents self-reported. If so, a measure of young adult children’s perceived parental concerns should show the same six factors found using a parent-report measure.

Also, as a more robust indicator of the distinctness of the six types of perceived parental concerns, it would be expected that each type of perceived parental concern would contribute unique variance to a set of criterion variables. The following paragraphs describe in greater detail the six types of parental concerns that may be experienced and enacted by parents and perceived by young adult children.

The first two types of parental concerns are called power concerns and malice concerns. First, power concerns refer to a parent's worries that the other parent will have more power than himself or herself in negotiating a satisfactory divorce settlement. Power differentials are often cited as negative influential factors in the divorce process (Bollen, Verbeke, & Euwema, 2013; Neumann, 1992; Nickles & Hedgespeth, 1991), such that balancing spousal power is one of the primary aims of divorce mediation (Neumann, 1992). Prior research with samples of divorced parents found that power concerns were associated with lower levels of self-reported power within the legal system and lower levels of satisfaction with divorce settlement (Sanford & Rivers, in press). If power concerns are indicative of difficulty or dissatisfaction during the divorce settlement process, this type of concern would likely be observable to witnesses of that process and associated with other negative divorce-related outcomes, such as acrimonious parent interactions and poor parent-child relationships. Second, malice concerns refer to a parent's worries that the other parent will be dishonest or cruel during the divorce process. Research among divorced couples has found that trust between parents is associated with positive post-divorce family functioning (Elkin, 1987; Turkat, 2002), so perceptions of dishonesty and cruelty are likely to be detrimental to post-divorce adjustment. Prior research with divorced parents has found just that – higher

levels of malice concerns were associated with increased hostility between parents and a greater desire to draw one's children into an alliance against the other parent (Sanford & Rivers, in press), both of which may be perceived by – and detrimental to – children. Although these two concerns are distinct (e.g., a parent might feel equally powerful as the other parent, but still worrying that the other parent will act cruel or dishonest), they are similar in that they both involve worries about how the other parent might act during the divorce process. These two concerns are also similar in that they contain or contribute to elements of ongoing parental conflict, which was identified by Amato (2000) as a divorce-related stressor for both parents and children. As such, both are likely to be positively related to acrimonious parent interactions and negatively related to parent-child relationships.

The third type of parental concern is called a finance concern, which refers to a parent's worries about not having enough money or other material resources after the divorce. Financial concerns are commonly endorsed among divorcing parents (Poortman and Seltzer, 2007), and economic decline has been identified as divorce-related stressor for both parents and children (Amato, 2000). Finance concerns may reflect actual resource disparities between parents (Bollen, Verbeke, & Euwema, 2013; Poortman and Seltzer, 2007), but could also be salient when financial loss is expected or imagined. Previous studies of divorced parents found that finance concerns were related to post-divorce financial stress and perceived financial resources, supporting the notion that these types of concerns represent accurate appraisals of divorce-related financial challenges (Sanford & Rivers, in press). Regardless, the threat of financial loss (real or imagined) may motivate parents to engage in acrimonious interactions – essentially, to fight for

access to resources. Finance concerns may also negatively impact parent-child relationships if the concerns lead to increased worry/stress or time away from children (e.g., longer work hours or moving to a neighborhood that is cheaper but less child-friendly). Again, this is because these concerns are more than private, inward experiences; they are likely to be enacted outwardly.

The fourth type of parental concern, called an esteem concern, refers to a parent's worries about feeling devalued or interpersonally rejected due to the divorce. Divorce is likely to be a time of grief, loneliness, and self-doubt for parents (Hancock, 1980) and low levels of self-esteem have been shown to predict of high levels of stress during divorce settlement (Burrell, Narus, Bogdanoff, & Allen, 1994). Similarly, Amato (2000) identified loss of emotional support as an important stressor for divorced parents. Sanford and Rivers (in press) found that parents' self-reported esteem concerns were associated with an anxious attachment style (characterized by fear of abandonment and doubts about one's value and lovability) and poorer well-being. If esteem concerns are related to parental stress and distress (e.g., fear, doubt, poor well-being), as the extant literature suggests, it would be reasonable to expect that this type of concern would be related to other negative outcomes such as more acrimonious parent interactions and less warmth and shared involvement in parent-child relationships.

The fifth type of parental concern is called a child rejection concern. This type of concern refers to a parent's worries that his or her child would no longer like him or her or that the child would be angry with him or her. These concerns are important to assess because anger and noncompliance are common reactions from children in the first two years following divorce (Greene et al., 2011), and for some children these reactions may

persist or worsen as they enter adolescence and young adulthood (Greene et al., 2011; Hetherington et al., 1992). Prior studies of divorced parents found that child rejection concerns were negatively associated with parent-child closeness and positively associated with internalizing behaviors in children (Sanford & Rivers, in press). Additionally, sole parenting responsibility and a decline in parental support and effective control have been identified as important divorce-related stressors for parents and children, respectively (Amato, 2000). Because child rejection concerns may reflect a lack of support and control within the parenting relationship as family members struggle to adjust to their new post-divorce roles and responsibilities, it is likely that concerns about child rejection would be expressed and acted out within the parental and parent-child relationships. More specifically, it is likely that this type of concern would be associated with acrimonious parent interactions and negatively related to warmth and shared involvement in parent-child relationships.

The sixth and final type of parental concern is called a custody concern, which refers to a parent's worries that the divorce custody arrangement would limit the amount of time or involvement he or she has in the child's life. Though custody concerns are similar to child rejection concerns in that they both deal with aspects of child-rearing and the parenting role, they are distinct in that child rejection concerns pertain to emotional aspects of the parenting role while custody concerns pertain to physical/practical aspects of the parenting role. Custody concerns are important to assess because it is common for divorcing parents to expect negative changes to their parenting roles following the divorce (Poortman and Seltzer, 2007) and loss of custody/contact has been identified as an important divorce-related stressor for both parents and children (Amato, 2000). On the

one hand, custody concerns may represent actual or expected changes in parenting rights and responsibilities, and therefore may be related to negative outcomes such as increased parental conflict as parents fight for their desired custody arrangement (Bahr, Chappell, & Marcos, 1987; Bollen, Verbeke, & Euwema, 2013). Prior studies using self-report data from divorced parents supports the notion that custody concerns are representative of actual custody outcomes: parents who reported higher levels of custody concerns reported less post-divorce access to their children in terms of legal and physical custody (Sanford & Rivers, in press). On the other hand, custody concerns may reflect concern for children's well-being, which is theoretically associated with better post-divorce adjustment among parents and children (Burrell, Narus, Bogdanoff, & Allen, 1994; Elkin, 1987; Lemmon, 1983). Synthesizing these two lines of thought, it is possible that custody concerns could be related to negative outcomes such as acrimonious parental interactions *and* related to positive outcomes such as warmth and shared involvement in parent-child relationships, especially if these associations were assessed from an alternate perspective, such as from the perspective of young adult children of divorced parents.

As described above, parent-reported concerns during divorce have been associated with several divorce-related outcomes. Therefore, it is possible that young adult children's perceptions of their parents' enacted concerns will also be related to post-divorce outcomes, including acrimonious parental interactions, warmth and shared involvement in parent-child relationships, and well-being. These outcomes are discussed in the following sections.

Acrimonious Parent Interactions

First, it is important to understand the extent to which perceived parental concerns are related to parents' interactions after divorce because conflictual or acrimonious parent interactions are the variable most strongly associated with post-divorce family functioning (Cummings & Davies, 1994; Grych & Fincham, 1990). In fact, meta-analyses examining post-divorce adjustment have found that the average effect size between parent conflict and family adjustment is nearly double the effect size between divorce itself and family adjustment (Amato & Keith, 1991; Buehler et al., 1997). These findings are consistent with the divorce-stress-adjustment model of divorce (Amato, 2000, 2010), in which ongoing parent conflict is a mediator of post-divorce adjustment. Acrimonious parental interactions can be defined by the two primary components identified by Sanford and Rivers (in press): high levels of hostile interactions and low levels of friendly interactions. Because acrimony is an important indicator of poor post-divorce family functioning, it may be beneficial to examine how acrimonious parental interactions may be related to perceived parental concerns.

Hostility (one component of acrimony) has previously been associated with parental concerns regarding malice, power, custody, child rejection, and finances in samples of divorced parents (Sanford & Rivers, in press), and it is important to examine the extent to which these results can be replicated when assessed from the perspectives of young adult children of divorced parents. Malice concerns demonstrated the largest effect, and it would be reasonable to expect the same result when assessed from an alternate perspective. Although esteem concerns were not significantly correlated with hostility when assessed from parents' perspectives by Sanford and Rivers (in press), the

result was in the expected direction. It is possible that parents may have been reticent to self-report esteem concerns, which involve highly vulnerable emotions such as doubt and fear, and that a significant effect may be found when assessed from young adult children's perspectives. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that acrimonious parent interactions may be positively associated with all six types of perceived parental concerns.

Because, like other types of interpersonal phenomena, acrimonious parental interactions may change over time, it may be valuable to assess this variable from two time perspectives: retrospectively (in the first 1-2 years after the divorce) and currently (at the time of assessment). Such an assessment method would allow for the possibility of capturing differences between participants' recollections of parental interactions during the time period shortly after the divorce compared to their perceptions of current parental interactions. Consistent with extant literature showing that most divorce-related effects tend to diminish over time (Hetherington & Stanley-Hagan, 1999), it is likely that perceived parental concerns related to the time of the divorce would be more strongly related to retrospective acrimonious parent interactions than to current acrimonious parent interactions.

Parent-Child Relationships

It is also important to understand the extent to which perceived parental concerns are related to parent-child relationships because previous research suggests that changes to parent-child relationships are another important aspect of post-divorce family functioning. For example, it is common for children to show anger, noncompliance, and/or dependence in the parent-child relationship in the first two years following divorce

when parents tend to be preoccupied with their own adjustment difficulties (Burrell, Narus, Bogdanoff, & Allen, 1994; Greene et al., 2011). However, problems in the parent-child relationship may persist after the first two years following divorce, and additional problems may surface when children enter adolescence and young adulthood (Greene et al., 2011; Hetherington et al., 1992). Strained parent-child relationships are associated with problem behaviors in children of divorce, but positive parent-child relationships may have a buffering effect (Hetherington, 1979, 1993). Warmth is an especially important aspect of the parent-child relationship because the extant literature suggests that children's post-divorce adjustment is facilitated by the presence of a caring, warm adult (Emery, 1982a; Greene et al., 2011). Due to possible differences young adult children may perceive in their relationships with their mothers and fathers, it is important to assess both maternal and paternal warmth. Shared involvement, or the extent to which parents share equitable contact and custody of their children, is another aspect of parent-child relationships that has been theoretically and empirically associated with positive post-divorce outcomes (Amato, Kane, & James, 2011; Greene et al., 2011; Nielsen, 2014). Conversely, reduced parent-child contact following divorce has been implicated in lower self-esteem among college-age females (Clifford & Clark, 1995). The importance of shared involvement is reflected in the fact that equitable custody and co-parenting variables are used as measures of divorce mediation success (Bailey & McCarty, 2009; Sbarra & Emery, 2008; Emery, Sbarra, & Grover, 2005; Zuberbuhler, 2001). From the risk and resiliency perspective of the divorce-stress-adjustment model (Amato, 2000), warmth and shared involvement may be considered types of interpersonal resources, which are resiliency factors for post-divorce adjustment. It is therefore important to

determine how parent-child relationships, dually defined by warmth and shared involvement, may be related to perceived parental concerns.

