Racial and Ethnic Differences in Consequences of Parental Divorce for American Adolescents

By

Yongmin Sun *

The Ohio-State University

And

Yuanzhang Li **

Allied Technology Group, Inc.

Paper Submitted to Annual Meeting of PAA, 2006

Author Affiliation:

* Dr. Yongmin Sun
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
1680 University Dr.
The Ohio State University-Mansfield
Mansfield, OH 44906
Tel: (614) 888-9088
Email: sun.84@osu.edu

** Dr. Yuanzhang Li
Allied Technology Group, Inc.

Abstract

Based on two waves of a nationally representative panel of American high school students, the current study examines whether well-being differences between adolescents from two-biological-parent and disrupted families vary in breadth and magnitude among four major racial/ethnic communities in the United States. Analyses indicate that compared with their Hispanic American counterparts, European, Asian, and African American adolescents consistently exhibit wider and larger well-being deficits both prior to and after parental divorce/separation. Moreover, whereas a shortage of social resources in pre-divorce families is primarily responsible for well-being problems among European and Asian American adolescents, the well-being problems among African Americans are largely attributable to disadvantages in financial and human resources. Differences in these pre-divorce factors are also largely responsible for adolescents' maladjustment after their parents' divorce in each non-Hispanic group. Overall, the findings highlight the importance of race and ethnicity in studying the consequences of parental divorce.

Keys words: child well-being, divorce, family structure, longitudinal studies, racial differences

During the past few decades, social scientists have devoted a substantial amount of research attention to the well-being of children who experience parental divorce or separation (for reviews, see Amato, 1993; 2000; Amato & Keith, 1991; Demo & Acock, 1988; Hines, 1997). Nevertheless, most existing studies in this area either focus exclusively on European American children or combine children with different racial/ethnic backgrounds in their analyses. Although some effort has been made to examine racial differences in experiences of parental divorce/separation (hereafter, referred to as divorce), such effort is rare and usually limited to Black-White comparisons. Consequently, relatively little is known about whether or not children of Asian and Hispanic origins may have some unique adjustment experiences and, more broadly, whether such adjustment may vary in extent and timing among all major racial and ethnic groups in the United States (Amato, 2000; McLoyd et al., 2000).

There are sound conceptual reasons to expect racial and ethnic diversities in children's experiences of parental divorce. First, divorce rate differs significantly by race and ethnicity in the United States. These differences in divorce prevalence may foster different attitudes and responses of children toward their parents' divorce (Amato & Keith, 1991; Smith, 1997). Second, racial and ethnic groups also differ dramatically in family resources. Given that prior research links the negative divorce effects on children to a shortage of various family resources in divorced families (for reviews, see Amato, 1993; 2000), it is possible that racial and ethnic disparities in the overall resource levels and in resource gaps between two-biological-parent and divorced families may contribute to different levels of maladjustment. Finally, racial/ethnic differences in family practices and parenting styles may also alter children's experiences during the divorce process.

Based on two waves of the National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS), the current study investigates whether the well-being problems observed during pre- and post-divorce periods

vary in breadth and magnitude among American adolescents of European, Asian, African, and Hispanic origins. It also explores whether racial/ethnic differences in children's maladjustment are indeed related to variations in divorce prevalence and stocks of family resources in different racial and ethnic communities. Finally, the study examines whether pre-divorce factors may predict adolescents' maladjustment after divorce and if so, whether the extent of such prediction varies by race and ethnicity.

BACKGROUND

Parental Divorce Process, Family Resources and Child Well-Being

Despite some inconsistency, a substantial amount of previous research has demonstrated that in general, experiencing parental divorce increases children's risks of academic, social, behavioral, and psychological problems (e.g., Amato, 1993; 2000; Amato & Keith, 1991; Astone & McLanahan, 1991; Entwisle & Alexander, 1995; McLanahan & Sandfur, 1994). Two previous theoretical arguments are particularly relevant to this study. The *resource-shortage* perspective attributes the negative effects of divorce to both prior and subsequent deficits in various family and parental resources. The early version of the perspective (often known as the economic deprivation model) attributes children's maladjustment to the economic hardships in divorced (particularly in single-mother) households (e.g., McLanahan, 1985). In his benchmark article on social capital, Coleman (1988) further elaborates the perspective by pointing out that parents' marital disruption can also decrease the amount of social capital (resources) for children, as divorce typically reduces children's social contact with their non-custodial parents (Furstenberg & Nord, 1985) and may even reduce the amount of parenting by the custodial parent (Astone & McLanahan, 1991). In addition to post-divorce resource problems, several recent studies further argue that pre-divorce families are also characterized by financial difficulties, inter-personal conflicts among family members, and a decline

in parental commitment (Cherlin, et al., 1991; Sun, 2001; Pong & Ju, 2000; White, 1990). Obviously, these resource shortages associated with both pre- and post-divorce families may contribute to a lower level of child well-being.

On the other hand, the *divorce-stress-adjustment* perspective regards the entire parental divorce process as a stressful transition for children (Amato, 1993, 2000). Consistent with several previous longitudinal studies in this area (e.g., Block, Block & Gjerde, 1986; Cherlin et al., 1991), this perspective explicitly argues that parental divorce is a continuous process, which begins years prior to the formal divorce and continues years after divorce. Throughout its entirety, the divorce process is associated with a set of stressful events and situations (stressors) to which children constantly have to adjust. Thus, the divorce process influences children through these stressors, which further increase the risk of various problems for children (Amato, 2000). To a large extent, this perspective is similar to the resource-shortage model in that many stressors (e.g., financial difficulties, inter-personal conflicts, reallocation of residence/school) either characterize or result from a financially and socially deteriorating family environment.

The existing empirical studies provide strong evidence for these related perspectives. First, consistent with the divorce-stress-adjustment model, several longitudinal studies have demonstrated that compared with their counterparts from two-biological-parent families, children who experienced the parental divorce process fared less well in a wide range of well-being indicators both prior to and after divorce (Block et al., 1986; Cherlin et al., 1991; Morrison & Cherlin, 1995; Sun, 2001; Sun & Li, 2002). Further, several studies have reported that pre-divorce deficits in social and financial resources mediated a large portion of the deficits in various child outcomes at both pre-divorce (Sun, 2001; Sun & Li, 2002) and post-divorce stages (Cherlin et al.; Furstenberg & Teitler, 1994; Morrison & Cherlin, 1995; Pong & Ju, 2000). A large number of cross-sectional

studies have also demonstrated that resource disadvantages of the disrupted families mediated a large proportion of children's maladjustment (e.g, Amato, 1993; Astone & McLanahan, 1991; Entwisle & Alexander, 1995; Thomson, Hanson, & McLanahan, 1994).

