

Center for Demography and Ecology

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Marital Disruptions and Grandparent Relationships

Brenda A. Gravenish and Elizabeth Thomson

NSFH Working Paper No. 74



A National Survey of
FAMILIES
and
HOUSEHOLDS

Marital Disruptions
and
Grandparent Relationships

Brenda A. Gravenish and Elizabeth Thomson

University of Wisconsin-Madison

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the effects of separation or divorce on children's contact and closeness with their grandparents. Using data from the National Survey of Families and Households conducted in 1987-88 and 1992-93, we estimated regression models with controls for race, mother's education, father's education, poverty ratio, age and sex of child, age of grandparent, distance from grandparent, and parent's contact and closeness with their parents prior to separation or divorce. Children's closeness with grandparents, both maternal and paternal, was not affected by separation or divorce. Separation/divorce also had no significant effects on contact with maternal grandparents, or when the grandchild was male, on contact with paternal grandparents. Granddaughters' contact with paternal grandparents was, however, negatively affected by separation or divorce.

The end of a marriage also terminates the formal connection between each partner's kin group and the former wife or husband. But just as the parents remain parents, children remain formal members of both maternal and paternal kin groups after divorce. Grandparents, in particular, are those most likely to maintain contacts and relationships with children, and may constitute a potentially important resource for children experiencing their parents' divorce.

Today, almost all children have living grandparents, most of whom are relatively young and healthy and able to provide emotional, social, or economic support to children and grandchildren. Although most grandparents are not extensively involved in their grandchildren's lives, they may be a latent source of support in crises such as divorce. On the other hand, grandparents are not usually neutral observers of the divorce process, and the aftermath of divorce may include disruption in relationships between grandparents and the divorcing parents, and consequently between grandparents and grandchildren.

In this paper, we report results of a panel analysis of separation or divorce and children's relationships with grandparents. Our data come from a recent nationally representative survey of parents and children. We investigate effects of divorce on children's contact with grandparents and their ratings of relationship quality, paying particular attention to the gendered nature of kinship. That is, we investigate differences in effects of divorce for maternal and paternal grandparents, for relationships with grandmothers and grandfathers, and for granddaughters and grandsons.

Marital Disruption and Kinship Theory

Parsons' (1943) classic characterization of the American kinship system suggests a

strengthening effect of separation or divorce on relationships with extended kin. Parsons compared the system to an onion, comprised of layers of conjugal families. Each person is a member of two conjugal families, the family of origin into which he/she is born, and the family of procreation founded by his/her marriage. The emphasis on conjugal family ties requires that the interests of the newly formed family take precedence over those of each partner's family of origin. Thus, marriage becomes a structural barrier between the individual and the conjugal family of origin and her/his extended kin group.

What happens to kinship when the marriage ends? Parsons' theory implies that the separated or divorced person could be reabsorbed into her/his family of origin. Rather than the spouse, parents and siblings again become the conjugal family to whom one turns for emotional, social, and economic support. Gibson (1972), in a defense of Parsons' theory, reported that the widowed and divorced, as well as the never-married, were more physically and functionally integrated with their extended kin network than were the married. Spicer and Hampe (1975) found that following divorce high levels of interaction were maintained with one's own kin group, while contact with relatives of a former marriage declined.

Children of the disrupted marriage are not, of course, members of their parents' conjugal families of origin. Children's relationships with grandparents are of the second order; they are connected to grandparents through their relationships with parents. If a nonresident parent loses contact with or has poor relationships with the children, his/her strengthened ties to the children's grandparents or other extended kin may not matter. With the parental link weakened or missing, children may lose contact with one set of grandparents after separation or divorce.

This structural view of family and kin relationships does not, of course, fully capture

intergenerational processes that influence relationships between grandparents and grandchildren. Drawing from life course theory, Caspi and Elder (1988) showed how problem behaviors and problem relationships are reproduced across generations. Their model specifies that separation or divorce weakens ties between children and both divorcing parents. As just noted, children's ties to the parent's conjugal family may depend on their relationships with the parent. For example, Rossi and Rossi (1990) reported that adult children's relationships with grandparents and other extended kin depended on how close they felt to their connecting parent, as well as on their general feelings of cohesiveness and affection in the conjugal family. Several recent studies report a negative effect of parental divorce on the parents' continuing relationships with adult children (Aquilino 1994; Cooney 1994; White 1992).