Prior research with samples of divorced parents found that child rejection concerns were negatively associated with parent-child closeness (Sanford & Rivers, in press), while custody concerns were negatively associated with parents' time spent with children post-divorce. When assessed from young adults' perspectives, it is likely that the similar constructs of parent-child warmth and shared involvement would be negatively associated with perceived parental concerns about power, malice, finances, esteem, and child rejection. This expectation is an expansion of prior findings, reflecting the possibility that stronger associations might be found when variables are assessed from the perspectives of young adult children, because prior research comparing child- and parent-report data suggests that parents may underreport how divorce negatively affects children (Hetherington & Stanley-Hagan, 1999).

Alternately, parent-child warmth and shared involvement are likely to be positively associated with perceived parental concerns about custody. Although this expectation represents a departure from the pattern expected for the other concern types and is a direct contradiction to prior results from samples of divorced parents, it is reasonable to expect that some types of associations – especially those involving variables of which the child is a direct participant or recipient as well as an observer – could be different when assessed from the perspectives of young adult children of divorced parents. For example, whereas in parent samples custody concerns seem to represent actual custody settlement challenges, perceived parental custody concerns in samples of young adult children may be more representative of children's perceptions that their parents want to spend time

with them and are concerned for their well-being, which is theoretically associated with better post-divorce adjustment (Burrell, Narus, Bogdanoff, & Allen, 1994; Elkin, 1987; Lemmon, 1983). Therefore, although custody concerns may be associated with negative parent-child outcomes when reported by divorced parents, they are likely to be associated with positive parent-child outcomes, such as warmth and shared involvement, when assessed from the perspectives of young adult children of divorced parents.

As with acrimonious parental interactions, it may be valuable to assess parent-child warmth from two time perspectives: retrospectively (in the first 1-2 years after the divorce) and currently (at the time of assessment), in order to assess for possible differences. Specifically, it is possible that perceived parental concerns related to the time of the divorce would be more strongly related to retrospective parent-child warmth than to current parent-child warmth, as is consistent with extant literature on diminishing divorce-related effects over time (Hetherington & Stanley-Hagan, 1999). Because custody and contact issues become less relevant, and more complicated by other factors, after children reach the age of majority, shared involvement was only measured from one time perspective (between the time of the divorce and respondents' 18th birthday).

Well-Being

The final outcome variable of interest is current well-being, as self-reported by young adult children. A review of the literature on children's divorce outcomes indicates that well-being is often used as a measure of post-divorce adjustment and functioning. Although well-being is accepted as an important outcome variable, empirical results regarding the association between parental divorce and children's well-being have been somewhat mixed (Amato & Keith, 1991; Greene et al., 2011). Different ways of defining

and assessing well-being, different time points of assessment, and different theories regarding why and how parental divorce impacts children have all been referenced as explanations for the variations in results (Amato, 2010; Amato & Keith, 1991). Despite these differences, empirical results tend to support the notion that parental divorce, as a single event, is responsible for little lasting variance in children's well-being (Amato & Keith, 1991; Bradbury & Karney, 2014; Greene et al., 2011). Rather, well-being seems to be more strongly related to underlying and ongoing factors, such as parental conflict (Amato, 2010; Amato & Keith, 1991). To the extent that parent's enacted concerns represent underlying and ongoing factors, it is expected that well-being, as self-reported by young adult children of divorced parents, would be negatively associated with perceived concerns about power, malice, finance, esteem, and child rejection and positively associated with perceived custody concerns. However, given the nature of prior findings for well-being, it is likely that these effects might be small.

Overview of the Study Rationale and Plan

Using self-report data from a sample of divorced parents, Sanford & Rivers (in press) demonstrated support for the salience and distinctness of six types of concerns that divorcing parents may experience: concerns about power, malice, finances, esteem, child rejection, and custody. These "concerns" agree and overlap with constructs previously identified by researchers of divorce, including Patterson's "primary appraisals" (2002) and particularly Amato's "stressors" (2000), lending credence to the theory. However, parental concerns have heretofore been examined only from parents' perspectives. Because concerns are likely to be both experienced and enacted, it is likely that others, including young adult children of divorced parents, should be able to report on parental

concerns. Thus, the present study sought to examine the extent to which prior findings regarding parents' self-reported concerns could be replicated using data from the perspectives of young adult children of divorced parents. Using internet samples of young adults aged 18-23 whose parents divorced during their childhood (between the ages of 10-17), the following hypotheses were tested: (a) a measure assessing young adult children's perceived parental concerns would show the same six factors found using parent-report data, (b) acrimonious parent interactions would be positively correlated with all six perceived parental concerns, (c) parent-child relationships (warmth and shared involvement) would be negatively correlated with perceived parental concerns regarding power, malice, finances, self-esteem, and child rejection, and positively correlated with perceived custody concerns, (d) well-being would be negatively correlated with perceived parental concerns regarding power, malice, finance, esteem, and child rejection, and positively correlated with perceived custody concerns (but these effects should be small), (e) for criterion variables assessed from two time perspectives (parent acrimony and parent-child relationship warmth), those assessed from retrospective perceptions of the time during the first 1-2 years after the divorce would be more strongly associated with perceived parental concerns than those assessed from perceptions of the current time, and (f) each type of perceived parental concern would explain unique variance in the criterion variables (acrimonious parent interactions, parent-child warmth, shared involvement, and well-being) after controlling for all the other types of concerns.

CHAPTER TWO

Method

Participants

A total of 313 participants were included in this study. The sample was 63.6% women and the average age of participants was 21.86 years ($SD = 1.73$, range 18-23). As expected based on the target age range and recruitment sources, the majority of participants (56.5%) had completed some college. Regarding participants' mothers' and fathers' educational attainment, the modal response was college completion (35.5% and 29.4% respectively). In regard to relationship status, 46.6% of participants reported that they were single, 29.7% reported that they were in a romantic relationship, 14.4% reported that they were cohabitating with a romantic partner, and 9.3% reported that they were married. In regard to parents' current relationship status, 48.2% of respondent's mothers and 41.9% of respondent's fathers were reported to be single, 12.8% of mothers and 13.4% of fathers were reported to be in a romantic relationship, 9.3% of mothers and 11.2% of fathers were reported to be cohabitating with a romantic partner, and 29.7% of mothers and 33.5% of fathers were reported to be remarried. The sample was 8.0% Asian, 9.6% Black or African American, 1.0% Native American, 11.2% Hispanic or Latino, 0.3% Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian, 66.1% White (not Hispanic) and 3.8% other categories. Regarding divorce mediation use, 31.3% of participants reported that their parents used mediation in their divorce settlement, 30.7% reported that their parents did not use mediation, and 38.0% reported that they did not know whether or not their parents used mediation. Respondents' average age when parents divorced was 13.02

years ($SD = 2.24$, range 10-17). Most participants ($n = 296$) reported that their parents' divorce occurred more than two years ago, and so were able to respond to both retrospective- and current-perspective criterion variable items. Participants who indicated that the divorce happened less than 2 years ago ($n = 17$) were only given criterion items related to the current time of assessment (not their retrospective perceptions), and their responses were excluded from analyses pertaining to differences between retrospective and current perceptions.

Participants were recruited from two sources: the Baylor Human Participation in Research pool ($n = 112$) and Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk (MTurk; $n = 201$), and there were several differences between the two recruitment subsamples. For example, the MTurk subsample demonstrated more equal gender distribution than the Baylor subsample (45.8% men and 54.2% women versus 20.3% men and 79.7% women, respectively). MTurk participants also reported being older than Baylor participants ($d = 2.08$, $t(249.15) = 17.83$, $p < .01$). Whereas the Baylor sample was comprised completely of people currently enrolled in college, the MTurk sample was more diverse: 3.5% had discontinued their education prior to completing high school, 12.4% had completed high school, 44.3% had completed some college or were currently enrolled in college, 35.3% had completed college, and 4.5% had completed or were currently enrolled in graduate school. Baylor participants reported higher educational attainment for both mothers and fathers compared to MTurk participants ($d = .55$, $t(311) = -4.69$, $p < .01$ and $d = .45$, $t(311) = -3.83$, $p < .01$, respectively).

Procedures

Participants recruited from Baylor undergraduate psychology courses learned about the study and participation criteria through the Baylor Human Participation in Research pool using the SONA system. They were recruited with the following statement: “Participants for this study are required to be between the ages of 18-23 and to have experienced a parental divorce between the ages of 10 and 17. This study involves completing an online questionnaire that should last approximately 20-30 minutes.” Participants who were eligible and interested signed up through SONA and were redirected to complete the questionnaire through the Qualtrics online survey system. First, participants were told in writing in the informed consent document that they must be between the ages of 18-23 and must have experienced a parental divorce between the ages of 10 and 17. Participants were allowed to proceed with the questionnaire only if they provided their electronic consent after reading the informed consent document. Participants who provided consent but were later determined to not meet the eligibility requirements (i.e., reported that their parents had never divorced, or reported that they were outside the desired age range when their parents divorced) were allowed to complete the survey for course credit, but were excluded from data analysis. Specifically, 76 individuals were excluded because they reported that parents divorced before their 10th birthday or after their 18th birthday, and 6 more individuals were excluded because they indicated that their parents never divorced, but they elected to complete the survey with fake answers for course credit. Thus, although 194 individuals completed the survey through SONA, only 112 were included in the data analyses.

Participants recruited from MTurk learned about the study through the Amazon MTurk Worker home page. They were recruited with the following statement: “This is a study about your memories of childhood experiences and also your current experiences. This study involves completing two questionnaires: a screening questionnaire to determine eligibility, and – if eligible – an online questionnaire that should last approximately 20-30 minutes.” Because it was anticipated that MTurk participants may be financially motivated to complete the questionnaire in an inaccurate way, they first completed a separate informed consent document and an unpaid screening survey. The screening survey consisted of five items:

1. Current age
2. Parents’ marital status
3. Age at parental divorce (if participant indicated that parents were divorced)
4. In the last five years, have you traveled to a country where you were exposed to Carrion’s disease?
 - a. No, I have NOT traveled to such a country,
 - b. Yes, I have traveled to such a country
5. In the past week, which forms of technology have you used?
 - a. desktop computer
 - b. laptop computer
 - c. tablet or e-reader
 - d. cell phone without internet connectivity
 - e. cell phone with internet connectivity
 - f. none of the above.