Arguments for alternative causal links or ordering remain possible. The *selection* perspective, for instance, argues that both divorce and the associated child adjustment problems simply reflect a series of selections, by which parents with antisocial personality and behavioral problems are married in such multi-problem families (see Amato, 2000). A similar argument maintains that it is parents' financial problems that cause both the later divorce and children's problems. While family researchers continue to debate whether financial problems are the cause or consequence of family structure (Eggebeen & Lichter, 1991) and whether divorcees share problematic personally traits, empirical tests of these alternative causal links are rare, because a complete test would require a special data set covering a long period of parents' lives.

Racial/Ethnic Disparity in Child Adjustment to Parental Divorce

Although most previous studies ignore racial/ethnic disparities when studying the consequences of divorce, there are several noticeable exceptions. In a meta-analysis of prior studies, Amato and Keith (1991) found that studies based on African American samples tended to report smaller divorce effects than studies based on European American cases. The authors speculated that this might be partly due to the prevalence of divorces in African American communities. Because a large proportion of peers experienced parental divorce in their communities, parental divorce might carry a less negative stigma and therefore, generate fewer adjustment problems for children. In another study of seventh and ninth graders, Smith (1997) also reported a weaker negative association between parental divorce and children's school grades for African than for European Americans. Interestingly, the study also found that whereas European American children might be

influenced by stress from inter-parental conflicts, African Americans appeared to be mainly affected by economic difficulties associated with disrupted families. Finally, using a sample of 300 young children from low-income families, Shaw, Winslow and Flanagan (1999) found that compared with respective peers in two-biological-parent families, European American boys in pre-divorce families exhibited a higher level of externalizing behavioral problems than African American boys. However, no comparable racial differences in divorce effects were reported after parental divorce.

Although these studies provide some insights, all (except for Amato & Keith, 1991) are based on small, nonrepresentative samples. Further, the absence of Asian and Hispanic American children in these studies not only excludes two fast-growing racial/ethnic groups in the United States, but also limits our understanding of adjustment differences among these children and their European and African American peers. For instance, Amato and Keith (1991) hypothesized that African American children encountered less maladjustment because divorce was more prevalent in their communities. If indeed the magnitude of children's maladjustment is negatively associated with the divorce rate in a given racial/ethnic community (hereafter, referred to as the hypothesis of prevalence of divorce), Asian American children should experience the most maladjustment because divorce is least prevalent among Asian American parents. Despite its conceptual merit, the hypothesis has not been rigorously tested in a multi-racial sample. Similarly, although Smith (1997) suggested that European and African American children might be affected by the divorce process via different types of resource shortages (social vs. financial), it is unclear how such patterns apply to Asian and Hispanic Americans. Finally, Shaw and his associates (1999) report that African American boys exhibit fewer behavior problems than their European American peers before but not after divorce. This may suggest that, beyond the pre-divorce damage, experiencing the formal divorce causes different levels of additional effects in various racial/ethnic contexts. Unfortunately,

with no further elucidation, we still know little about whether racial/ethnic differences in children's maladjustment observed in an earlier phase of the divorce process will be sustained over time.

THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study advances several aspects of previous research. First, based on two waves of a large, nationally representative panel of American 10th-graders, we examine whether well-being differences between adolescents from two-biological-parent and disrupted families vary in breadth and magnitude among European, Asian, African, and Hispanic American communities approximately one year before and one year after the formal divorce. Such a design allows for not only a cross-racial comparison of the well-being deficits at two separate time points in the divorce process, but also an examination of whether the patterns of racial diversity observed in the pre-divorce period are sustained after divorce.

In conducting such comparisons, we are also able to empirically test the hypothesis of prevalence of divorce based on a multi-racial data set. Because national estimates of divorce rates are not broken down by race and ethnicity, we use national estimates on the percentage of children 18 years of age or younger not living in two-biological-parent families as a proxy measure of the prevalence of nontraditional family structures (including divorced families). Given that such percentages are 21.0, 29.9, 41.3, and 70.1 in Asian, European, Hispanic, and African American communities respectively (US Bureau of Census, Internet Table 1, 1996), we tentatively propose that the breadth and magnitude of the well-being deficits in these four racial/ethnic groups linearly follow the same ranking, with Asian Americans expected to experience the most maladjustment and African American children, the least.

Second, we further investigate whether potential racial/ethnic diversities in well-being problems during the pre-divorce period are indeed related to differences in family resource profiles

in various racial and ethnic groups. As suggested by earlier work (e.g., Smith, 1997), it is possible that children of divorce in a given racial/ethnic group are particularly vulnerable to the shortage of a certain type of family resources. With a wide range of measures of economic, human, and social resources measured approximately one year prior to divorce, we are able to assess whether children with different racial/ethnic backgrounds are indeed affected by a shortage of different family resources. In pursuing this research goal, we follow the resource shortage and divorce-stress-adjustment perspectives and assume that throughout its various stages, the parental divorce process sets in motion a reduction in family resources and a set of stressful events, which, in turn, are negatively associated with child outcomes. Nevertheless, we caution the reader that family resources (especially economic factors) can be modeled differently based on alternative causal links or ordering (Brown, 2004).

Finally, several longitudinal studies report that a large proportion of post-divorce deficits in child outcomes are due to their pre-divorce counterparts and other pre-divorce family circumstances. (e.g., Block et al., 1986; Cherlin et al., 1991; Morrison & Cherlin, 1995; Sun, 2001). In this study, we further examine whether such a pattern is evident in each racial/ethnic community. In light of some previous findings (Shaw et al., 1999), the extent to which pre- and post-divorce maladjustments are related may vary in different racial/ethnic contexts. By comparing the extent to which pre-divorce factors may predict adolescents' maladjustment after divorce in various racial and ethnic groups, we are able to detect whether the event of divorce imposes a different level of additional effects over and above the pre-divorce damage in various racial/ethnic groups.