This life course model also points out how a negative association between divorce and extended kin ties may arise through selection into divorce rather than through a causal effect of divorce. Parents who divorce are disproportionately likely to come from families of origin with marital or other relationship problems. Thus, ties between the parents and their extended families may already be relatively weak prior to separation or divorce. As a result, divorcing parents may not return to their families of origin for emotional, social or economic support formerly provided by a spouse. Furthermore, the adult child's divorce could also exacerbate conflicts between the child and her/his parents, further weakening already weak ties.

Empirical Evidence: Gendered Divorce and Kinship

Contact and exchanges between generations are most often facilitated and carried out by women (Adams, 1968; Bahr, 1976; Hagestad & Neugarten, 1985). Women are closer to kin of all

sorts than are males (Rossi and Rossi 1990). They organize get-togethers, remember birthdays, write Christmas cards. Women are also “family monitors,” who observe the course of and register changes in family and kin relationships.

One result of women’s kin-keeping is that children’s relationships with their maternal grandparents are warmer and more emotionally complex than with their paternal grandparents (Hagestad and Neugarten 1985). Grandparents’ relationship with the daughter or daughter-in-law is one of the most important determinants of how often grandparents and grandchildren contact each other (Hagestad, 1982; Johnson, 1985; 1988; Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1985). By contrast, relationships with sons or sons-in-law do not seem to influence grandparents contact with grandchildren, controlling for relationships with their wives (Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1986).

Also consistent with women’s kin-keeping role, relationships between grandmothers and grandchildren are closer than those between grandfathers and grandchildren. The latter relationships also appear to be mediated by the former. Few grandfathers participate in activities with grandchildren independently from their wives (Johnson, 1988). Kahana and Kahana (1970) found the closest grandparent-grandchild relationships to be between maternal grandmothers and granddaughters. Bengtson (1985) found that although grandfathers were not as close to their grandchildren as were grandmothers, grandfathers were closer to their grandsons than to their granddaughters. Cherlin and Furstenberg (1986) reported that exchange of services with grandfathers was more strongly influenced by the grandchild’s sex than was the case for grandmothers.

The gendered character of kinship may have even stronger effects on grandparent relationships after divorce. Women are more likely to be reabsorbed into their families of origin, since they are generally more economically dependent than men after divorce. Also, since children usually

live with mothers after divorce, it is the maternal kin who are most likely to provide the safety net for children.

Cherlin and Furstenberg (1986), using a national sample of teenagers whose parents were divorced for more than seven years, found that divorce was associated with more frequent contact between maternal grandmothers and grandchildren, less frequent contact with paternal grandmothers. Since children remain part of their father's kin group, however, many resident mothers retain relationships with former in-laws (Anspach 1976).

Although some of the studies cited above have used panel data, the data we use are unique in having information from both parents on grandparent contact and relationships prior to separation or divorce and from children on grandparent contact and relationships afterwards. We are therefore able to test more rigorously the causal hypothesis drawn from Parsons that separation or divorce increases contact and relationships with grandparents through the reabsorption of the parents into their respective families of orientation. We can also test the selection hypothesis drawn from life course theory that weaker ties among families of origin are the source of any negative association between separation or divorce and grandparent-grandchild relationships. And, finally, data from both mothers and fathers enables us to consider potentially gendered differences in effects of separation or divorce on grandparent relationships.

Sample and Measures

Our data come from the two-wave panel of the National Survey of Families and Households, 1987-88 to 1992-93. The first wave was conducted with a representative sample of 13,008 adults age 19 and older living in the continental United States (Sweet, Bumpass and Call, 1988). One adult

per household was randomly selected as the primary respondent, and was interviewed in person and completed several self-enumerated questionnaires. Spouses or cohabiting partners were asked to complete a self-enumerated questionnaire with somewhat less detailed but parallel information to that provided by the primary respondent. The primary respondent's interview included information about a focal child, randomly selected from children under 19 living in the household.

The second wave survey included personal interviews with primary respondents in NSFH-1, current spouses or cohabiting partners, and, for those whose marriages at NSFH-1 had ended in divorce, the former/separated spouse - whether or not she or he completed the spouse questionnaire in NSFH-1. If the focal child was age 10 or older, she/he was asked to participate in a short telephone interview, which included questions about maternal and paternal grandparents.