The purpose of the screening survey was twofold: (a) to ensure that participants were eligible for the study (items 1, 2, and 3; participants should respond that they were currently age 18-23 and that their parents divorced when they were between the ages of 10 and 17), and (b) to ensure that participants were responding in a valid way (item 4; participants should respond “No”). Screening item 5 was included to mask the eligibility requirements, to provide an additional validity check (participants should not respond “none of the above”), and to discourage participants from supplying false answers to the earlier questions in an attempt to gain access to the full survey to get payment. Only participants who satisfied the eligibility requirements were invited to complete the full questionnaire for a monetary payment of \$1.50. Those who satisfied these requirements and indicated their interest were redirected to a separate informed consent document with which they were re-informed of the purpose of the study and the time involved (20-30 minutes). Only people that provided their electronic consent to participate were allowed to proceed to the full questionnaire. Of the 3,796 individuals who completed the screening survey, 3,029 were excluded from the study due to reporting that their current age was outside the desired range for the present study (17 or younger, $n = 7$; 24 or older, $n = 3,022$). An additional 365 individuals were excluded because they reported that their parents had never divorced. One hundred fifty seven more individuals were excluded because they reported that their parents divorced before their 10th birthday ($n = 131$) or after their 18th birthday ($n = 26$). Finally, 34 more individuals were excluded because they endorsed highly unlikely-to-be-true responses to screening questions 4 and 5, suggesting that these individuals were not adequately attending to the survey (33 endorsed traveling to a country within the past 5 years where they had been exposed to

Carrion's disease, and 1 endorsed "none of the above" when asked about technology use within the past week). In summary, out of the 3,796 individuals who completed the screening survey, a total of 211 respondents were invited to proceed to the full questionnaire. At this juncture, 1 individual elected not to proceed, and 9 respondents were excluded because they provided an MTurk ID code that already been used (i.e., these individuals had already completed the entire survey). Thus, a total of 201 unique participants completed the full questionnaire.

After providing consent, each participant completed a questionnaire consisting of measures assessing demographic information, parental concerns, parent interactions, parent-child relationships, and well-being. All measures were administered through the Qualtrics online survey system. Baylor participants received course credit in a particular undergraduate psychology course as compensation for their participation. MTurk participants received monetary compensation (\$1.50) through Amazon's online payment system for their participation. Participants were not asked to provide their names or contact information; anonymous ID codes were used for compensation (monetary or class credit) purposes. The protocol for this project, including the measures described below and recorded in full in Appendix A, was reviewed by the Baylor University Institutional Review Board.

Measures

Demographic Information

Participants were asked to report their gender, current age, level of education, parents' levels of education, race, relationship status, parents' divorce status, age at parental divorce, whether or not their parents used mediation to reach a divorce

settlement, mother's relationship status, and father's relationship status. Current age and age at parental divorce were used to confirm eligibility for inclusion in the analyses (participants were required to be between age 18-23 and to have experienced parental divorce between age 10-17) and to determine whether participants received both retrospective and current outcome measures (if parental divorce occurred more than 2 years ago) or only current outcome measures (if parental divorce occurred 2 or less years ago) when completing the questionnaire.

Perceived Parental Concerns

Perceived parental concerns were assessed with a measure adapted from Sanford and River's Parting Parent Concern Inventory (in press), with wording changed to reflect the fact that respondents were asked to report on their parents' enacted concerns.

Participants were instructed to "Think about the time in your life when your parents were going through a divorce. Rate the extent to which AT LEAST ONE OF YOUR PARENTS worried about these things at the time of their divorce." Before completing the measure, participants were asked to answer two comprehension questions:

1. This measure is asking about your parents at which point in time?
 - a. during the divorce
 - b. during the first 1-2 years after their divorce
 - c. at the current point in time

2. Imagine that Lisa is completing the next section and is asked to rate the statement, "one of my parents likes football." How should Lisa respond if one parent is an avid football fan and the other hates football?

- a. She should strongly agree because at least one parent definitely likes football
- b. She should only somewhat agree because one parent likes football but the other does not
- c. She should disagree because the statement is not true for both parents.

Participants were required to choose the correct responses to these two comprehension questions before continuing on with the measure; those who did not were prompted to re-answer the questions until they were successful. The measure consisted of 28 items with a 5-point Likert response format. The measure provided scores for 6 scales: power, malice, finances, esteem, child rejection, and custody. Each scale was comprised of 3-5 items, as shown in Appendix A. Scale scores were created by averaging across items. The original parent-report measure demonstrated high internal consistency for each scale, and a confirmatory factor analysis of the six scales produced a good fit (Sanford & Rivers, in press). In the present study, Cronbach's alpha values were .83 for power, .86 for malice, .74 for finances, .80 for esteem, .84 for child rejection, and .83 for custody.

Acrimonious Parent Interactions

Participants completed two versions of a scale measuring acrimonious parental interactions. Each version was based on the Acrimony Scale (Emery, 1982b), with wording changed to reflect the fact that respondents were asked to report on their parents' experiences. The first version assessed participants' retrospective perceptions of parent interactions that occurred in the first 1-2 years following the divorce. The second version assessed participants' perceptions of parent interactions at the current time of assessment.

The two versions were identical except for verb tense (past or present) and preceding instructions (in order to orient participants to the correct time perspective). Though the original Acrimony Scale contains 25 items assessing various aspects of co-parent acrimony, the versions used in the current study were based on Sanford and Rivers' (in press) shortened version of the measure, which applied factor analysis to identify the most important items. Additional changes to make the measure more appropriate for the present study were as follows: 1) two pairs of items assessing each parent separately were collapsed into single items assessing "at least one parent" 2) one item was changed to be more appropriate for young adults: item 12 (originally item 22, asking about pick-ups and drop-offs of children) was changed to ask about coordinating visits with parents.

Respondents were oriented to the retrospective-perspective version of the measure with the following instructions: "The next questions ask about your parents' relationship during the first 1-2 years after their divorce. Rate how often the following things happened." Respondents were oriented to the current-perspective version of the measure with the following instructions: "The next questions ask about your parents' relationship at the current point in time. Rate how often the following things happen." Each version of the measure was preceded by one clarification question:

1. This measure is asking about your parents' relationship at which point in time?
 - a. during their divorce
 - b. during the first 1-2 years after their divorce
 - c. at the current point in time.

Participants were required to choose the correct response before continuing on with the measure; those who did not were prompted to re-answer the question until they

were successful. Each version of the measure consisted of 12 items with a 4-point Likert response format. Scores were averaged across the 12 items to yield a total acrimony score. The original measure demonstrated high internal consistency and test-retest reliability (Shaw & Emery, 1987; Sbarra & Emery, 2005), and Sanford and Rivers' (in press) shortened version also demonstrated high internal consistency, as well as convergent and divergent validity. The version used in the present study demonstrated Cronbach's alpha values of .82 for the current-perspective version, and .84 for the retrospective-perspective version of the scale.

Parent-Child Relationships: Warmth

Warmth in parent-child relationships was assessed with two versions each of maternal and paternal warmth subscales of the Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS) – The College-Student Scale (Robbins, 1994). The two versions were identical except for verb tense and instructions. The original subscales, with items worded in the present-tense, were used as-is to assess maternal and paternal warmth at the current time of assessment. Item wording was changed to the past tense to assess maternal and paternal warmth from the retrospective perspective (1-2 years after the divorce). Participants were oriented to the retrospective-perspective version with the following instructions: “Please answer the following questions about your mother and your father during the first 1-2 years after their divorce.” Participants were oriented to the current-perspective version with the following instructions: “Please answer the following questions about your mother and your father at the current point in time.” Each version of the measure was preceded by one clarification question:

1. This measure is asking about your mother and father at which point in time?
 - a. during their divorce
 - b. during the first 1-2 years after their divorce
 - c. at the current point in time.

Participants were required to choose the correct response before continuing on with the measure; those who did not were prompted to re-answer the question until they were successful. Each version of the measure was composed of 12 items (6 items each for the maternal warmth and paternal warmth subscales) with a 7-point Likert scale response format. Scores were averaged across subscale items to yield an overall subscale score. The original measure demonstrated high reliability and adequate factor fit across studies in the U.S., Turkey, and Belgium (Kocayoruk, 2012; Niemiec, Lynch, Vansteenkiste, Bernstein, Deci, & Ryan, 2006; Robbins, 1994). In the current study, Cronbach's alpha values were .93 and .91 for the maternal and paternal warmth subscales, respectively, for both the current- and retrospective-perspective versions.

Parent-Child Relationships: Shared Involvement

Shared involvement in parent-child relationships was assessed with a series of questions adapted from a previous, similar study with a sample of divorced parents (Sanford & Rivers, in press). The purpose of this scale was to assess the extent to which child custody and contact were equally shared by both parents, such that high scores indicate involvement from both parents (and an absence of infrequent contact with either parent), and low scores indicate involvement from only one parent. The measure was comprised of 7 items. The first two items pertained to custody, assessing (a) physical custody between the time of the divorce and age 18 and (b) legal custody between the

time of the divorce and age 18. Responses indicating shared custody on these items were tallied, and respondents were assigned scores of 0 (neither physical nor legal custody was shared), 1 (either physical or legal custody was shared), or 2 (both physical and legal custody was shared) on a new “joint custody” variable. The next two items on the scale, pertaining to time spent with parents, measured (a) percentage of time spent with mother between the time of the divorce and age 18 and (b) percentage of time spent with father between the time of the divorce and age 18. These items were recoded using the equation $50 - |\%time - 50|$, so that 50 (meaning 50% of time spent with the given parent) would be the highest score, then the recoded scores for these two items were averaged to create a new “split time” variable. The next two items measured minimum frequency of contact with parents, assessing (a) contact with mother between the time of the divorce and age 18 and (b) contact with father between the time of the divorce and age 18, then taking the lowest score from these items to create a new “low contact” variable. The seventh item, assessing inter-parental contact between the time of the divorce and age 18, was treated as a single variable. Responses for items pertaining to parent-child and inter-parent contact were scored on a 9-point Likert scale with the following response options: Never, About once a year, A few times a year, Several times a year, About once a month, A few times a month, About once a week, Several times a week, or Usually every day. To create the overall scores for this scale, the four scores (joint custody, split time, low contact, and inter-parent contact) were converted to z-scores, then averaged to form a single shared involvement score for each respondent. Scores less than zero indicate below-average shared involvement; scores greater than zero indicate above-average shared involvement.

In the present study, scores ranged from -1.55 to 1.57. Cronbach's alpha for the four z-scores was .79.

Well-Being

Participants' current well-being was assessed with the WHO-5 Well-Being Index (Bech, Olsen, Kjoller, & Rasmussen, 2003). This measure consists of five items assessing one's overall subjective sense of well-being within the past 2 weeks. Responses are reported using a six-point Likert scale (assigned values of 0-5), and scores are summed to produce an overall score ranging from 0-25. In the present study, Cronbach's alpha was .90.