In later analyses, we also control for the student's gender, school affiliation, residence location, and geographic region, because these demographic factors are related to child outcomes, race, and/or parental resources (Astone & McLanahan, 1991; Parcel & Geschwender, 1995).

METHOD

Sample

Data in this study came from the 1990 and 1992 waves of the NELS. Conducted in 1988, the original base-year study of NELS consisted of a nationally representative sample of more than 24,000 American 8th-graders. More than 16,000 cases from the base-year sample were resurveyed in 1990 and 1992 when these adolescents were in their 10th and 12th grades. We focused on the latter two waves because they contained key measures (e.g., behavior problems, parent-parent and parent-child relationships) that were not available in the base-year wave. Given our special interests in assessing racial differences during both pre- and post-divorce periods, we further restricted the final sample to students who: (1) had no missing values on family structure measures in either wave, (2) lived in two-biological-parent families in 1990, and (3) had no missing values on race/ethnicity. American Indians were further excluded due to the small number of cases. These four filters excluded 7,497 students from the original pool (over 6,000 were excluded by the second filter). The final sample consisted of 9,252 adolescents, among whom 701 students (approximately 8%) experienced family dissolution between 1990 and 1992. Because the NELS study over-sampled minority students, we used the sampling weights provided by NELS in all later analyses.

Measures

Well-Being Indicators. Nine cross-wave comparable indicators were taken from both waves of the student survey to gauge students' well-being in three areas. For academic success, we first used the IRT (item-response-theory) version of students' cognitive test scores for math and reading. We then included students' educational aspiration (1 = less than high school graduation; 6 = graduate school). Academic readiness was a multi-item measure gauging how often students came to school with pencils, paper, books, and finished homework (0 = never had any of the above ready; 9 = usually

had each ready; alpha values for two waves = 0.67 and 0.70). We also included a measure from teacher surveys on how often a student finished homework (0 = never; 6 = all the time).

For students' psychological well-being, we used the two existing multi-item composites of self-esteem and locus of control. The self-esteem composite (alphas for two waves = 0.82 and 0.85) consisted of seven statements (e.g., I feel good about myself), whereas the composite of locus of control (alphas = 0.73 and 0.74) contained six items (e.g., I don't have control over the direction my life is taking). In all these psychological items, responses were coded from 1 to 4 where 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree.

For students' behavioral problems, we used a multi-item composite (alphas = 0.65 and 0.68) based on students' self report on frequencies of their involvement in the following events during the first half of the school year: being late for school, cutting or skipping class, getting into trouble for not following rules, and fighting with others (0 = never involved in any such events; 16 = involved more than 10 times in each event). A similar composite came from four items in teachers' surveys (alphas = 0.71 and 0.69) measuring how often a student was absent, tardy, inattentive, or disruptive (0 = never involved in any of the above; 16 = involved in each all the time).

Predictor Variables. The key predictor variable is family structure. Because all adolescents lived in two-biological-parent households in 1990 (cases living in single-parent and stepfamilies were excluded by sampling filters), we were able to use a dummy variable of family structure to classify all participants into two categories: those who lived in families with two biological parents in both 1990 and 1992 (n = 8,551), and those who lived in two-biological-parent families in 1990, but lived in single-parent, stepparent, or other nontraditional families in 1992 (n = 701). In later analyses of 1990 (Time 1) data, the variable was labeled as pre-divorce status, distinguishing between two types of two-biological-parent households (0 = continuously married families; 1 = families at the pre-

divorce stage). Because the variable measured a Time 1 phenomenon (i.e., whether a family was at the pre-divorce stage of the divorce process), it was appropriate to use it as a predictor variable in regression analyses of pre-divorce (Time 1) differences in child well-being. In the investigation of 1992 (Time 2) data, the variable was labeled as post-divorce status (0 = continuously married households; 1 = families that dissolved by 1992). Due to data limitations, we were unable to exclude from the divorced group those cases whose parents happened to be absent in 1992 for reasons other than divorce/separation (e.g., hospitalization, military service). These cases, however, were presumably rare within a two-year period and should not significantly alter our findings.

A self-report measure of race and ethnicity categorically classified adolescents as European, Asian, African, and Hispanic Americans.

We used eight indicators from the student survey to measure family social resources in 1990 (during the pre-divorce period). We first assessed the inter-parental relationship by asking the student whether the two parents were getting along (0 = false; 5 = true). We then included two dummy variables measuring whether the student got along with either parent (0 = false; 1 = true). We also included each parent's educational expectation for the student as proxy measures of social resources (1 = less than high school, 12 = doctoral degree), because these variables tapped the extent to which parents care about and therefore, push their children for educational success. We then measured the frequencies with which a student did things with parents (1 = never or rarely, 4 = every day) and a parent attended school events with the student during the first half of the school year (0 = never, 3 = more than twice). Finally, a composite measured the frequency of parent-child discussion on five educational matters (course selection, school activities, things studied in class, students' grades, and plans for college; alphas = 0.78 for the 1990 wave).

For economic and human resources available in the household, we first included annual household income, measured in 15 income intervals (1 = no income; 15 = more than $200,000). Because NELS did not survey parents in 1990, the family income for 1988 was used instead. Two human resource measures included parents' educational attainment (1 = less than high school; 6 = graduate degree) and occupational prestige (gauged by the index provided in the NELS data).

Control Variables. Control variables include a student's sex, school affiliation (public, Catholic, other religious, or nonreligious private), residential location (urban, suburban, or rural), and geographic region (Northeast, North-central, East, or West).

Analytical Strategies, Test of Significance and Missing Value Procedures

In this study, we used two separate criteria of breadth and magnitude to evaluate possible racial differences in adolescents' maladjustment. First, we examined whether pre- and post-divorce deficits were evident in more well-being indicators (i.e., in wider scope) in one racial/ethnic group than in others. For the sake of convenience, we assumed that the nine outcome measures examined were equally important in adolescents' lives. Thus, a large number of significant deficits in these outcomes (e.g., seven out of nine) indicated a wide range of well-being problems. Second, by testing the interaction effects between family structure and race/ethnicity, we examined whether the deficits in outcomes were larger in magnitude within one racial/ethnic group than in others.