The first survey included interviews with 3,069 original two-parent families, i.e., families in which the focal child was living with both biological or adoptive parents and had no stepsiblings in the household. In the second wave, 2,676 (87%) of these families were represented by an interview from at least one parent. Among responding families, 1,659 had a focal child age 10 or older who would have been eligible for the child interview. Parents' permission was obtained for 88.1% of these children, and 91% of those with permission completed the interview. Most of the nonresponses for the focal children with parent permission were due to problems contacting or completing the interview rather than the child refusing to participate. The overall focal child completion rate (parent permission plus focal child response) was 80.1%.

Our analysis is limited to focal child respondents age 10-17 because the focus of concern about kin relationships and support has centered on minor children; because the life courses of young adult children are relatively chaotic even when parents remain married, confounding potential effects

of divorce; and because the questions about grandparent relationships were less detailed in the young adult than in the minor child interview. Of the 778 couples in this sample, 673 remained married at the second wave interview, 31 were separated, 61 were divorced, and in 13 families one of the parents had died. We excluded the last group of families from our analysis, because parental death has theoretically and empirically different consequences for families than marital disruption. And because the number of disrupted families was small, we combined the separated and divorced couples for analysis.

Grandparent Contact. In the second survey wave, focal children were asked: “During the last year, how often did you see your grandparent(s) on your mother’s side? on your father’s side?” “During the last year, how often did you talk on the telephone or receive a letter from your grandparent(s) on your mother’s side? On your father’s side?” For both questions, the response options were scored 1 = not at all, 2 = about once a year, 3 = several times a year, 4 = 1-3 times a month, 5 = about once a week, 6 = several times a week. Grandparents living with the focal child were assigned a score of 7 on both items.

Cherlin and Furstenberg (1986) reported that grandparents who see children least often, in part because they live far away, also talk to them least often on the telephone. Telephone calls apparently serve the purpose of furthering routine, regular interaction rather than renewing distant relationships. We therefore constructed measures of maternal and paternal grandparent contact by averaging the scores for phone/letter contact and visits for each set of grandparents.

At wave 1, focal children were not interviewed. We must therefore use the parents’ reports of contact with their own parents (the child’s grandparents) as proxies for grandparent contact prior to separation or divorce. This may be a reasonable inference for children under 19 because extended

kin ties are mediated by primary ties between parents and children (Rossi and Rossi, 1990). Each parent was asked: “During the past 12 months, about how often did you see your mother (father)?” and “During the past 12 months, about how often did you communicate with your mother (father) by letter or phone?” Response options were coded in the same way as were focal children’s responses at wave 2. The questions were asked separately for the grandmother and grandfather if the two grandparents lived apart. To construct measures comparable to those provided by grandchildren at wave 2, we first selected the more frequent response for grandparents living apart, and then averaged the scores for visits and phone/letter contact.

Grandparent Closeness. Children were also asked two questions about the quality of their relationship with each grandparent: “On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all close and 10 is extremely close, how would you describe your relationship with this grandparent?” and “If you had a major decision to make or if you felt depressed or unhappy, how likely would you be to talk about it with any of your grandparents?” Response options for the second question were “definitely wouldn’t,” “probably wouldn’t,” “50-50 chance,” “probably would,” “definitely would.” If the child responded “50-50 chance” or “more likely”, they were asked: “Which grandparent? ... Any others?” Because we cannot tell whether the likelihood rating applies to each of the grandparents who may have been listed, we assigned a score of 10 to grandparents who were mentioned, 0 to those who were not mentioned, in order to give equal weight to this item and the closeness rating. Children who said they probably or definitely would not talk to a grandparent received a score of 0 for each grandparent. The closeness scale was constructed as the mean of the closeness rating and the 0 or 10 score for grandparent as confidant.

As for the contact measures, we had only the parent’s report of grandparent relationships at

wave 1. There may be less correspondence between the parent-grandparent and grandchild-grandparent relationship, however, than between the corresponding levels of contact. Each parent was asked: “How would you describe your relationship with your mother? Your father?” with a response scale ranging from 0 (labeled ‘very poor’) to 7 (labeled ‘excellent’).