CHAPTER THREE

Results

Preliminary Analyses

As a first step in data analysis, means and standard deviations were calculated for each of the six scales of the Perceived Parental Concerns questionnaire, and for the criterion variables: acrimonious parent interactions (retrospective and current), maternal and paternal warmth (retrospective and current), shared involvement, and well-being. As shown in Table 1, the most-reported perceived parental concerns were about power and finances. The least-reported perceived parental concerns were about malice. T-tests revealed differences between the MTurk and Baylor samples for perceived finance concerns and warmth variables. Specifically, MTurk participants reported higher levels of perceived parental concerns about finances ($d = .24, t(311) = 2.14, p < .05$), lower levels of maternal warmth (retrospective: $d = .64, t(247.68) = -5.41, p < .01$ and current: $d = .76, t(277.83) = -6.66, p < .01$), and lower levels of paternal warmth (retrospective: $d = .37, t(292) = -3.03, p < .01$ and current: $d = .42, t(292) = -3.43, p < .01$).

Next, relationships were examined between each of the perceived parental concern scales and each of the demographic variables. As shown in Table 2, females reported more perceived parental concerns about power, finances, and esteem. No significant correlations were found for current age or age at divorce. As shown in Table 3, participants who reported that they were cohabitating with their romantic partners reported higher levels of perceived parental concerns about power, malice, finances, and esteem compared to those who reported that they were single. Table 4 shows the results

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges of Study Variables

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Possible Range	Actual Range
<u>Perceived Parental Concerns</u>				
Power	3.16	0.94	1-5	1-5
Malice	2.97	1.05	1-5	1-5
Finance	3.17*	1.05	1-5	1-5
MTurk	3.27	1.01		
Baylor	3.01	1.09		
Esteem	3.09	0.89	1-5	1-5
Child Rejection	3.12	0.99	1-5	1-5
Custody	3.11	0.99	1-5	1-5
<u>Criterion Variables</u>				
Retrospective Acrimony	2.42	0.60	1-4	1-3.83
Retrospective Maternal Warmth	5.48**	1.53	1-7	1-7
MTurk	5.17	1.57		
Baylor	6.08	1.24		
Retrospective Paternal Warmth	4.96**	1.58	1-7	1-7
MTurk	4.76	1.57		
Baylor	5.34	1.53		
Current Acrimony	2.09	0.58	1-4	1-3.92
Current Maternal Warmth	5.65**	1.48	1-7	1-7
MTurk	5.31	1.57		
Baylor	6.32	1.03		
Current Paternal Warmth	5.17**	1.64	1-7	1-7
MTurk	4.96	1.58		
Baylor	5.64	1.66		
Shared Involvement	0.014	0.77	-3-3***	-1.55-1.57
Well-Being	15.31	5.30	0-25	0-25

*samples significantly different, $p < .05$ **samples significantly different, $p < .01$

***Note: 99% of all possible scores are contained within this range.

Table 2

Correlations between Demographic Variables and Perceived Parental Concerns

Variable	Female Gender	Current Age	Age at Divorce
Power	.149**	.056	.012
Malice	.104	.088	.020
Finance	.116*	.076	.045
Esteem	.133*	.081	.065
Child Rejection	.080	-.010	.017
Custody	-.017	-.008	-.004

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

Table 3

One-way ANOVA results for Perceived Parental Concerns and Participant Relationship Status

Variable	Single	Dating but not living together	Dating and living together	Married	F	η^2
Power	3.01 (.97) ^a	3.21 (.90)	3.53 (.89) ^a	3.08 (.78)	3.90**	.04
Malice	2.81 (1.04) ^b	3.03 (.98)	3.37 (1.07) ^b	2.93 (1.10)	3.51*	.03
Finance	3.01 (1.14) ^c	3.22 (.90)	3.64 (.96) ^c	3.16 (.93)	4.31**	.04
Esteem	2.96 (.94) ^d	3.10 (.84)	3.41 (.85) ^d	3.21 (.77)	3.04*	.03
Child Rejection	3.08 (.99)	3.22 (.95)	3.13 (1.03)	2.93 (1.08)	.75	.01
Custody	3.07 (1.01)	3.22 (.95)	3.09 (1.02)	2.93 (.99)	.76	.01

Note: Means with same superscripts differ according to Tukey HSD post hoc comparisons, $p < .05$

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

Table 4

One-way ANOVA results for Perceived Parental Concerns and Divorce Mediation Use

Variable	Parents used mediation	Parents did not use mediation	Don't know	F	η^2
Power	3.38 (.96) ^a	2.99 (.94) ^a	3.10 (.89)	4.39*	.03
Malice	3.25 (1.07) ^{bc}	2.82 (1.05) ^b	2.87 (.99) ^c	5.14**	.03
Finance	3.29 (1.10)	3.16 (1.00)	3.09 (1.04)	.92	.01
Esteem	3.23 (.90)	3.12 (.84)	2.96 (.90)	2.73	.02
Child Rejection	3.29 (.97)	2.98 (1.00)	3.08 (.98)	2.65	.02
Custody	3.27 (.96)	3.02 (.99)	3.04 (1.02)	1.95	.01

Note: Means with same superscripts differ according to Tukey HSD post hoc comparisons, $p < .05$

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

for divorce mediation use. Unexpectedly, respondents who reported that their parents used divorce mediation reported higher levels of perceived power concerns compared to those who reported that their parents did not use mediation. Similarly, participants who reported that their parents used divorce mediation reported higher levels of perceived malice concerns compared to those who reported that their parents did not use mediation and to those who reported that they did not know if their parents used divorce mediation.

Next, inter-scale correlations were computed between the six scales on the Perceived Parental Concern questionnaire to begin examining the extent to which the scales overlapped or were distinct from one another. As shown in Table 5, 13% of the inter-scale correlations were small in magnitude (less than .3), 67% were moderate (between .3 and .5), and 20% were large (greater than .5). The largest correlation was between perceived concerns about power and malice ($r = .73$). There were also large correlations between perceived concerns about child rejection and custody ($r = .63$) and power and finances ($r = .51$). These results call attention to several ways in which the perceived parental concern scales overlap with one another, particularly the power and malice scales, which raises questions about the extent to which young adults are able to distinguish between six types of parental concerns.

Table 5

Inter-Scale Correlations between Perceived Parental Concerns Scales

Scale	Power	Malice	Finance	Esteem	Child Rejection	Custody
Power	-					
Malice	.728**	-				
Finance	.510**	.477**	-			
Esteem	.433**	.344**	.449**	-		
Child Rejection	.485**	.450**	.333**	.421**	-	
Custody	.366**	.291**	.292**	.310**	.632**	-

** $p < .01$

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Next, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to assess the factor structure of the Perceived Parental Concerns questionnaire. A six-factor model, including concerns about power, malice, esteem, child rejection, and custody with five indicators each, and finances with 3 indicators, was tested using LISREL 8.8 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2006). Fit was evaluated using a two-index strategy (Hu & Bentler, 1999) with a cut-off of .95 for the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and a cut-off of .09 for the Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMR). As expected, the six-factor model produced a good fit (χ^2 (df = 335) = 511.88, $p < .01$; CFI = .99; SRMR = .06). As an additional indicator of factor validity, items were expected to have “good” factor loadings (.55 or greater), a cut-off suggested by Comrey and Lee (1992). As shown in Table 6, all but one item met this standard. The esteem scale item stating “At least one of my parents worried that the divorce would make him/her feel lonely” narrowly missed the suggested cut-off with a factor loading of .54. All other factor loadings ranged from .58 to .83.

In regards to discriminant validity, correlations between latent factors were expected to be less than .85, a cut-off suggested by Brown (2015). As shown in Table 7, one correlation exceeded this value: the correlation between factors pertaining to power and malice was .87, suggesting that these scales are highly overlapping. Additionally, the correlation between factors pertaining to child rejection and custody was .79. Although this value is below the suggested maximum, it is quite high and calls attention to another pair of scales that may not be as distinct as expected. To further test discriminant validity, two alternate models were tested based on these high correlations between factors. The first alternate model was identical to the original, except that the power and malice

Table 6

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Standardized Factor Loadings

Item	Power	Malice	Finance	Esteem	Child Rejection	Custody
Other parent have more power	0.68					
Other parent have more control	0.72					
Be in a weak position	0.83					
Be helpless against other parent	0.71					
Other parent force things to go his/her way	0.79					
Other parent be dishonest		0.83				
Other parent try to cheat		0.70				
Other parent be fraudulent		0.77				
Other parent tell lies		0.80				
Other parent be cruel		0.82				
Not live in desired house			0.70			
Not have money			0.78			
Not live in desired neighborhood			0.78			
Feel rejected				0.58		
Feel like a failure				0.80		
Feel lonely				0.54		
Feel unloved				0.77		
Feel wounded				0.78		
Child takes sides with other parent					0.70	
Child like other parent more					0.82	
Child not appreciate parent					0.77	
Child not want to spend time					0.80	
Child not respect parent					0.74	
Miss important days in child's life						0.66
Not be involved in child's life						0.75
Not be able to help and guide child						0.73
Not be able to encourage and comfort child						0.77
Not be able to spend time with child						0.83

factors were combined into one factor with ten indicators. The resulting five-factor model produced a good fit ($\chi^2 (df = 340) = 573.17, p < .01$; CFI = .99; SRMR = .06). The second alternate model was identical to the first alternate model, except that the child rejection and custody factors were also combined into a single factor with ten indicators. Again, the resulting four-factor model produced a good fit ($\chi^2 (df = 344) = 694.96, p < .01$; CFI = .98; SRMR = .07). To test discriminant validity even further, three more alternate models were tested. Each alternate model was identical to the preceding model, except that the two most highly correlated latent factors in the preceding model were combined into one factor in the subsequent alternate model. First, a three-factor model combining the finance factor with the power/malice factor produced a good fit ($\chi^2 (df = 347) = 808.71, p < .10$; CFI = .97; SRMR = .07). Second, a two-factor model combining the esteem factor with the power/malice/finance factor also produced a reasonably good fit ($\chi^2 (df = 349) = 1180.05, p < .10$; CFI = .95; SRMR = .09), although the CFI and SRMR values were at the minimum and maximum suggested cut-offs, respectively. Finally, a one-factor model combining all six factors into a single factor with 28 indicators produced a poor fit ($\chi^2 (df = 350) = 2186.79, p < .10$; CFI = .88; SRMR = .12). Although it was possible to detect a reduction in fit for each of the alternate models compared to the preceding models, it is striking that the alternate models continued to produce good fits with as few as two factors. These results raise further doubts about the extent to which young adults are able to distinguish between types of parental concerns.

In summary, the confirmatory factor analysis results raise questions about the discriminant validity of the Perceived Parental Concerns questionnaire. Although the expected six-factor model produced a good fit and all but one of the 28 items exhibited

factor loading values was above the suggested minimum, high correlations between two sets of latent factors suggested that certain scales were not as distinct as expected. There was a particularly high degree of overlap between the factors related to power and malice ($r = .87$). Furthermore, a series of alternate models combining the two most highly correlated latent factors in the preceding model produced good fits with as few as two factors. These results suggest that the six parental concerns that were previously identified using self-report data from a sample of divorced parents (Sanford & Rivers, in press) may not remain distinct when assessed from young adult children’s perspectives. In other words, these results suggest that young adult children are not able to distinguish between various types of parents’ enacted concerns, and may have particular difficulty distinguishing between parental concerns about malice and power.