In comparing the magnitudes of pre- and post-divorce deficits between two non-European American groups (e.g., between Asian and Hispanic Americans), the divorce group in both races/ethnicities was small (e.g., 50 Asian divorce cases vs. 90 Hispanic cases, see Table 1). Thus, in reporting the statistical significance of the interaction terms between two *non-European American* racial/ethnic groups, we reported interaction effects that were significant at both conventional levels and the non-conventional level of $p < 0.10$, with the latter serving only as

preliminary findings, suggesting possible trends of interactions that might have been stronger if the divorce group in minority races were larger. When interpreting the results, we built our conclusions on the basis of interactions significant at the conventional levels and used those with $p < 0.10$ only as *secondary* and *additional* evidence.

Given the sampling procedure, no students had missing values on family structure and race/ethnicity. To save the cases with missing values on resource measures, we employed Rubin's multiple imputation (MI) techniques and imputed 10 (m = 10) estimates for each missing value on any of the resource variables (see Schafer & Olsen, 1998 for a discussion of MI). In later analyses of intervening effects of family resources, we estimated each coefficient and its standard error 10 times and reported a summary coefficient based on Rubin's formulae.

RESULTS

Descriptive Analyses

Before addressing the research questions of this study, we first examined the racial/ethnic composition of the sample and the frequencies of family disruption within the two-year period of this investigation. Table 1 displays the distribution of race/ethnicity by family status.

Table 1 about here

As shown in Table 1, adolescents descended from Europeans comprised 79.1%, Asians 4.4%, Africans 7.8%, and Hispanics 8.8% of the sample. When compared with 1990 Census information on the racial/ethnic composition of the US population (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1990), the sample over-represents European and Asian Americans by 3.5% and 2.9%, respectively, and under-represents African Americans by 4.3%. These discrepancies were presumably due to sampling errors in the NELS as well as our sampling procedures of excluding early-dissolved families, which were over-represented by African American families and under-represented by

Asian Americans. Table 1 also indicated that between 1990 and 1992, approximately seven percent of European and Asian American families dissolved, as compared with about ten and seventeen percent among Hispanic and African Americans, respectively. Due to our sampling procedures of excluding early-dissolved families, the percentages of two-biological-parent families in each racial/ethnic group were not directly comparable with Census estimates. However, the ranking of such percentages in our sample (with Asian Americans having the highest percentage of two-biological-parent families and African Americans having the lowest) roughly matched the ranking of Census estimates presented earlier. With these findings, we assumed that the sample was nationally representative of American adolescents who either had never experienced family disruption by 12th grade or who did so in their late adolescent years.

Racial Differences during the Pre-Divorce Period

We began our investigation by comparing how widely pre-divorce deficits in adolescent well-being were distributed among four racial/ethnic groups. To this end, we used multiple regressions and regressed each 1990 well-being indicator on pre-divorce status and the control variables based on four separate racial/ethnic sub-samples. Table 2 summarizes the unstandardized regression coefficients of pre-divorce status in Panel A. To save table space, the coefficients of demographic controls were suppressed, but are available to the reader upon request.

As demonstrated in Panel A of Table 2, pre-divorce deficits were observable in seven out of nine indicators among European Americans. For instance, compared with peers in two-biological-parent families, European American students from pre-divorce families scored 3.54 and 2.23 points lower in math and reading tests, after demographic controls were taken into consideration. They also showed lower levels of educational aspiration, academic readiness and homework completion, and exhibited an elevated level of behavior problems.

(Table 2 about here)

The pre-divorce deficits also appeared to be widespread among Asian Americans (in six out of nine indicators). Specifically, Asian American adolescents in pre-divorce families fared less well than peers in two-biological-parent families in math and reading test scores, academic readiness, homework completion, self-esteem, and teacher-reported behavior problems. The extent to which African Americans were affected during the pre-divorce period was somewhat limited (four of nine indicators). By sharp contrast, Hispanic American students in pre-divorce families fared as well as their peers in two-biological-parent families in all areas except for math performance.

If European, Asian, and African American adolescents were affected in more aspects of their lives than Hispanic Americans during the pre-divorce period, were these deficits also larger in magnitude? To answer this question, we pooled all cases into an overall sample and regressed each of the nine outcome measures on pre-divorce status, race/ethnicity measures, control variables, and the interaction term of pre-divorce status x race/ethnicity. Table 2 reports the bi-race coefficients of these interaction terms in Panel B (the latter racial group serves as the reference group). Due to a relatively large number of interactions tested (nine in total) for each pair of racial/ethnic groups, one interaction effect might reach the level of statistical significance by chance alone. To avoid making conclusions on the basis of random effects, we only treated three or more significant interactions with a consistent pattern between two racial/ethnic groups as clear evidence for racial diversity in effect size, because three significant interactions (33% of the nine) were clearly beyond chance.

As demonstrated in Panel B, we found some evidence that the disadvantages associated with pre-divorce families were larger in size among European, Asian, and African American adolescents than among their Hispanic American counterparts. For instance, between European and Hispanic Americans (the latter was the reference group), the interaction effects were significantly negative in

educational aspiration and homework completion, and significantly positive in two behavior-problem measures. These findings indicated that the disadvantages of pre-divorce households relative to two-biological-parent families were larger (with greater deficits in education items and more behavior problems) for European than for Hispanic Americans. Similarly, Asian and African Americans in pre-divorce families were also affected to a greater extent (with larger disadvantages) than their Hispanic peers in three and four indicators, respectively. Meanwhile, differences in deficit size among three non-Hispanic groups were either absent/minimal (e.g., as between Asian and European Americans) or inconsistent (as between European and African Americans).

In short, our analyses in this section provided evidence that the well-being disadvantages associated with pre-divorce families were consistently greater in number and somewhat larger in magnitude for European, Asian, and African American adolescents than for their Hispanic peers. Furthermore, compared with African Americans, pre-divorce differences were somewhat greater in number, but not larger in size among European and Asian Americans. These findings clearly challenge the hypothesis of prevalence of divorce, because, according to the hypothesis, African Americans should rank lower in the extent of influence than their Hispanic peers whereas Asian Americans should rank the highest among all groups

Intervening Effects of Family Circumstances

In light of these racial disparities during the pre-divorce period, we further examined whether adolescents in different racial/ethnic groups were affected through a shortage of different family resources. Specifically, we used 1990 well-being differences between two-biological-parent and pre-divorce households in each racial/ethnic group as the baselines and presented them in Model 1 of Table 3. We then individually added into Model 1 measures of social resources (Model 2), financial/human resources (Model 3), and all family resources (Model 4). This strategy allowed

us to compare which types of family resources contributed more to accounting for pre-divorce deficits, as measured by percentage changes in the coefficients of pre-divorce status presented in brackets in Table 3. For instance, in the European American sample, the pre-divorce deficit in the math test was reduced from -3.54 in Model 1 to -1.50 in Model 2 (or a 58% reduction), when social resource factors were taken into consideration. To compare the overall mediating power of various family resources among racial/ethnic groups, we also presented in the right column of Table 3 two summary statistics: The number of well-being deficits completely mediated by a certain type of resources and the averaged percentage changes in all pre-divorce deficits from Model 1. To save table space, we only presented the coefficients of resource variables in this and the next table for the European American sample. Coefficients for other racial groups are available upon request.