Several social and economic characteristics of families may be common causes of divorce and relationships with grandparents. Although their effects should be captured by controls for grandparent contact and closeness at wave 1, we include them in our models as control variables. Education and income are generally negatively associated with divorce and positively associated with kin contact and exchanges. We include each parent’s education measured as years completed (12 = high school graduation, 16 = bachelor’s degree, 18 = master’s degree, 20 = doctorate or professional degree) and measure income as the poverty ratio (household income divided by the poverty income for a family of similar size and composition). Higher divorce rates are found for ethnic minority couples than for white couples, while kinship ties are believed to be weaker among whites than among ethnic minority groups. We measured race/ethnicity as four categories: African-American, Mexican-American, non-Hispanic white, and other. Couples of mixed race/ethnicity were classified in the residual category. We also include the focal child’s sex and age in years as control variables.

Our final models, which include controls for grandparent relationships at wave 1 also include grandparents’ age and distance. Although these characteristics of grandparents are unlikely to be causes of separation or divorce, they may capture additional sources of variation in grandparent relationships that are not adequately controlled by the wave 1 measures. Each grandparent’s age was measured in years at the first wave. In wave 2, this information was obtained only from the corresponding parent and we did not want to lose cases from the analysis in which one or the other

parent did not participate at wave 2. In analyses of grandparent contact, grandparent age was computed as that of the older grandparent. Grandparent distance was also measured in the first wave for the same reason. In addition, when the parents are divorced or separated, it is not possible to determine distance between the grandchild and grandparents on the nonresident parent's side of the family. The nonresident parent reported how far he/she lives from the child, and how far she or he lives from her or his parents, but we do not know how far apart the grandparents and grandchildren live from each other. Distance was reported in miles, with grandparents in the household scored at 0. If the grandparents lived apart at wave 1, the shorter distance was used for analyses of grandparent contact.

Analyses and Results

Table 1 presents number of focal child respondents 10-17 with grandparents still living at the second survey wave. The largest number of living grandparents were grandmothers, with 611 from the maternal side and 582 from the paternal side. Less than one-third of these children had all four grandparents living, but 96 per cent had at least one living grandparent.

(Table 1 about here)

Selection Bias. Two analyses were conducted to estimate bias in the panel sample. First, we compared families in which at least one parent had participated in the second wave to those in which neither parent participated on both parents' reports of contact and closeness to their respective parents at wave 1. (This analysis included parents of older and younger children, since we could not determine the child's age at the second wave unless at least one parent participated in NSFH-2.) Only one statistically significant difference emerged: the mother's contact with her parents was slightly

higher for responding than for nonresponding families (difference between means .21 on the 7-point scale). Second, we compared families on these same wave 1 variables according to whether the focal child had permission to participate and whether she or he did participate. No statistically significant differences were found for grandparents' contact or closeness at wave 1 between focal children who did and did not have parent permission or who did and did not participate in the wave 2 interview. Thus, overall, the families included in the analyses reported below do not appear to have been selected from those with the closest relationships or most contact at wave 1.

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics on grandparent contact and closeness at wave 1 and wave 2 for the sample of families with respondent children age 10 to 17 at wave 2. Contact, measured on a scale from 1 to 7, averaged between 4 and 5 at wave 1 (reported by parents), just under 4 at wave 2 (reported by children). These differences probably reflect real differences in that parents have more visits or telephone/letter contact with the grandparents than do grandchildren. On the 7-point closeness scale, parents in wave 1 rated their parents very high, all means above 5.5. Grandchildren scores were similar, but on a longer scale, indicating that grandchildren's feelings of closeness, as for levels of contact, were lower than those reported by their parents approximately five years previously. Again, these differences are quite consistent with the structural relationship between grandparents and grandchildren being once-removed from that between grandparents and parents.

(Table 2 about here)

Apparent differences between relationships with grandmothers and grandfathers, or between relationships with maternal and paternal grandparents are based on different sets of families with different combinations of living grandparents at each survey wave. Differences between relationships

with grandmothers and grandfathers were tested by comparing the parent's or child's relationship with grandmother to that for the corresponding grandfather, if both grandparents are living. When information was available for grandparents on both sides of the family differences between relationships or contact with maternal versus paternal grandparents were tested.

