

Fathers & **DIVORCE**

Terry Arendell

Fathers & DIVORCE

Terry Arendell



SAGE Publications

International Educational and Professional Publisher

Thousand Oaks London New Delhi

Copyright © 1995 by Sage Publications, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

For information address:



SAGE Publications, Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320
E-mail: order@sagepub.com

SAGE Publications Ltd.
6 Bonhill Street
London EC2A 4PU
United Kingdom

SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
M-32 Market
Greater Kailash I
New Delhi 110 048 India

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Arendell, Terry.

Fathers and divorce / Terry Arendell.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8039-7188-5 (acid-free paper). — ISBN 0-8039-7189-3 (pbk.
: acid-free paper).

1. Divorced fathers—New York (State) I. Title.

HQ756.A8 1995

306.89—dc20

94-42213

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

96 97 98 99 00 01 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

Sage Production Editor: Gillian Dickens
Ventura Typesetter: Janelle LeMaster

Fathers & DIVORCE

For Rob

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I thank the men who participated in this study. They generously made time in their busy lives to talk with me about their experiences of divorce and being a divorced father. Although the analysis and direction the work takes are mine alone and will surely meet with mixed reviews from those who were interviewed, the book is possible only because of these men's willingness to share how they view and respond to their social worlds. To protect the participants' anonymity, I can issue only this collective thank you. I also thank the family attorneys, therapists, mediators, and others who work with families and spoke with me for their input into this project.

Institutional support along the way assisted me in this project. Faculty research grants from Hobart and William Smith Colleges, City University of New York (PSC-CUNY 669492), and the University of Wisconsin-Madison helped defray some of the costs of the study. I am also grateful to the University of Wisconsin, School of Family Resources and Consumer Sciences, for course release time during 1992-93, which enabled me to concentrate more fully on writing.

Numerous colleagues and friends have offered advice, support, and encouragement over the course of this project. Special words of appreciation go to Dottie and Shan Mariner, who provided warm hospitality and friendship on various occasions when I interviewed in upstate New York.

Needing particular mention here among those who offered assistance and generous friendship, and who commented on material along the way, are Joseph Marino, Alan Berkowitz, Chip Capraro, Linda Barton, Barbara Owen, Robert Perinbanayagam, and Ruth Sidel. Special words of appreciation go to Bill Aquilino and Linda Thompson for friendship, hospitality, and overall generosity. To Arlie Hochschild for her unfailing friendship, support, and guidance, the latter especially at several crucial points during the evolution of this project, I extend my heartfelt thank you. To those at Sage Publications who offered support to and expedited the publication of this work, all with good humor and patience—especially, Mitch Allen, Executive Editor; Frances Borghi, Editorial Assistant; Gillian Dickens, Special Editor; and Kate Peterson, Copy Editor—I extend my gratitude. Last, but never least, appreciation goes to my brother Randy Pitstick and my son Rob Arendell for their love, good humor, unwavering support, and warmest of family ties.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments

xi

Part I. Divorce in Contemporary America

1. Men and Divorce: Unanswered Questions	3
This Study	4
The Participants	4
The Method	7
Theoretical Assumptions	9
The Findings in Brief	13
A Bifurcated Story	15
Notes	18
2. At the Crossroads of Family and Gender: Divorce in Context	22
Family	22
The Divorce Rate	23
Family Changes	24

Gender	28
Gender Constructs	28
Gender Changes	30
Fatherhood	31
Cultural Tensions	33
Backlash Against Change and Ambiguity	34
The <i>His</i> and <i>Hers</i> of Divorce	37
Custody	38
Economics and the Postdivorce Support of Children	38
Property	40
Emotional Well-Being	40
Remarriage	41
Notes	41

Part II. Divorce Injustice

3. A Masculinist Discourse of Divorce	45
A Rhetoric of Rights	45
Sources	47
The Politicization of Divorce	50
A Belief in Gender Differences	52
Male Superiority	53
A Broken Family	61
Exceptions	66
Notes	67
4. The Law and "Miscarriages of Justice"	69
State Intrusion	70
Legal Encounters	72
The Legal Game	74
Mediation	75
Primary Injustices	77
Maternal Custody	77
Access	83
Allegations of Child Abuse	84
Child Support	87
Reform in the Child Support System	94
Property Settlements and Earnings	97
Economic Effects	99
Notes	102