(Table 3 about here)

As illustrated in Model 2 in the European American sample, most social resource variables were significantly associated with various well-being indicators and in most cases, the associations were in expected directions. This finding lent support to Coleman's argument (1988) on the importance of parental social capital in improving child well-being. More important to this study, the social resource variables reduced the pre-divorce deficits among European Americans by a range of 26% to 82%, averaging a 53% reduction. In particular, three pre-divorce deficits (in the reading test, educational aspiration, and academic readiness) were reduced to a nonsignificant level. By contrast, differences in financial/human resources accounted for a much smaller amount of pre-divorce deficits, with no deficits completely explained and the reduction averaging only 20% (see Model 3 in the European American sample). The same pattern was also evident among Asian Americans. Whereas variations in social resources completely explained all six pre-divorce deficits, financial/human resources appeared to have much less mediating power (with no deficits

completely accounted for and the reduction averaging only 2%, see Models 2 and 3 for the Asian American sample). Interestingly, African American adolescents in pre-divorce families appeared to be affected by different types of resources. Although the inclusion of social resources completely accounted for the deficit in locus of control, it did little in mediating the two test score deficits (1% - 2%) and even increased that in behavior problems slightly (Model 2 in the African American sample). By contrast, financial/human resources appeared to be more powerful as they completely accounted for two deficits and reduced all the effects by an average of 37% (Model 3). Among Hispanic Americans, financial/human resources mediated a larger amount of the only deficit in the math test than social resource measures.

In Model 4, we included all measures of family resources. Although the number of independent variables included in this model was large, the number of cases in each racial/ethnic sample was large enough for the analyses. As shown in Model 4, most resource indicators were significantly associated with well-being measures, independent of other variables included in the equation. In addition, these resource measures completely accounted for three, six, and two pre-divorce deficits among European, Asian, and African Americans, respectively, and changed most remaining deficits to a modest extent.

In short, our findings in this section provided general support to the resource-shortage and divorce-stress-adjustment models in that pre-divorce maladjustment is indeed related to a shortage of various family resources. More importantly, the analyses detected different mechanisms through which children with various racial/ethnic backgrounds were affected during the pre-divorce period.

Racial Differences during the Post-Divorce Period

Finally, we examined racial differences in adolescents' lives after their parental divorce. To compare the breadth of post-divorce effects among the four racial/ethnic groups, we regressed each

1992 well-being indicator on post-divorce status and demographic controls based on separate racial/ethnic sub-samples and presented the findings in Model 1 of Table 4.

(Table 4 about here)

Approximately one year after parental divorce, the well-being problems were still clearly observable in six out of nine indicators among European Americans and in five indicators among Asian and African Americans (see Model 1 in these three racial samples). By sharp contrast, however, not a single negative effect was evident in the Hispanic American sample (see Model 1). In fact, Hispanic American adolescents who experienced family dissolution reported a higher level of academic readiness than their peers from two-biological-parent families.

To compare the magnitudes of post-divorce differences, we combined the four racial/ethnic groups into an overall sample and regressed each 1992 well-being indicator on post-divorce status, race/ethnicity, control variables, and the interaction term (post-divorce status x race/ethnicity). The results showed that in the bi-racial/ethnic comparisons with Hispanic Americans, European, Asian, and African American groups showed seven, four, and seven significant interaction effects, respectively (out of nine tested), with an overwhelmingly consistent pattern that adolescents in non-Hispanic groups experienced *larger* post-divorce effects than Hispanic Americans (coefficients of interaction effects not shown but available upon request). Significant interaction effects among three non-Hispanic groups were minimal and inconsistent.

In Model 2, we reevaluated the post-divorce effects presented in Model 1 by further controlling for their 1990 corresponding well-being measures (a practice often referred to as the regressor variable method; see Allison, 1990). This strategy estimated how much the post-divorce effect in Model 1 was due to the pre-divorce damage (the Hispanic group was excluded from this analysis due to a lack of significant post-divorce deficits). Among European Americans, controlling

for the corresponding pre-divorce well-being measure completely mediated the deficit in educational aspiration and reduced the remaining five effects by a range of 17% to76%, with the reduction of all six measures averaging 49%. These findings demonstrated that the post-divorce deficits in well-being indicators were either completely or partially due to their pre-divorce counterparts. In other words, the event of divorce added only limited additional effects on adolescents over and above the pre-divorce damage. A similar pattern was found among Asian Americans. Variations in pre-divorce well-being deficits completely accounted for one post-divorce effect (self-esteem) and reduced the other four substantially (the reduction in all five effects averaged 48%). Similarly, two post-divorce effects were reduced to nonsignificance among African Americans, but the remaining three effects were only reduced marginally (the reduction averaged 40%). Racial and ethnic differences in the extent to which pre- and post-divorce deficits were related were marginal, indicating that the event of divorce caused a similar amount of additional damage beyond the pre-divorce deficits in these three non-Hispanic groups.

Finally, we further included all the 1990 resource measures in Model 3. As shown in Model 3 in the European American sample, many 1990 resource measures failed to have a significant impact on the 1992 outcomes, largely due to the strong predicting power of the 1990 corresponding well-being indicator. Nevertheless, these pre-divorce resource measures still reduced one effect to nonsignificance and the rest marginally. Among Asian and African Americans, further controlling for pre-divorce resource measures completely mediated three and one post-divorce effect(s), respectively. Racial/ethnic differences in the predicting power of resources are mixed and marginal when considering both the number of effects completely explained and the averaged reduction.