Table 7

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Correlations between Latent Factors

Latent Factor	Power	Malice	Finance	Esteem	Child Rejection	Custody
Power	-					
Malice	0.87**	-				
Finance	0.67**	0.63**	-			
Esteem	0.55**	0.45**	0.59**	-		
Child Rejection	0.60**	0.56**	0.43**	0.55**	-	
Custody	0.46**	0.38**	0.38**	0.41**	0.79**	-

** $p < .01$

Correlations

Expected associations between each of the six perceived parental concerns and the criterion variables were tested by examining bivariate correlations between each perceived parental concern (power, malice, finances, esteem, child rejection, and custody) and each outcome variable (acrimonious parental interactions (retrospective and current), parent-child relationship warmth (retrospective and current; maternal and

paternal subscales), shared involvement, and well-being). The results are reported in Table 8.

Table 8

Correlations between Perceived Parental Concerns and Criterion Variables

Variable	Power	Malice	Finance	Esteem	Child Rejection	Custody
Retro Acrimony	.57**	.59**	.39**	.22**	.30**	.16**
Retro Maternal Warmth	-.227**	-.25**	-.19**	-.05	-.02	.13*
Retro Paternal Warmth	-.29**	-.35**	-.24**	-.17**	-.02	.12*
Current Acrimony	.44**	.47**	.22**	.07	.13*	.06
Current Maternal Warmth	-.22**	-.28**	-.10	-.05	-.03	.12*
Current Paternal Warmth	-.31**	-.36**	-.21**	-.09	.02	.12*
Shared Involvement	-.24**	-.32**	-.17**	-.03	.01	.01
Well-Being	.06	.10	.12*	-.01	-.01	-.01

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

As hypothesized, all six types of perceived parental concerns were positively associated with retrospective acrimonious parental interactions. Perceived concerns about custody demonstrated the smallest relationship with acrimony ($r = .16$), while perceived concerns about malice demonstrated the strongest relationship ($r = .59$). However, only four types of perceived parental concerns were significantly correlated with current acrimonious parental interactions. Perceived concerns about power and malice demonstrated moderate associations with current acrimony ($r = .44$ and $.47$, respectively), while finance and child rejection demonstrated small associations ($r = .22$ and $.13$, respectively). Although esteem and custody demonstrated associations in the expected positive direction, these associations were not significant. In sum, all correlations between the six types of perceived parental concerns and retrospective and current acrimonious parental interactions were in the expected direction and 83% of these associations were significant.

Regarding warmth and shared involvement in parent-child relationships, it was expected that these variables would be negatively associated with perceived parental concerns about power, malice, finances, esteem, and child rejection, and positively correlated with perceived parental concerns about custody. As expected, perceived parental concerns about power, malice, and finances were negatively correlated with retrospective maternal and paternal warmth, with r values ranging from $-.19$ to $-.29$. Additionally, perceived parental concerns about esteem were negatively correlated with retrospective paternal warmth ($r = -.17$). A similar result pattern was found for current maternal and paternal warmth, but fewer correlations reached significance. Specifically, perceived parental concerns about power and malice were negatively correlated with current maternal and paternal warmth, and perceived parental concerns about finances were negatively correlated with paternal warmth only. Also as expected, perceived parental concerns about power, malice, and finances were negatively associated with shared involvement ($r = -.24, -.32, \text{ and } -.17$, respectively). However, concerns about esteem and child rejection were not. Notably, child rejection concerns were not significantly associated with any of the warmth or shared involvement variables. As hypothesized, and in contrast to the other types of concerns, perceived parental concerns about custody were positively associated with retrospective and current maternal and paternal warmth, though the correlation coefficients all fell in the small range ($r = .12$ -. $.13$). Custody was not significantly associated with shared involvement, although the result was in the expected direction. Overall, 93% of the associations between perceived parental concerns and parent-child relationship variables were in the expected direction, and 63% of the expected associations reached statistical significance.

It was hypothesized that well-being would be negatively correlated with perceived parental concerns regarding power, malice, finance, esteem, and child rejection, and positively correlated with perceived custody concerns (but these effects should be small). As shown in Table 8, this hypothesis was not supported. Only perceived parental concerns about finance were significantly correlated with well-being and, contrary to expectations, the result was in the positive direction ($r = .12$).

Taken together, the correlation results call attention to several important findings regarding the perceived parental concern scales. First, the largest correlations were between the malice and power scales and acrimonious parental interactions, suggesting that these scales may be particularly associated with conflict. Although power and malice were correlated with many other expected outcomes, their result patterns were strikingly similar, which suggests that these scales, although salient, may not be distinct. The finance scale demonstrated several significant associations, but most were small in magnitude and one was in an unexpected direction. Thus, the results for finance were not particularly meaningful. The esteem and child rejection scales had mostly non-significant correlations, suggesting that these scales may not be salient for young adult children of divorced parents. Although the correlation results for custody were small in magnitude (as well as three correlations that were nonsignificant), it was the only concern scale that demonstrated positive correlations with the parent-child warmth variables. Thus, although its effects were small, the custody scale is meaningful because it is unique compared to all the other concern scales. In summary, the correlation results highlight the salience of the power and malice scales (although these scales may not be distinct), as well as the custody scale.

Differences between Correlations

To test for differences between outcomes assessed retrospectively (participants' recollections of the first 1-2 years after the divorce) and currently (participants' perceptions at the current time of assessment), *t*-tests were used to determine if there were significant differences between pairs of correlations: perceived parental concerns and retrospective outcomes (acrimonious parent interactions and parent-child relationship warmth – maternal and paternal subscales) compared to perceived parental concerns and corresponding current outcomes. These analyses were conducted to test the hypothesis that perceived parental concerns would be more strongly associated with outcomes assessed from retrospective perspectives (1-2 years after the divorce) than outcomes assessed from current perspectives (at the time of assessment). In other words, to test the hypothesis that the relationships between perceived parental concerns at the time of the divorce and outcomes would weaken over time. As shown in Table 9, this hypothesis was only partially supported. Acrimonious parental interactions showed the most consistent pattern of expected effects, with five out of six types of perceived parental concerns (all except custody) being more strongly related to retrospective acrimony than to current acrimony (power: $t(291) = 3.35, p < .001$, malice: $t(291) = 3.00, p < .01$, finance: $t(291) = 3.77, p < .001$, esteem: $t(291) = 3.17, p < .01$, child rejection: $t(291) = 3.85, p < .001$). Maternal warmth showed only one significant time effect, with perceived parental concerns about finance being more strongly related to retrospective maternal warmth than current maternal warmth ($t(291) = -2.63, p < .01$). Paternal warmth also showed only one significant time effect, with perceived parental concerns about esteem being more strongly related to retrospective paternal warmth than current paternal warmth ($t(291) = -$

2.48, $p < .05$). Although only 39% of the differences in correlation values reached statistical significance, it is worth noting that all of these significant differences were in the expected direction. In other words, none of the associations between perceived parental concerns and outcome variables increased in strength over time; they either decreased in strength (as expected) or stayed the same.

Table 9

T-values from T-tests for Differences between Correlations between Perceived Parental Concerns and Retrospective and Current Outcomes

Variable	Acrimony	Maternal Warmth	Paternal Warmth
Power	3.35 ^{***}	-0.18	0.65
Malice	3.00 ^{**}	0.95	0.40
Finance	3.77 ^{***}	-2.63 ^{**}	-0.92
Esteem	3.17 ^{**}	-0.06	-2.48 [*]
Child Rejection	3.85 ^{***}	0.46	-1.33
Custody	1.95	0.35	-0.09

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Regressions

Finally, simultaneous regression analyses were conducted to examine unique variance explained by each perceived parental concern over and above the other perceived parental concerns. A total of eight simultaneous regression equations were conducted. A separate regression equation was used for each criterion variable (retrospective and current acrimonious parental interactions, retrospective and current maternal and paternal warmth, shared involvement, and well-being), with all six perceived parental concern scales entered as predictors in each equation. Recruitment sample (“MTurk,” coded as Baylor = 0, MTurk = 1) was also entered as a predictor variable in each equation, to control for variance due to differences between samples. With the exception of the MTurk variable, all variables were first converted to z-scores,

then entered into the regression equation. This way, perceived parental concern beta weights can be interpreted in the same way as standardized beta weights, while MTurk beta weights indicate the difference between MTurk and Baylor samples in units of standard deviation. The purpose of these analyses was to submit the six-factor Perceived Parental Concerns questionnaire to a more stringent test of validity by examining the measure's incremental validity, or the extent to which each of the six perceived parental concerns accounted for unique variance in the criterion variables after controlling for variance due to other types of concerns or sample differences. In other words, to provide additional evidence that each perceived parental concern was meaningful and distinct.

As shown in Table 10, the hypothesis that each perceived parental concern scale would contribute unique variance to each criterion variable was largely unsupported, as only 32% of the expected beta weights were significant. However, malice explained unique variance in all outcomes except retrospective maternal warmth and well-being, suggesting that this scale is quite meaningful. Power explained unique variance in some variables, and – importantly – there was no instance in which power predicted an outcome that malice did not also predict. Given the overlap between power and malice across analyses, it is likely that these results are further evidence of the redundancy of these two scales. Custody explained unique variance in the parent-child warmth variables and the effect was in the expected direction and opposite that of the other concern types. Thus, as with other analyses, custody continued to stand out as a unique type of perceived parental concern. The results for finance, esteem, and child rejection were almost all non-significant. Moreover, the only significant effects were between variables that yielded nonsignificant correlations. This pattern of results raises doubts about whether

these scales can provide meaningful, specific information. In summary, the regression results agree with the analyses described above in calling into question the distinctness of the six expected concern scales. However, the regression results provide additional evidence of two general categories of perceived parental concerns that may be particularly salient for young adult children: concerns about power/malice and custody.