Whether reported by parents at wave 1 or by children at wave 2, families had more frequent contact with maternal than paternal grandparents, among those with at least one living grandparent on each side. Relationships with grandmothers are significantly closer than those with grandfathers, among families with both grandparents living, whether reported by parents at wave 1 or by grandchildren at wave 2. At wave 2, the child's relationships with maternal grandparents were significantly better than those with paternal grandparents, if they had grandparents on both sides, but the difference between mothers' and fathers' reports of relationships with their own parents was not significant at wave 1.

Correlations between the wave 1 (parent report) and wave 2 (child report) measures of grandparent contact and closeness are presented in Table 3. As expected, measures of contact are more strongly correlated than those for closeness, perhaps reflecting greater real differences between parent-grandparent and grandchild-grandparent relationships than between levels of contact for parents and grandparents or for grandchildren and grandparents.

(Table 3 about here)

Ordinary least-squares regression was used to estimate effects of marital disruption on grandparent contact and closeness. First, tests were conducted for interactions between sex of child and effects of separation/divorce, in models unadjusted and adjusted for control variable effects. We found one significant interaction, such that effects of separation or divorce on contact with paternal

grandparents differed for grandsons and granddaughters. We therefore estimated separate models for paternal grandparent contact, but combined models for all maternal grandparent contact and for grandparent closeness.

As shown in Table 4, we estimated three models for each dependent variable. Model 1 estimates the total association between divorce/separation and grandparent contact or closeness. Model 2 controls for potential common causes of the two phenomena - mother's education, father's education, race/ethnicity, poverty ratio, age of child (and for combined models, child's sex). The final model adds controls for characteristics of grandparents (age, distance) and the nature of grandparent relationships prior to divorce, inferred from the parent's report of her/his relationships with her/his parents.

(Table 4 about here)

Table 4 shows that neither the total association nor any direct effects of separation or divorce were statistically significant for children's contact with maternal grandparents, nor for grandsons' contact with paternal grandparents. Separation or divorce had a significant negative, direct effect on granddaughters' contact with paternal grandparents, however. More than two-thirds of the association shown in Models 1 or 2 remained as a direct effect of divorce, controlling for contact prior to divorce.

Table 5 presents parallel models for grandchildren's closeness to each grandparent. Separation or divorce had no significant associations or direct effects on children's closeness to grandparents, regardless of the grandparent's or child's sex.

(Table 5 about here)

The relative absence of differences in grandparent contact or closeness associated with

separation or divorce contrasts with the strong effects of continuity in grandparent contact or closeness. Also shown in Table 4, the more contact reported by parents at wave 1, the more contact reported by grandchildren at wave 2. Similar large coefficients are shown for associations between parents' (wave 1) and children's (wave 2) closeness to each grandparent (Table 5).

Conclusions and Discussion

Our analyses demonstrated that parental divorce had only minimal effects on children's relationships with their grandparents, whether maternal or paternal. The only significant effect of divorce was a reduction in contact between granddaughters and their paternal grandparents. Considerable stability was found in grandparent contact and relationships over time.

The single significant effect of divorce found in our analysis is, however, consistent with gendered characteristics of divorce and kinship. Contact with paternal grandparents was reduced, as would be expected when most fathers are nonresident parents and may themselves have considerably reduced contact with their children. But this difference was found only for granddaughters, consistent with the slightly higher levels of contact nonresident fathers maintain with sons than with daughters. Nevertheless, neither granddaughters nor grandsons report any less positive relationships with grandparents after divorce.

If these estimates accurately reflect the effect of divorce on grandparent relationships they are not consistent with the inference from Parsons' theory that divorce should increase contact and closeness to the family of origin, indirectly increasing children's contact and closeness with grandparents. Limited evidence was found for the intergenerational transmission of family problems, since contact with paternal grandparents prior to divorce did explain a small part of the less frequent

contact granddaughters had with these grandparents after divorce.

These findings are not completely consistent with those reported in earlier grandparent studies, since we found no increase in contact with maternal grandparents after divorce and the decrease in contact with paternal grandparents was found only for granddaughters. The strength of our analysis is in having a national sample of children, and having measures of grandparent relationships both before and after divorce. A weakness may be that a large proportion of the divorces will have occurred within one or two years prior to the second wave interviews, and almost one third of the couples have not formally divorced. Processes of estrangement from or reabsorption into kin groups might be ongoing at the second wave with changes in grandparent relationships showing up later.