In short, the findings in this section suggested that approximately one year after divorce, non-Hispanic adolescents continue to exhibit wider and larger maladjustment than their Hispanic

peers. In other words, the pre-divorce pattern of fewer and smaller well-being problems among Hispanic Americans appears to sustain over time. Moreover, most post-divorce problems in all non-Hispanic groups were either completely or partially due to variations in pre-divorce factors.

DISCUSSION

Prior research has demonstrated that the parental divorce process often increases children's risks of experiencing various well-being problems. The current study goes beyond previous research in that it compares pre- and post-divorce deficits among adolescents from four racial/ethnic groups, evaluates the hypothesis of prevalence of divorce, compares the mediating power of different family resources in different racial/ethnic contexts, and examines the extent to which pre-divorce factors predict well-being problems after family dissolution.

Our findings provide clear evidence that compared with their Hispanic American peers, European, Asian, and African American adolescents experience wider and greater maladjustment both before and after the formal divorce/separation. One possible explanation for this pattern rests in the relatively unimportant role of parental divorce as a stressor in communities with an overabundance of disadvantages (Amato & Keith, 1991). For instance, separate analyses of our data (not shown) demonstrate that Hispanic American families as a whole (with two types of families combined) rank significantly lower than European, Asian, and even African American families in annual income, parental educational attainment, and parental occupational prestige. Hispanic American adolescents as a group also rank lower than the other three groups in four out of nine well-being indicators, and among the lowest in the remaining ones. Because Hispanic children in general have to cope with significantly more disadvantages of various kinds in their lives than their peers in the other racial groups, the unique disadvantages associated with parental divorce may not add many more stresses over and above those that they have already experienced on a daily basis.

Other explanations remain possible. For instance, one recent study (Sorenson, Upchurch, & Shen, 1996) reports that among married respondents of various racial/ethnic backgrounds, Hispanic American couples are the least likely to report that their marital arguments have escalated into physical violence. Thus, it is possible that these less violent inter-parental conflicts in pre-divorce Hispanic families serve as an important stress buffer, lessening the stress associated with the divorce process. Moreover, quite a few prior studies (e.g., King, Harris & Heard, 2004) report that Hispanic American nonresident fathers consistently stand out among all racial/ethnic groups to be least likely to visit their children. Presumably, such a low level of father involvement may exist prior to divorce in Hispanic American communities. Consequently, when the divorce process begins, the amount of parenting provided by the father may not further decline by much as the process advances, which helps lessen children's frustration with the divorce process. Unfortunately, the present data do not allow us to elucidate which parent provides the pre-divorce involvement and parenting in our measures of parent-child discussion, child doing things with parents, and parent attending school events. Moreover, although a recent study (Schwartz & Finley, 2005) investigated the role of ethnicity in moderating the effect of divorce on fathering, their sample was not representative of Hispanic Americans in general. Thus, we still know little about whether pre-divorce fathering explains the better adjustment among Hispanic American adolescents. Obviously, future studies with appropriate data can further explore this possible explanation.

Our results also provide general support to both the resource-shortage and divorce-stress-adjustment models. The findings further suggest that adolescents in different racial/ethnic groups may be affected differently by different aspects of pre-divorce family environment. Whereas European and Asian American adolescents appear to be affected mainly by a shortage of family social resources, their African American peers appear to be affected by a shortage of

financial/human resources. These findings are in accord with those from Smith's study (1997). One possible explanation is that European and Asian Americans enjoy an overall high level of family income and parental education. Thus, although pre-divorce families in these two racial groups indeed have financial disadvantages relative to two-biological-parent families, such disadvantages may be relatively less important than those in social resources. Consequently, European and Asian American adolescents may be more sensitive to their disadvantages in the social rather than the economic aspects of the family. By contrast, although African American pre-divorce families have fewer financial/human resources than their two-biological-parent counterparts, they show no deficit in any social resource measures (the results are not tabulated to save space). Thus, it is perhaps not surprising that differences in financial/human resources play a more important role in explaining pre-divorce deficits.

In accord with several prior longitudinal studies (e.g. Block et al., 1986; Cherlin et al., 1991), our analyses also demonstrate that the post-divorce differences in adolescent well-being are either completely or partially due to pre-divorce factors in each non-Hispanic group. Racial and ethnic differences in the extent to which pre-divorce factors may predict post-divorce effects are inconsistent and marginal. Overall, these findings suggest that the actual experience of the formal divorce may cause a similarly limited level of additional effects on children in all these non-Hispanic groups.

The present study also has several limitations. First, although the study is nationally representative of adolescents who experience parental divorce in their late adolescent years, the special sampling procedure excludes all families which dissolve when the marriage and children are young. Thus, our findings regarding racial disparity may not be safely generalized to young children in such early-dissolved families. In addition, several prior studies (e.g., Smith, 1997) speculate that

the extended family structure commonly found in minority (particularly Hispanic) families may serve as a stress buffer during family crises such as divorce, because extended family members can provide extra financial and emotional support to children. Although our preliminary analyses show some evidence for this argument, the cases in the divorced and extended families are too few in minority groups (e.g., 9 Hispanic American cases) to draw reliable conclusions. Moreover, a recent study (Brown, 2004) reports that child well-being differs between two-biological-parent married and two-biological-parent cohabitating families. Unfortunately, the current data do not allow a clear distinction between these two types of families. Also because of the limited scope of this study, we did not include more waves of the NELS data to investigate the racial/ethnic differences in possible cumulative effects of multiple parental divorces. Finally, we were also unable to investigate how changes in family resources between the pre- and post-divorce periods may influence children's post-divorce outcomes, because the 1992 wave of the NELS data either does not contain some of the 1990 resource measures or codes them in an incomparable manner. Obviously, future studies with large minority sub-samples and with appropriate measures may further probe in these areas.

In summary, the current study reports important racial/ethnic variations in adolescents' experiences during the parental divorce process and identifies different mechanisms through which adolescents are affected. Through these findings, the study demonstrates that race and ethnicity are important sources of variation when studying the consequences of parental divorce.

REFERENCES

Allison, P.D. (1990). Change scores as dependent variables in regression analysis. In C. Clogg (Ed.), *Sociological Methodology* (Vol. 20, pp. 93-114). Oxford: Blackwell.

Amato, P. R. (1993). Children's adjustment to divorce: Theories, hypotheses, and empirical support. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55*, 23-38.