Part III. The Majority Story: Conventional Responses

5. Former Spousal Relations: "War Without End"	111
Resistance and Opposition	112
Subjective Assessments	114
Harassment	115
Violence	118
Child Abduction	122
Withdrawal and Avoidance	125
Support Noncompliance	127
Custody Challenges	130
Identity Management	133
Identity and the Former Wife	135
Notes	138
6. Traditionalist Fathers:	
Disengagement and Absence	141
Parental Separation	142
Absence and Disengagement as Practice and Option	143
Disengagement as Emotion Management	153
Absence as a Standard of Comparison	157
Involuntary Absence	159
Assessments of Children	160
Notes	164
7. Neo-Traditionalist Fathers: Shifting Priorities	166
Levels of Parental Involvement	166
Role Ambiguity	171
Parental Relations and Discontent	174
Others' Children	176
Social Lives and Children	176
Parenting	177
Visitation Routines	178
Outside Influences	185
Assessments of Children	187
Notes	190

Part IV. The Minority Story: Innovative Responses

8. Parenting Partnerships With Former Wives	195
Collaborations With Former Wives	202
Minimizing Conflict	204
Being "Deviants"	210
The Logistics of Shared Parenting	212
Household Transitions	215
Notes	217
9. Innovative, Nurturing Fathers	219
Parenting Strategies	225
Assessments of Children's	
Development and Well-Being	229
Personal Life Course Developmental Issues	234
A Price Exacted	235
Social Lives and Isolation	240
Identity Management	244
Notes	246
10. Making Progress, Making Policies	248
Policy Issues	252
Divorce Law and Legal Procedures	253
A Primary-Caretaker Rule	255
Parental Access	258
Child Support and a Child Support Assurance	
Program	260
Mediation and Counseling Services	262
Parent Education Courses	263
Outlaw Corporal Punishment	264
Professional Education and Legal Sanctioning	
of Illegal Acts	265
Full Employment: Decent Minimum Earnings	
and Economic Equity	266
Workplace Reforms	267
Housing, Health Care, Equitable Education,	
and Child Care	267
Ending Institutional Sexism:	
Dismantling the Gender Belief System	267

Valuing Unpaid Domestic and Caring Labor	268
Redefining Society's Obligation to Its Children	268
Notes	269
References	273
Index	297
About the Author	303

PART I



Divorce in
Contemporary America



1



MEN AND DIVORCE Unanswered Questions

Men are relatively neglected in divorce research. A dearth of information on men's perceptions and actions persists even though divorce research increased dramatically over the past several decades, as the divorce rate remained strikingly high. This neglect of men, and particularly of divorced fathers, is not unique but is characteristic of fathers and fathering more generally. For example, Furstenberg (1988) observed: "Evidence on fatherhood, though far more abundant now than a few years ago, is still sparse" (p. 194; see also LaRossa 1988; Lewis and Salt 1986; Lamb 1987, 1986).¹ Much of what is known about divorced fathers comes from interviews with custodial mothers (e.g., Arendell 1986; Kurz 1995; Hetherington, Cox, and Cox 1976, 1978, 1982) and survey research, including the National Survey of Children (Furstenberg, Morgan, and Allison 1987; Furstenberg and Nord 1985; Furstenberg, Nord, and Zill 1983), the National Survey of the High School Class of 1972 (Teachman 1991a, 1991b), the National Survey of Child Health (Zill 1988), and the National Survey of Families and Households (Seltzer, Schaeffer, and Charng 1989; Seltzer and Bianchi 1988; Seltzer 1991a, 1991b). Neither mothers' reports nor survey findings, however, give expression to fathers' views or experiences.

Men are not mere understudies in the divorce dramas being played out nationally, as might be suggested by the limited research attention given them. Rather, they are key players in postdivorce families, whatever the nature of

their actions and level of parental involvement. The ways in which men draw from the culture, social institutions, and their personal histories and construct and direct their actions in the changed family tell us much about their attitudes, expectations, and relationships. Moreover, men's perceptions on and behaviors in divorce suggest a partial profile of contemporary American family life.