Another threat to our estimates is the proxy measures of children's contact and closeness to grandparents at wave 1. Suppose the positive correlation we observed between grandparent relationships at wave 1 and wave 2 is composed of a direct positive effect (stability) and an indirect positive selection effect (selecting out of divorce). If we have not sufficiently controlled for selection out of divorce, we may underestimate the direct (but suppressed) negative effect of divorce on subsequent grandparent contact and relationships.

On the other hand, it may be that separation or divorce does not have much effect on children's relationships with grandparents in part because those relationships are not so strong even prior to divorce. Although many grandchildren report quite frequent contact with grandparents, and most children feel quite close to their grandparents, grandparents may not be a central part of the child's or the nuclear family's life. And even if grandparents, particularly maternal grandparents, provide more support during the crisis of divorce, this may not be noticed by or reacted to when

children are experiencing radical changes in nuclear family relationships, possible residential moves, and reductions in economic circumstances.

REFERENCES

- Adams, B. N. 1968. *Kinship in an urban setting*. Chicago: Markham.
- Anspach, D. F. 1976. "Kinship and divorce." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 38, 323-340.
- Aquilino, William S. 1994. "Impact of childhood family disruption on young adult's relationships with parents." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 295-313.
- Bahr, H. M. 1976. "The kinship role." In F. I. Nye (ed.), *Role structure and analysis of the family*. (pp.61-69). Beverly Hills, CA:Sage.
- Bengtson, Vern L. 1985. "Diversity and Symbolism in Grandparental Roles." In *Grandparenthood*, ed. Vern L. Bengtson, Joan F. Robertson. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Caspi, Avshalom, and G. H. Elder, Jr. 1988. "Emergent Family Patterns." *The Intergenerational Construction of Problem Behaviour and Relationships*.
- Cherlin, Andrew and F. F. Furstenberg. 1985. "Styles and Strategies of Grandparenting." In *Grandparenthood*, ed. Vern L. Bengtson, Joan F. Robertson. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Cherlin, Andrew J., F. F. Furstenberg Jr. 1986. *The New American Grandparent: A Place in the Family, a Life Apart*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cooney, Teresa M. 1994. "Young Adults' Relations With Parents: The Influence of Recent Parental Divorce." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56:45-56.
- Gibson, Geoffrey. 1972. "Kin Family Network: Overheralded structure in Past conceptualizations of Family Functioning." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Feb.
- Hagestad, G. O. 1982. "Divorce: The family ripple effect." *Generations: The Journal of the Western Gerontological Society* (Winter), 24-31.
- Hagestad, G. O. and B. L. Neugarten. 1985. "Aging and the life course." In E. Shanas & R. Binstock Eds.), *Handbook of aging and the social sciences*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Johnson, Colleen Leahy. 1985. *Exfamilia: Grandparents, Parent, and Children Adjust to Divorce*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Johnson, Colleen L. 1988. "Active and Latent Functions of Grandparenting During the Divorce Process." *The Gerontologist*, Vol.28, No.2.

Kahana, E. and Kahana, B. 1970. "Grandparenthood from the perspective of the developing grandchild." *Developmental Psychology* 3:98-105.

Parsons, Talcott. 1943. "The Kinship System of the Contemporary United States." *American Anthropologist*, Vol 45.

Rossi, Alice S. and P. Rossi. 1990. *Of Human Bonding*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Sweet, James A., Larry L. Bumpass and Vaughn R.A. Call. 1988. "The design and content of the national survey of families and households." NSFH Working Paper #1, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.

Spicer, Jerry W. and G. D. Hampe. 1975. "Kinship Interaction After Divorce." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 37:113-119.

White, Lynn. 1992. "The effect of parental divorce and remarriage on parental support for adult children." *Journal of Family Issues* 13:234-250.

Table 1. Children with Grandparents

Grandparent(s)	Number	Percent
Maternal		
Grandmother	611	79%
Grandfather	459	59%
Either	676	87%
Both	393	51%
Paternal		
Grandmother	582	75%
Grandfather	406	52%
Either	641	82%
Both	347	45%
Both sets of grandparents	209	27%
At least one living grandparent	742	96%

SOURCE: National Survey of Families and Households. Families with child under 19 in the household in 1987-88 who was age 10-17 and participated in the follow-up survey, 1992-93.