Amato, P. R. (2000). The consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 62*, 1269-1287.

Amato, P.R. & Keith, B. (1991). Parental divorce and adult well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *53*, 43-58.

Astone, N. M., & McLanahan, S.S. (1991). Family structure, parental practices, and high school completion. *American Sociological Review, 56*, 309-320.

Block, J.H., Block J., & Gjerde, P. (1986). The personality of children prior to divorce: A prospective study. *Child Development, 57*, 827-840.

Brown, S. L. (2004). Family structure and child well-being: The significance of parental cohabitation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 351-367.

Cherlin, A.J. , Furstenberg, F.F., Chase-Lansdale, P.L., Kiernan, K.E., Robins, P.K., Morrison, D.R., & Teitler, J.O. (1991). Longitudinal studies of effects of divorce on children in Great Britain and the United States, *Science*, *252,*1386-1389.

Coleman, J.S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology,* 94, S95-S120.

Demo, D.H., & Acock, A.C. (1988). The impact of divorce on children. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 50*, 619-648.

Eggebeen, D.J., & Lichter, D.T. (1991). Race, family structure, and changing poverty among American children. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 801-817.

Entwisle, D.R., & Alexander, K.L. (1995). A parent's economic shadow: Family structure versus family resources as influences on early school achievement. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 57*, 399-409.

Furstenberg, F.F., & Nord, C.W. (1985). Parenting apart: Patterns of childrearing after marital disruption. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 47, 893-904.

Furstenberg, F.F., & Teitler, J.O. (1994). Recosidering the effects of marital disruption. *Journal of Family Issues, 15*, 173-190.

Hines, A.M. (1997). Divorce-related transitions, adolescent development, and the role of the parent-child relationship: A review of the literature. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 59*, 375-388.

King, V., Harris, K.M., & Heard H. E. (2004). Racial and ethnic diversity in nonresident father involvement. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 1-21.

McLanahan, S. S. (1985). Family structure and the reproduction of poverty. *American Journal of Sociology, 90*, 873-901.

McLanahan, S., & Sandefur, G. (1994). *Growing up with a ingle-parent: What hurts, what helps?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McLoyd, V.C., Cauce, A.M., Takeuchi, D. and Wilson, L. (2000). Marital processes and parental socialization in families of color: A decade review of research. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 62*, 1070-1093.

Morrison, D.R., & Cherlin, A.J. (1995). The divorce process and young children's well-being: A prospective analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 57*, 800-812.

Parcel, T.L., & Geschwender, L.E. (1995). Explaining southern disadvantages in verbal facility among young children. *Social Forces*, *73*, 841-872.

Pong, S.L., & Ju, D.B., (2000). The effect of change in family structure and income on dropping out of middle and high school. *Journal of Family Issues, 21*, 147-169.

Shaw, D.S., Winslow, E.B., & Flanagan, C. (1999). A prospective study of the effects of marital status and family relations on young children's adjustment among African American and European American families. *Child Development, 70*, 742-755.

Schafer, J.L., & Olsen, M.K. (1998). Multiple imputation for multivariate missing-data problems: A data analyst's perspective. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 33*, 545-571.

Schwartz, S.J., & Finley, G. E. (2005). Fathering in two-biological-parent and divorced families: Ethnic differences in retrospective reports. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*, 207-215.

Smith, T.E. (1997). Differences between Black and White students in the effect of parental separation on school grades. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 27*, 25-43.

Sorenson, S.B., Upchurch, D.M., & Shen, H. (1996). Violence and injury in marital arguments: Risk patterns and gender differences. *American Journal of Public Health*, *86,* 34-40.

Sun, Y. (2001). Family environment and adolescents' well-being before and after parents' marital disruption -- A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*, 697-713.

Sun, Y., & Li, Y. (2002). Children's well-being during parents' marital disruption process: A pooled time-series analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family 64*, 472-488.

White, L.K. (1990). Determinants of divorce: A review of research in the eighties. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 52*, 904-912.

TABLE 1. FREQUENCY AND WEIGHTED-PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF FAMILY STRUCTURE BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

	Overall Sample	European American Sample	Asian American Sample	African American Sample	Hispanic American Sample
(N=)	9,252	7,054	658	570	970
(%=)	(100%)	(79.1%)	(4.4%)	(7.8%)	(8.8%)
Pre/Post-divorce Status					
Always-two-biological-parent	8,551	6,591	608	472	880
	(92.0%)	(93.1%)	(93.2%)	(82.6%)	(90.4%)
Disrupted	701	463	50	98	90
	(8.0%)	(6.9%)	(6.8%)	(17.4%)	(9.6%)

Source: National Education Longitudinal Studies, 1988.
Note: All percentages are weighted by the panel weight.

TABLE 2. UNSTANDARDIZED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FROM REGRESSIONS OF 1990 (PRE-DIVORCE) WELL-BEING INDICATORS ON PRE-DIVORCE STATUS AND CONTROLS BY RACE AND ON INTERACTION TERMS

	Adolescent Well-Being during Pre-divorce Period (1990)									
Pre-divorce Status in Each Racial/Ethnic Sub-sample	Math test	Reading test	Edu. aspira-tion	Academic readiness	Complete Home-work	Self-esteem	Locus of control	Behavior problems	Teacher-reported problems	# of signifcant deficits
PANEL A [a]										
European American Sample										
Pre-divorce status	-3.54***	-2.23***	-0.34***	-0.19*	-0.29***	-0.16	-0.22	0.60***	0.77***	7/9
R^2	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.03	0.07	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.04	
N	6,782	6,791	6,999	6,932	6,310	6,787	6,782	7,054	6,325	
Asian American Sample										
Pre-divorce status	-8.48***	-4.21**	-0.15	-0.75**	-0.25*	-1.56**	-0.83	0.57	0.63*	6/9
R^2	0.12	0.14	0.14	0.05	0.14	0.10	0.05	0.06	0.21	
N	625	629	652	649	551	631	631	658	552	
African American Sample										
Pre-divorce status	-4.90***	-4.46***	-0.17	0.03	-0.03	-0.84	-0.75*	0.76**	0.45	4/9
R^2	0.12	0.15	0.11	0.08	0.15	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.08	
N	547	545	558	550	501	530	527	569	503	
Hispanic American Sample										
Pre-divorce status	-3.69**	-1.47	0.24	0.04	0.09	-0.80	-0.39	-0.27	-0.12	1/9
R^2	0.05	0.06	0.10	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.02	
N	910	910	960	920	762	881	879	969	763	
PANEL B [b]										
Interaction Terms of Race X Pre-divorce Status										
European vs Hispanic	-0.13	-1.23	-0.62***	-0.32	-0.41***	0.63	0.19	0.90**	0.88**	4/9
Asian vs. Hispanic	-4.89*	-3.17	-0.31	-0.77*	-0.34†	-0.63	-0.42	0.73	0.62	3/9
African American vs. Hispanic	-1.46	-3.52*	-0.43*	-0.10	-0.17	-0.05	-0.34	1.05*	0.57†	4/9
European vs. African American	1.33	2.29*	-0.19	-0.23	-0.24*	0.68	0.52	-0.15	0.32	2/9
Asian vs. African American	-3.43	0.35	0.12	-0.68†	0.17	-0.57	-0.08	-0.32	0.05	1/9
Asian v. European	-4.76	-1.94	0.31	-0.45	0.07	-1.26	-0.60	-0.17	-0.27	0/9