Table 10

Beta Weights for Perceived Parental Concerns Predicting Criterion Variables

Variable	MTurk	Power	Malice	Finance	Esteem	Child Rejection	Custody
Retro Acrimony	-.06	.30***	.35***	.11	-.07	.07	-.12
Retro Maternal Warmth	-.49***	-.15	-.13	-.11	.07	-.04	.26***
Retro Paternal Warmth	-.20	-.11	-.29***	-.09	-.08	.05	.26***
Current Acrimony	-.04	.29***	.36***	-.003	-.12*	-.09	-.06
Current Maternal Warmth	-.59***	-.12	-.23**	.04	.04	-.05	.23**
Current Paternal Warmth	-.25*	-.18*	-.31***	-.06	.02	.11	.22**
Shared Involvement	.02	-.08	-.34***	-.07	.06	.17*	.03
Well-Being	.13	-.01	-.11	.01	.08	-.16	.12

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

CHAPTER FOUR

Discussion

The present study sought to measure young adult children's perceptions of six types of divorce-related parental concerns, and to examine the associations between perceived parental concerns, acrimonious parental interactions, warmth and involvement in parent-child relationships, and well-being, with the purpose of determining the extent to which previous findings regarding parent-reported concerns could be replicated with non-parent-report data. Towards this end, a measure was created based on a previously-studied parent-report measure (Sanford & Rivers, in press), with wording changed to allow young adult children of divorced parents to report their perceptions of their parents' divorce-related concerns. The new measure, assessing young adult children's perceptions of parental concerns related to power, malice, finances, esteem, child rejection, and custody, demonstrated evidence of redundancy between several scales, particularly the power and malice scales. The pattern of correlation and regression results for the malice and power scales provided further evidence suggesting that these scales are not distinct from each other, but may be meaningful, especially in relation to acrimony, and are likely to be components of a more general category of perceived parental concerns pertaining to conflict. The pattern of correlation and regression results for the custody scale was remarkable in that it differed from all the other types of concerns: although its effects were small, custody was the only type of perceived parental concern that was positively associated with parent-child warmth. Scales pertaining to finance, esteem, and child rejection demonstrated nonsignificant or inconsistent results in correlation and regression

analyses, raising doubts about the salience of these types of perceived parental concerns. Four major results, discussed below, can be gleaned from this study.

First, although there was a lack of distinction between malice and power, scores on these scales were correlated with several expected outcomes, suggesting that children's reported perceptions of parents' enacted concerns about malice and power are important. The largest correlations in this study were found between the malice and power scales and acrimonious parental interactions, suggesting that these scales may be particularly related to conflict. Similar to the correlation results, the regression results highlighted the importance and redundancy of the power and malice scales. Since these scales were not distinct from each other, it is likely that these two scales are components of a more general category of perceived parental concerns pertaining to inter-parent conflict. Although parents are able to self-report more subtle distinctions between concerns about power and malice (Sanford & Rivers, in press), results from the present study suggest that children perceive these concerns more generally. This interpretation is consistent with the extant literature on divorce, which suggests that children are highly sensitive to conflict cues (Grych & Fincham, 1990; Lewis, Siegel, & Lewis, 1984). Although it was expected that young adult children might have meaningful recollections about many different types of divorce-related concerns because divorce itself is a type of conflict, the data did not support this. Rather, the data suggest that young adult children were more perceptive of parental concerns directly indicative of conflict (power and malice) and, furthermore, were not able to make more subtle distinctions between these types of concerns. Young adult children may be particularly perceptive about concerns related to conflict because prior research indicates that conflict is the variable most

strongly associated with post-divorce family functioning (Cummings & Davies, 1994; Grych & Fincham, 1990), such that the average effect size between parent conflict and post-divorce family adjustment is nearly double the effect size between divorce itself and family adjustment (Amato & Keith, 1991; Buehler et al., 1997). This is consistent with the divorce-stress-adjustment model of divorce (Amato, 2000, 2010), in which ongoing inter-parent conflict is identified as an important mediator of children's post-divorce adjustment. Children experiencing parental divorce, then, may be particularly inclined to perceive parental concerns related to conflict because these concerns may provide important information about family functioning and adjustment challenges. The finding that young adult children are unable to make subtle distinctions between types of conflict-related parental concerns is consistent with a previous study in which children had difficulty distinguishing between various types of conflict-related parental behaviors (Grych, Seid, & Fincham, 1992), perhaps suggesting that more subtle, specific components of conflict covary to a degree that makes them indistinguishable to children.

The second major result from the present study was that the custody scale produced a unique pattern of results in which it was associated with higher parental acrimony but also higher scores on parent-child warmth. The correlation results for custody concerns, although small in magnitude, were striking because they were in the expected direction and opposite the other scales. Likewise, the regression results highlighted the uniqueness of the custody scale, as it was the only scale that positively predicted the warmth variables after controlling for all other concern types. This suggests that young adult children's perceptions of parent enactments of custody concerns are meaningful, important, and different from other types of perceived enacted

concerns. Thus, custody concerns seem to be a second general category of perceived enacted concerns that are particularly salient for young adult children of divorced parents. Similar to conflict concerns, it makes sense that young adult children would have meaningful recollections of enacted custody concerns because custodial and parenting changes are identified as important divorce-related stressors for children in the divorce-stress-adjustment model (Amato, 2000, 2010). Although parents' self-reported custody concerns seem to be indicative of custody challenges and disparities (Bahr, Chappell, & Marcos, 1987; Bollen, Verbeke, & Euwema, 2013; Sanford & Rivers, in press), data from the present study suggest that young adult children's perceptions of parents' enacted custody concerns are also indicative of the perception that parents care about their children and want to spend time with them. Several researchers have reported similar conclusions, relating parents' interests in custody outcomes with concern for their children's well-being (Burrell, Narus, Bogdanoff, & Allen, 1994; Elkin, 1987; Lemmon, 1983). These two lines of evidence (that parental custody concerns reflect both custody challenges and disparities as well as concern and care towards children) are consistent with the results of this study, in which higher levels of perceived parental custody concerns were associated with higher levels of acrimonious parent interactions as well as higher levels of parent-child warmth.

The third major result from the present study was that the hypotheses regarding perceived parental concerns about finance, esteem, and child rejection were either unsupported or poorly supported. The correlation results for finance, esteem, and child rejection raise questions about whether these scales are meaningful, as few expected associations reached significance and those that did were not particularly robust.

Additionally, the regression results for finance, esteem, and child rejection were almost all non-significant, and the only significant effects were between variables that yielded nonsignificant correlations. Taken together, this pattern of results raises doubts about whether these scales can provide meaningful, specific information, and therefore raises doubts about the value of assessing children's perceptions of parents' enacted concerns in these areas. Although concerns about finances, esteem, and child rejection are experienced and meaningfully reported by parents (Sanford & Rivers, in press), results were not replicated in the present study when these concerns were assessed from the perspectives of young adult children of divorced parents. This raises questions about whether (a) these types of parental concerns are not relevant to children and/or (b) these types of concerns are not enacted by parents or are not interpretable by children. Given that economic decline, parental psychological distress, and reduced parental support and control have been identified as important divorce-related stressors for children (Amato, 2000, 2010), and that these stressors and perceived parental concerns about finance, esteem, and child rejection seem to be similar constructs, it seems more likely that these types of concerns may not be enacted by parents or may not be interpretable by children. Using finance concerns as an example, it is possible that parents may try to hide financial ramifications of divorce from children. It is also possible that children are not able to understand and interpret cues about finances, which may involve concepts of which children – especially younger children – have limited knowledge and experience (e.g., money, budgeting, cost of living). Understanding and interpreting cues about esteem and child rejection concerns may be especially difficult for children, as these concern types are particularly emotion-laden and the ability to infer others' emotional states is a skill

which continues to develop into adulthood and which can be negatively impacted by children's own negative mood states (Cummings & Rennels, 2014; Gnepp & Gould, 1985).

Finally, the fourth major result from the present study, was that compared to how parents experience concerns, young adult children seem to perceive parents' enacted concerns with less specificity. This conclusion is based on three different results from this study: (a) several large inter-scale correlations and high correlations between latent factors, especially between power and malice (b) a substantial portion of expected associations that were not supported by the data, especially for finance, esteem, and child rejection, and (c) limited evidence that each perceived parental concern scale was explaining something unique about the target outcome variables. Whereas divorced parents report experiencing six types of concerns related to power, malice, finances, esteem, child rejection, and custody (Sanford & Rivers, in press), two general categories of parental concerns were detected when assessed from the perspectives of young adult children in the present study: concerns related to inter-parent conflict (encompassing both power and malice concerns) and custody. As described above, these concern types are consistent with previous research identifying inter-parent conflict and custodial and parenting changes as important divorce-related stressors for children (Amato, 2000, 2010), so it makes sense that these types of parental concerns may be particularly meaningful for children. Therefore, although it may not be meaningful to assess young adult children's perceptions of all six types of divorce-related parental concerns previously identified in parent samples, it may be valuable to assess their perceptions of parents' enacted concerns related to inter-parent conflict and custody. By providing

evidence of the extent to which parental concerns be assessed from the perspectives of young adult children, the present study has made an important contribution to the literature on families of divorce by taking a first step toward developing a non-parent-report measure of divorce-related parental concerns. Future researchers can build on this study by continuing to develop and refine measures that allow for the assessment of all family members involved in the divorce process, rather than an overreliance on parent-report data. Some specific research ideas that were not addressed in the present study are outlined below.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This study included several limitations. One important limitation was that data were based on young adult children's perceptions of their parents, without a second source of information. Although this was in accord with one of the primary purposes of the present study (to create a non-parent-report measure of parental concerns during divorce), future research may focus on collecting data from both children and parents affected by divorce and making direct comparisons between the two sources of information. Relatedly, it may also be worthwhile to develop a measure of children's concerns during divorce and to make comparisons between children's own experienced concerns and their perceptions of parents' enacted concerns.

A second limitation was that many participants were reporting on parental divorces that occurred several years ago, so there is the possibility that their reports may not have been fully accurate. Again, this was in accord with the outlook of the present study – that children's perceptions, regardless of accuracy, are important to consider. Despite the possibility that one's memories and perceptions of the past may be equally or

more meaningful than accurate historical reports, potentially questionable accuracy of the participants' reports may still be counted as a limitation. One way to address this limitation could involve collecting reports across time, such that there is an increased chance of historical accuracy (made possible by collecting reports immediately after the event) *and* the opportunity to measure lasting memories (made possible by collecting retrospective reports at later times).

Relatedly, a third limitation of the present study was that it did not incorporate a “time since parental divorce” variable into the analyses. Although various aspects of age and time were considered (i.e., current age, age at time of parental divorce, whether or not the divorce occurred more than 2 years ago), including a more specific measure of time since parental divorce in future research protocols may be useful to address more nuanced questions about the interplay between age, time, and divorce recollection and adjustment.

A fourth crucial limitation was that the data were correlational, therefore cause and direction of the relationships between perceived parental concerns, acrimony, warmth, shared involvement, and well-being could not be determined. Future studies could address this limitation by focusing on families in which children report high levels of perceived parental concerns. The research protocol could involve a therapeutic intervention targeting the cognitions and emotions of the children and/or the behaviors of the divorced parents, followed by an assessment of how behavioral and relational outcomes change after the levels of perceived parental concerns are reduced.

A fifth limitation was that most questionnaire items used in the present study asked about “at least one parent,” making it impossible to examine differences between

mothers and fathers. In the future, researchers may consider adding mother- and/or father-specific questions, which would make it possible to examine these differences, while maintaining awareness that increasing items in this way could contribute to respondent fatigue.

To capitalize on the findings of the present study, an additional direction for future research would be to examine a more succinct measure of perceived parental concerns. Such a measure could include only the most important items and scales identified in the present study; namely, the ten items of the malice and custody scales. Both scales demonstrated strong results, particularly in the regression analyses. The malice scale items also demonstrated high factor loadings, while the custody scale produced a pattern of results unique from all the other scales. Thus, malice and custody seem to warrant further investigation as meaningful areas of perceived parental concerns. A shortened perceived parental concerns measure including only these scales could help forward this investigation.