Table 2. Grandparent Contact and Closeness

Variable	<u>Parent Reports, Wave 1</u>		
	Mean	S.D.	Number
Mother's Parents			
Contact	4.61	1.19	655
Closeness			
Mother	5.96	1.23	631
Father	5.57	1.50	522
Father's Parents			
Contact	4.17	1.15	608
Closeness			
Mother	5.79	1.38	583
Father	5.57	1.49	443
	<u>Child Reports, Wave 2</u>		
Maternal Grandparents			
Contact	3.98	1.29	655
Closeness			
Grandmother	6.29	2.96	601
Grandfather	5.35	2.87	450
Paternal Grandparents			
Contact	3.63	1.32	635
Closeness			
Grandmother	5.36	3.08	571
Grandfather	4.69	2.76	395

SOURCE: See Table 1.

Table 3. Stability in Grandparent Relationships, Wave 1-2

Variable	Correlations	Valid Cases
Maternal Grandparents		
Contact	.532***	603
Closeness		
Grandmother	.163***	561
Grandfather	.273***	416
Paternal Grandparents		
Contact	.447***	553
Closeness		
Grandmother	.153***	503
Grandfather	.187**	336

SOURCE: See Table 1.

NOTE: Wave 1 measures reported by parent, wave 2 by child.

*** Sig LE .001 level, two tailed

Table 4. Grandparent Contact and Divorce

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Maternal Grandparents			
Boys & Girls (N=507)			
Separation/Divorce	-.007 (.178)	-.000 (.178)	.010 (.154)
Contact Wave 1	-----	-----	.520** (.047)
R-squared	.000	.033**	.283**
Paternal Grandparents			
Boys & Girls (N=491)			
Separation/Divorce	-.309# (.183)	-.375* (.184)	(-.218) (.163)
Contact Wave 1	-----	-----	.492** (.050)
R-squared	.006	.033**	.244**
Paternal Grandparents			
Boys (N=230)			
Separation/Divorce	.221 (.275)	.110 (.277)	.190 (.241)
Contact Wave 1	-----	-----	.536** (.073)
R-squared	.003	.055**	.295**
Paternal Grandparents			
Girls (N=254)			
Separation/Divorce	-.705* (.250)	-.727** (.256)	-.500** (.234)
Contact Wave 1	-----	-----	.470** (.074)
R-squared	.031	.050**	.231**

SOURCE: See Table 1

NOTE: Models 2 and 3 also include parents' education, race/ethnicity, family poverty ratio, child's age and (pooled models) sex. Model 3 also includes grandparents' age and distance.

#p<.1 *p<.05 **<.01

Table 5. Grandparent Closeness and Divorce

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Maternal Grandmother (N=459)			
Separation/Divorce	-.372 (.417)	-.370 (.403)	-.332 (.398)
Closeness Wave 1	-----	-----	.334** (.107)
R-squared	.002	.093**	.125**
Maternal Grandfather (N=346)			
Separation/Divorce	-.375 (.542)	-.174 (.541)	.060 (.523)
Closeness Wave 1	-----	-----	.561** (.101)
R-squared	.001	.044**	.128**
Paternal Grandmother (N=439)			
Separation/Divorce	-.308 (.459)	-.368 (.453)	-.280 (.447)
Closeness Wave 1	-----	-----	.308** (.104)
R-squared	.001	.060**	.100**
Paternal Grandfather (N=299)			
Separation/Divorce	-.059 (.478)	-.095 (.474)	.110 (.471)
Closeness Wave 1	-----	-----	.380** (.111)
R-squared	.000	.062**	.109**

SOURCE: See Table 1

NOTE: Models 2 and 3 also include parents' education, race/ethnicity, family poverty ratio, child's age and (pooled models) sex. Model 3 also includes grandparents' age and distance.

*p<.05 **p<.01

Center for Demography and Ecology
University of Wisconsin
1180 Observatory Drive, Rm. 4412
Madison, WI 53706-1393
U.S.A.
608/262-2182
FAX 608/262-8400