This Study

I previously had interviewed and written about divorced mothers (Arendell 1986, 1987). I also was interested in men's perspectives on and experiences in the family, an interest that was further piqued by the college and university courses I was teaching and by the various sociocultural and political developments regarding the family and relationships between men and women. Therefore, in the early 1990s I set out to study divorced men directly. Wanting to hear from men in their own words about their family and marital dissolution experiences, I interviewed 75 divorced fathers living in various parts of New York state. In my efforts to better situate the men's reports in the current social and legal context, I also spoke with numerous family attorneys, mediators, and mental health workers involved professionally with divorced families. This, then, is an exploratory study of fathers and divorce: It is an investigation of how 75 divorced men viewed and managed their situations and relationships, particularly the former spousal and parental ones, and handled their emotional lives and identities. Focused primarily on the accounts and actions of a small number of divorced fathers, the study is also about the changing American family. So, too, it is about gender—the sociocultural constructs and expectations of masculinity and femininity, assigned to the respective biological identities of male and female—and, more specifically, about the transitions in and challenges to gender roles, definitions, and identities. This book, then, confronts an array of contemporary issues and trends.

THE PARTICIPANTS

All participants in the study were volunteers who responded to notices placed in newsletters, magazines, and newspapers or to referrals from men who were interviewed. The sample, therefore, is one of convenience, recruited through a modified snowball technique (Rubin 1976; Wiseman 1979; Morse 1992). Because the sample is self-selected and, therefore, nonrepresentative, generalizations can be made only sparingly and with caution (Babbie 1992). McCracken (1988) addressed the matter of a lack of generalizability from interview data: "The issue is not one of generalizability. It is that of access.

The purpose of the qualitative interview is not to discover how many, and what kinds of, people share a certain characteristic. It is to gain access to the cultural categories and assumptions according to which one culture construes the world" (p. 17).² I try to exercise caution throughout the text not to generalize from these particular men's experiences to all divorced fathers even though most participants freely extrapolated from their own situations and perspectives, positing their experiences as ones universal to divorced fathers. Although often generalizing, over two thirds of the respondents also said at some point, usually in the initial contact with me when they indicated a willingness to participate in the study, and in varying ways, "Boy, do I have a story to tell you. This is one you haven't heard before." Most saw in their situations, then, both every man's and no other man's divorce, only theirs.

The respondents ranged in age from 23 to 59 years, with the median age being 38. Sixty-four interviewees were white, three were black, four Hispanic, two Asian American, and two Native American. Two respondents were northern European immigrants who had married and divorced in the United States as naturalized citizens. Additionally, five men stressed that their ethnic identity was Italian (Italian American) and another two that theirs was Greek (Greek American).

Nearly half of the respondents had some college education, with over one-third having completed college and approximately one-sixth having earned a graduate or professional degree. The group was largely middle class but included some stably employed working-class men. Occupationally, one-third of the employed participants worked in blue-collar and two-thirds in white-collar positions. Six men were unemployed at the time of the interview, three by choice.

The length of time the respondents had been divorced or legally separated ranged from 2 to 10 years; the median time since divorcing, *postdivorce* time, was $4\frac{3}{4}$ years. Only men divorced more than 2 years were included in the study. Called selective sampling (Schatzman and Strauss 1973), this strategy was used because persons whose divorces are more recent may have uniquely different perspectives than those divorced for longer periods: The first several years following a marital separation are especially tumultuous, and it takes a year or more for most divorcing persons to regain equilibrium and stability in their lives (Hetherington 1987; Chase-Lansdale and Hetherington 1990).³

At the time they were interviewed, 18 men were remarried, 5 were living with a woman in a marital-like relationship, and the others were unmarried. Nationally, the remarriage rate is declining: "Based on 1985 patterns, Norton and Moorman (1987) predicted that only seventy percent of currently divorced men and women will eventually remarry" (Chase-Lansdale and Hetherington 1990, p. 109). Nevertheless, the proportion of participants who