Conclusions

The present study sought to answer the following question: is it possible to assess children's perceptions of parents' divorce-related enacted concerns? More specifically, could young adult children of divorced parents distinguish between the same six types of concerns identified in parent samples: concerns about power, malice, finances, esteem, child rejection, and custody? In response to this question, results from the present study raise doubts about young adult children's ability to make subtle distinctions between parental concern types, as only two distinct and meaningful categories of concern were identified: concerns related to inter-parent conflict (encompassing power and malice

concerns) and custody. Therefore, the present study has made a valuable contribution to the literature on divorced families by providing evidence of the extent to which parental concerns can be assessed from the perspectives of young adult children. As a next step in this area, researchers can continue to develop and refine measures that allow for the assessment of all family members involved in the divorce process, and might especially consider testing a shortened measure of perceived parental concerns (including only the malice and custody scales), gathering both parent and child data, collecting data at different time points, and/or assessing children's perceptions of each parent separately. Clinical research, in which researchers continue exploring divorce-related concerns and outcomes by implementing and analyzing clinical interventions targeting these variables, may also be of value in the effort to understand and enhance family functioning throughout the divorce process.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Study Questionnaire

Demographics

1. Gender (Male; Female)
2. Age (under 18; 18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 23; 24 or over)
3. Highest educational level completed (elementary school; middle or intermediate school; some high school (did not earn degree); high school; some college (did not earn degree or currently enrolled); college; Masters; Doctorate)
4. Mother's highest educational level completed (elementary school; middle or intermediate school; some high school (did not earn degree); high school; some college (did not earn degree or currently enrolled); college; some graduate level (did not earn degree or currently enrolled); graduate level (e.g., masters, doctorate))
5. Father's highest educational level completed (elementary school; middle or intermediate school; some high school (did not earn degree); high school; some college (did not earn degree or currently enrolled); college; some graduate level (did not earn degree or currently enrolled); graduate level (e.g., masters, doctorate))
6. Race (Asian, Black or African American; American Indian or Native American; Hispanic or Latino; Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian; White (Not Hispanic); Other)
7. Current relationship status (single/not currently in a romantic relationship; in a romantic relationship, but not living together; cohabitating with a partner; married)
8. Parents' divorce status (never divorced; previously divorced)
9. Age at parental divorce (under 10; 10; 11; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 17; 18 or over)
10. Divorce mediation usage (Yes; No)
11. Mother's current relationship status (single/not currently in a romantic relationship; in a romantic relationship, but not living together; cohabitating with a partner; married)
12. Father's current relationship status (single/not currently in a romantic relationship; in a romantic relationship, but not living together; cohabitating with a partner; married)

Perceived Parental Concerns

(adapted from Parting Parent Concern Inventory, Sanford & Rivers, in press)

In the next sections, you will see lists of things that parents sometimes think or do when they get divorced. You will be asked to rate how much each statement was true for at least one of your parents during the time of their divorce.

In these sections, it will not matter whether a statement is true for only one parent or for both parents. Simply indicate agreement with any statement that is true for at least one parent.

Please answer the following questions to be sure you understand the instructions.

This measure is asking about your parents at which point in time?

- during the divorce (CORRECT)
- during the first 1-2 years after their divorce
- at the current point in time

Imagine that Lisa is completing the next section and is asked to rate the statement, “one of my parents likes football.” How should Lisa respond if one parent is an avid football fan and the other hates football?

- She should strongly agree because at least one parent definitely likes football. (CORRECT)
- She should only somewhat agree because one parent likes football but the other does not.
- She should disagree because the statement is not true for both parents.

This section lists things that parents sometimes worry about when they go through a divorce. Rate the extent to which AT LEAST ONE OF YOUR PARENTS worried about these things at the time of their divorce. Though the following statements will refer to one parent, please agree to the statement if it describes one parent or both parents.

Definitely was NOT worried	Was NOT worried	Was a little bit worried	Was worried	Was extremely worried
1	2	3	4	5

At that time of their divorce, AT LEAST ONE OF MY PARENTS worried that. . .

1. The other parent would have more power to get what he or she wants. (power1)
2. The divorce would make him/her feel like a rejected person. (esteem1)
3. He or she would miss important events or special days in my life. (custody1)
4. The divorce would make it hard for him/her to live in the type of house he/she wanted. (finance1)
5. The other parent would have more control to get his or her way. (power2)
6. I would take sides with the other parent. (child rejection1)
7. The other parent would be dishonest. (malice1)
8. The divorce would make him/her feel like a failure. (esteem2)
9. The divorce would make it hard for him/her to have the money he/she needed. (finance2)
10. He or she would not be involved in my life. (custody2)
11. He or she would be in a weak position against the other parent. (power3)
12. I would like the other parent more than him/her. (child rejection2)
13. The other parent would try to cheat him/her. (malice2)
14. He or she would not be able to provide help and guidance to me as often as he/she would like. (custody3)
15. The divorce would make him/her feel lonely. (esteem3)
16. He or she would be helpless against the other parent’s demands. (power4)
17. He or she would miss opportunities to provide encouragement and comfort to me. (custody4)

18. The other parent would be fraudulent. (malice3)
19. I would not appreciate how much he/she loves me. (child rejection3)
20. The other parent would tell lies. (malice4)
21. The divorce would make him/her feel like nobody loves him/her. (esteem4)
22. The other parent would be able to force things to go his or her way. (power5)
23. I would not want to spend time with him/her. (child rejection4)
24. He or she would not be able to spend time with me. (custody5)
25. The divorce would make it hard for him/her to live in the type of neighborhood he/she wanted. (finance3)
26. The divorce would make him/her feel wounded. (esteem5)
27. I would not respect him/her. (child rejection5)
28. The other parent would be cruel. (malice5)

Shared Involvement

Since the divorce, who has had physical custody of you? (Physical custody has to do with where you live.)

- My mother
- My father
- They have joint physical custody (you live a significant portion of time with both parents)

Since the divorce, who has had legal custody of you? (Legal custody has to do with who makes decisions about your upbringing.)

- My mother
- My father
- They have joint legal custody (they both make decisions about my upbringing)

Between the time of your parents' divorce and your 18th birthday, how much time did you spend living under your mother's care?

- Never
- 1% of the time (a few days a year)
- 5% of the time (a few weeks a year)
- 10% of the time (a month each year)
- 25% of the time (a few months each year).
- 50% of the time (half of the year)
- 75% of the time (all but a few months each year)
- 90% of the time (all but one month each year)
- 95% of the time (all but a few weeks each year)
- 99% of the time (all but a few days each year)
- All of the time

Between the time of your parents' divorce and your 18th birthday, how much time did you spend living under your father's care?

- Never
- 1% of the time (a few days a year)
- 5% of the time (a few weeks a year)
- 10% of the time (a month each year)
- 25% of the time (a few months each year)
- 75% of the time (all but a few months each year)
- 90% of the time (all but one month each year)
- 95% of the time (all but a few weeks each year)

- year). 99% of the time (all but a few days each year)
 50% of the time (half of the year) All of the time

Between the divorce and your 18th birthday, how often did you have contact with your mother?

- Never
- About once a year
- A few times a year
- Several times a year
- About once a month
- A few times a month
- About once a week
- Several times a week
- Usually every day

Between the divorce and your 18th birthday, how often did you have contact with your father?

- Never
- About once a year
- A few times a year
- Several times a year
- About once a month
- A few times a month
- About once a week
- Several times a week
- Usually every day

Between the divorce and your 18th birthday, how often did your parents have contact with each other?

- Never
- About once a year
- A few times a year
- Several times a year
- About once a month
- A few times a month
- About once a week
- Several times a week
- Usually every day

Retrospective Outcomes

The next sections will ask about things that happened during the first 1-2 years after your parents' divorce.

Please answer the following questions to be sure you understand the instructions.

The next section will be asking about things that happened at which point in time?

- during the divorce
- during the first 1-2 years after their divorce (CORRECT)
- at the current point in time

Acrimony Scale (adapted from Emery, 1982b and Sanford & Rivers, in press)

The next questions ask about your parents' relationship during the first 1-2 years after their divorce. Rate how often the following things happened. Note: If your parents did not have any contact with each other, some of the questions on this page may ask you about things that never happened. If so, answer these types of questions by selecting the "Almost Never" option.

Almost Never	Some of the time	Much of the time	Almost always
1	2	3	4

1. Did your parents have friendly talks with each other? (friendliness) (R)
2. Was visitation a problem between your parents? (hostility)
3. Did your parents agree on discipline for you? (friendliness) (R)
4. Did your parents disagree in front of you? (hostility)
5. Did you take sides in disagreements between your parents? (hostility)
6. Did you feel hostile toward at least one of your parents? (hostility)
7. Did at least one of your parents say things about the other parent to you that the other parent didn't want you to hear? (hostility)
9. Did your parents have angry disagreements with each other? (hostility)
10. Did at least one of your parents feel hostile toward the other parent? (hostility)
12. Could your parents talk to each other about problems with you? (friendliness) (R)
13. Did your parents have a friendly divorce or separation? (friendliness) (R)
14. Was coordinating visits with your parents a difficult time? (hostility)

(Note: items followed by (R) indicate items that were reverse scored.)

Perceptions of Parents Scale, Warmth subscales (adapted from Robbins, 1994)

Please answer the following questions about your mother and your father during the first 1-2 years after their divorce. If you did not have any contact with one of your parents (for example, your father) at that time, then mark the questions about that parent as "1 – not at all true." Please use the following scale:

Not at all true			Somewhat true			Very true
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

First, questions about your mother.

1. My mother accepted me and liked me as I was.
2. My mother clearly conveyed her love for me.
3. My mother made me feel very special.
4. My mother was often disapproving and unaccepting of me. (R)
5. My mother was typically happy to see me.
6. My mother seemed to be disappointed in me a lot. (R)

Now questions about your father.

1. My father accepted me and liked me as I was.
2. My father clearly conveyed his love for me.
3. My father made me feel very special.
4. My father was often disapproving and unaccepting of me. (R)
5. My father was typically happy to see me.
6. My father seemed to be disappointed in me a lot. (R)

(Note: items followed by (R) indicate items that were reverse scored.)

Current Outcomes

The next sections will ask about things that are happening now, at the current point in time.

Please answer the following question to be sure you understand the instructions.

The next sections will be asking about which point in time?

- during the divorce
- during the first 1-2 years after their divorce
- at the current point in time (CORRECT)

Acrimony Scale (adapted from Emery, 1982b and Sanford & Rivers, in press)

The next questions ask about your parents' relationship at the current point in time. Rate how often the following things happen. Note: If your parents do not have any contact with each other, some of the questions on this page may ask you about things that never happen. If so, answer these types of questions by selecting the "Almost Never" option.

Almost Never	Some of the time	Much of the time	Almost always
1	2	3	4

1. Do your parents have friendly talks with each other? (friendliness) (R)
2. Is visitation a problem between your parents? (hostility)
3. Do your parents agree on discipline for you? (friendliness) (R)
4. Do your parents disagree in front of you? (hostility)
5. Do you take sides in disagreements between your parents? (hostility)
6. Do you feel hostile toward at least one of your parents? (hostility)
7. Does at least one of your parents say things about the other parent to you that the other parent wouldn't want you to hear? (hostility)
9. Do your parents have angry disagreements with each other? (hostility)
10. Does at least one of your parents feel hostile toward the other parent? (hostility)
12. Can your parents talk to each other about problems with you? (friendliness) (R)
13. Do your parents have a friendly divorce or separation? (friendliness) (R)
14. Is coordinating visits with your parents a difficult time? (hostility)

(Note: items followed by (R) indicate items that were reverse scored.)

Perceptions of Parents Scale, Warmth subscales (adapted from Robbins, 1994)

Please answer the following questions about your mother and your father at the current point in time. If you do not have any contact with one of your parents (for example, your father), then mark the questions about that parent as “1 – not at all true.” Please use the following scale:

Not at all true			Somewhat true			Very true
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

First, questions about your mother.

1. My mother accepts me and likes me as I am.
2. My mother clearly conveys her love for me.
3. My mother makes me feel very special.
4. My mother is often disapproving and unaccepting of me. (R)
5. My mother is typically happy to see me.
6. My mother seems to be disappointed in me a lot. (R)

Now questions about your father.

1. My father accepts me and likes me as I am.
2. My father clearly conveys his love for me.
3. My father makes me feel very special.
4. My father is often disapproving and unaccepting of me. (R)
5. My father is typically happy to see me.
6. My father seems to be disappointed in me a lot. (R)

(Note: items followed by (R) indicate items that were reverse scored.)

Well-Being (WHO-Five Well-Being Index; Bech, Olsen, Kjoller, & Rasmussen, 2003)

Please indicate for each of the five statements which is closest to how you have been feeling over the last two weeks. Notice that higher numbers mean better well-being.

Example: If you have felt cheerful and in good spirits more than half of the time during the last two weeks, put a tick in the box with the number 3 in the upper right corner.

At no time	Some of the time	Less than half of the time	More than half of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
0	1	2	3	4	5

Over the last two weeks...

1. I have felt cheerful and in good spirits.
2. I have felt calm and relaxed.
3. I have felt active and vigorous.
4. I woke up feeling fresh and rested.
5. My daily life has been filled with things that interest me.

REFERENCES

- Amato, P. R. (2000). The consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4), 1269-1287. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01269.x
- Amato, P. R. (2010). Research on divorce: Continuing trends and new developments. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 650-666. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00723.x
- Amato, P. R., & Keith, B. (1991). Parental divorce and the well-being of children: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110(1), 26-46. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.110.1.26
- Amato, P. R., Kane, J. B., & James, S. (2011). Reconsidering the 'good divorce'. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 60(5), 511-524. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2011.00666.x
- Amato, P. R., Loomis, L. S., & Booth, A. (1995). Parental divorce, marital conflict, and offspring well-being during early adulthood. *Social Forces*, 73(3), 895-915. doi:10.2307/2580551
- Bahr, S. J., Chappell, C., & Marcos, A. C. (1987). An evaluation of a trial mediation program. *Mediation Quarterly*, 1837-52. doi:10.1002/crq.39019871805
- Bailey, J., & McCarty, D. (2009). Assessing empowerment in divorce mediation. *Negotiation Journal*, 25(3), 327-336. doi:10.1111/j.1571-9979.2009.00229.x
- Bandura, A. (1969). *Principles of behavior modification*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Bech, P., Olsen, L., Kjoller, M. & Rasmussen, N. (2003). Measuring well-being rather than the absence of distress symptoms: A comparison of the SF-36 mental health subscale and the WHO-Five well-being scale. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 12(2), 85-91. doi:10.1002/mpr.145
- Beck, J. (2011). *Cognitive therapy: Basics and beyond*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Bollen, K. L., Verbeke, A., & Euwema, M. C. (2013). Money or children? Power sources in divorce mediation. *Journal of Family Studies*, 19(2), 159-173. doi:10.5172/jfs.2013.19.2.159
- Bradbury, T. N. & Karney, B. R. (2014). *Intimate relationships*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

- Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research* (2nd ed). New York, NY: Guilford Publications.
- Burrell, N. A., Narus, L., Bogdanoff, K., & Allen, M. (1994). Evaluating parental stressors of divorcing couples referred to mediation and effects on mediation outcomes. *Mediation Quarterly*, *11*(4), 339-352. doi:10.1002/crq.3900110406
- Clifford, T., & Clark, R. (1995). Family climate, family structure and self-esteem in college females: The physical- vs psychological-wholeness divorce debate revisited. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, *23*(3-4), 97-112. doi:10.1300/J087v23n03_06
- Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, N.J: Psychology Press.
- Cummings, E. M., & Davies, P. (1994). *Children and marital conflict: The impact of family dispute and resolution*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Cummings, A. J., & Rennels, J. L. (2014). How mood and task complexity affect children's recognition of others' emotions. *Social Development*, *23*(1), 80-99. doi:10.1111/sode.12038
- Davies, P. T., Myers, R. L., & Cummings, E. M. (1996). Responses of children and adolescents to marital conflict scenarios as a function of the emotionality of conflict endings. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *42*(1), 1-21. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23090518>
- Elkin, M. (1987). Joint custody: Affirming that parents and families are forever. *Social Work*, *32*(1), 18-24. doi:10.1093/sw/32.1.18
- Ellis, A. (1959). Requisite conditions for basic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, *23*(6), 538-540. doi:10.1037/h0049260
- Emery, R. E. (1982a). Interparental conflict and the children of discord and divorce. *Psychological Bulletin*, *92*(2), 310-330. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.92.2.310
- Emery, R. E. (1982b). *Marital discord and child behavior problems*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, SUNY at Stony brook.
- Emery, R. E., Sbarra, D., & Grover, T. (2005). Divorce Mediation: Research and Reflections. *Family Court Review*, *43*(1), 22-37. doi:10.1111/j.1744-1617.2005.00005.x
- Gnepp, J., & Gould, M. (1985). The development of personalized inferences: Understanding other people's emotional reactions in light of their prior experiences. *Child Development*, *56*(6), 1455–1464. doi:10.2307/1130465

- Greene, S. M., Anderson, E. R., Forgatch, M. S., DeGarmo, D. S., & Hetherington, E. M. (2011). Risk and resilience after divorce. In F. Walsh (Ed.), *Normal family processes: Growing diversity and complexity* (pp. 102-127). New York: Guilford Press.
- Grych, J. H., & Fincham, F. D. (1990). Marital conflict and children's adjustment: A cognitive-contextual framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*(2), 267-290. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.267
- Grych, J. H., Seid, M., & Fincham, F. D. (1992). Assessing marital conflict from the child's perspective: The Children's Perception of Interparental Conflict Scale. *Child Development*, *63*(3), 558-572. doi:10.2307/1131346
- Hancock, E. (1980). The dimensions of meaning and belonging in the process of divorce. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *50*(1), 18-27. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.1980.tb03259.x
- Hetherington, E. M. (1979). Divorce: A child's perspective. *American Psychologist*, *34*(10), 851-858. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.851
- Hetherington, E. M., & Stanley-Hagan, M. (1999). The adjustment of children with divorced parents: A risk and resiliency perspective. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *40*(1), 129-140. doi:10.1111/1469-7610.00427
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*, 1-55. doi: 10.1080/10705519909540118
- Jöreskog, K.G., & Sörbom, D. (2006). LISREL 8.80 for Windows [Computer software]. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.
- Lemmon, J. A. (1983). Divorce mediation: Optimal scope and practice issues. *Mediation Quarterly*, *145-61*. doi:10.1002/crq.39019830106
- Long, B. H. (1987). Perceptions of parental discord and parental separations in the United States: Effects on daughters' attitudes toward marriage and courtship progress. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *127*(6), 573-582.
- Menin, B. (2000). The party of the last part: Ethical and process implications for children in divorce mediation. *Mediation Quarterly*, *17*(3), 281-293. doi:10.1002/crq.3900170306
- Narayan, A. J., Ippen, C. G., Harris, W. W., & Lieberman, A. F. (2017). Assessing angels in the nursery: A pilot study of childhood memories of benevolent caregiving as protective influences. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, *38*(4), 461-474. doi:10.1002/imhj.21653

- Neumann, D. (1992). How mediation can effectively address the male-female power imbalance in divorce. *Mediation Quarterly*, 9(3), 227-239. doi:10.1002/crq.3900090304
- Nickles, R. W., & Hedgespeth, J. (1991). A generic model for divorce mediation. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 17, 157-170. doi:10.1300/J087v17n01_11
- Nielsen, L. (2014). Shared physical custody: Summary of 40 studies on outcomes for children. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 55(8), 613-635. doi:10.1080/10502556.2014.965578
- Niemiec, C. P., Lynch, M. F., Vansteenkiste, M., Bernstein, J., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2006). The antecedents and consequences of autonomous self-regulation for college: A self-determination theory perspective on socialization. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29(5), 761-775. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2005.11.009
- Patterson, J. M. (2002). Integrating family resilience and family stress theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 349-360. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00349.x
- Peterson, C., Morris, G., Baker-Ward, L., & Flynn, S. (2014). Predicting which childhood memories persist: Contributions of memory characteristics. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(2), 439-448. doi:10.1037/a0033221
- Poortman, A., & Seltzer, J. A. (2007). Parents' Expectations About Childrearing After Divorce: Does Anticipating Difficulty Deter Divorce?. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(1), 254-269. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00357.x
- Sanford, K., & Rivers, A. S. (in press). *The Parting Parent Concern Inventory: Parents' Appraisals Correlate with Divorced Family Functioning*. *Journal of Family Psychology*. doi: 10.1037/fam0000340
- Sbarra, D. A., & Emery, R. E. (2005). Coparenting Conflict, Nonacceptance, and Depression Among Divorced Adults: Results From a 12-Year Follow-Up Study of Child Custody Mediation Using Multiple Imputation. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 75(1), 63-75. doi:10.1037/0002-9432.75.1.63
- Sbarra, D. A., & Emery, R. E. (2008). Deeper into divorce: Using actor-partner analyses to explore systemic differences in coparenting conflict following custody dispute resolution. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(1), 144-152. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.22.1.144
- Shaw, D., & Emery, R. E. (1987). Parental conflict and the adjustment of school-aged children whose parents have separated. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 15, 269-281. doi:10.1007/BF00916354
- Turkat, I. D. (2002). Shared parenting dysfunction. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 30(5), 385-393. doi:10.1080/01926180260296297

Zuberbuhler, J. (2001). Early intervention mediation: The use of court-ordered mediation in the initial stages of divorce litigation to resolve parenting issues. *Family Court Review*, 39(2), 203-206. doi:10.1111/j.174-1617.2001.tb00604.x