† $p < 0.10$ (only reported in Panel B between two non-European-American groups as secondary evidence); * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed tests).

[a] Regressions based on each racial/ethnic sub-sample. The control variables include sex, school affiliation, residence location, and geographic regions. The reference group is female public school students living in suburban areas in the West. Coefficients of controls are suppressed to save table space.

[b] Regressions based on the overall sample with pre-divorce status, race/ethnicity measures, controls, and the interaction term (race X pre-divorce status) as regressors. The reference group is female public school students living in suburban areas in the West in the latter racial/ethnic group.

TABLE 3. UNSTANDARDIZED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FROM REGRESSIONS OF 1990 (PRE-DIVORCE) WELL-BEING INDICATORS ON PRE-DIVORCE STATUS AND FAMILY RESOURCES IN DIFFERENT MODELS BY RACE

		Children's Well-Being during the Pre-divorce Period (1990)									
Samples	Independent Variables in Different Models	Math test	Reading test	Edu. aspira-tion	Aca-demic readiness	Complete Home-work	Self-esteem	Locus of control	Behavior problems	Teacher reported problems	# of deficits com-pletely explained & averaged % reduction (in brackets [b])
European American Sample											
Model 1 [a] (Baseline)											
	Pre-divorce status	-3.54***	-2.23***	-0.34***	-0.19*	-0.29***	-0.16	-0.22	0.60***	0.77***	7 to be
	R^2	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.03	0.07	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.04	explained
Model 2 (Model 1 + Social Resources)											
	Pre-divorce status	-1.50*	-0.82	-0.06	-0.07	-0.19***	0.38* [c]	0.25* [c]	0.33**	0.57***	3/7
		(-58%)	(-63%)	(-82%)	(-63%)	(-34%)	(/)	(/)	(-45%)	(-26%)	(-53%)
	Parent-parent relationship	0.18	0.31**	0.01	0.12***	0.03**	0.45***	0.30***	-0.20***	-0.09***	
	Father-child relationship	-0.06	-0.79*	-0.11**	0.09	0.10*	0.60***	0.63***	-0.66***	-0.15	
	Mother-child relationship	0.39	0.40	0.07	0.12	0.05	0.79***	0.39**	-0.42*	-0.27**	
	Father's expectation	3.39***	2.18***	0.42***	0.09	0.09***	0.08	0.21**	-0.05	-0.21***	
	Mother's expectation	2.32***	1.48***	0.35***	-0.03	0.06*	0.13	0.16*	-0.03	-0.10	
	Doing things w/parents	0.87***	0.49***	0.06***	0.08**	0.03**	0.44***	0.27***	-0.15**	-0.10***	
	Parent-child discussion	0.01	0.24***	0.08***	0.09***	0.03***	0.19***	0.20***	-0.14***	-0.04**	
	Attend school events	1.40***	0.32*	0.13***	0.03	0.09***	0.20***	0.22***	-0.19***	-0.12***	
	R^2	0.24	0.21	0.57	0.08	0.15	0.18	0.18	0.10	0.10	
Model 3 (Model 1 + Financial/ Human Resources)											
	Pre-divorce status	-2.24***	-1.42**	-0.22***	-0.19*	-0.24***	-0.09	-0.13	0.59***	0.69***	0/7
		(-37%)	(-36%)	(-35%)	(0%)	(-17%)	(/)	(/)	(-2%)	(-10%)	(-20%)
	Family annual income	0.76***	0.38***	0.10***	-0.01	0.02**	0.05	0.08***	0.08***	<0.01	
	Parental ed. attainment	3.39***	2.20***	0.27***	0.06*	0.12***	0.16***	0.19***	-0.21***	-0.27***	
	Parental occup. prestige	0.06***	0.04***	0.01***	0.01	0.01*	0.01**	0.01***	<0.01	<0.01	
	R^2	0.20	0.17	0.26	0.04	0.11	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.07	
Model 4 (Model 1 + All Resources)											
	Pre-divorce status	-1.22*	-0.68	-0.05	-0.07	-0.18***	0.38* [c]	0.26* [c]	0.35**	0.55***	3/7
		(-66%)	(-70%)	(-85%)	(-63%)	(-38%)	(/)	(/)	(-42%)	(-29%)	(-56%)
	Parent-parent relationship	0.04	0.23*	<0.01	0.12***	0.03**	0.45***	0.30***	-0.21***	-0.09***	
	Father-child relationship	-0.11	-0.83*	-0.11**	0.09	0.10*	0.60***	0.63***	-0.65***	-0.14	
	Mother-child relationship	0.64	0.55	0.08	0.12	0.06	0.79***	0.40**	-0.41*	-0.28**	
	Father's expectation	2.39***	1.57***	0.37***	0.11*	0.07**	0.07	0.19**	-0.06	-0.17**	
	Mother's expectation	2.05***	1.31***	0.33***	-0.02	0.05*	0.13	0.15*	-0.05	-0.09	
	Doing things w/parents	1.06***	0.60***	0.07***	0.07**	0.04***	0.44***	0.28***	-0.14**	-0.10***	
	Parent-child discussion	0.17*	0.13*	0.07***	0.09***	0.02***	0.19***	0.20***	-0.15***	-0.03*	
	Attend school events	1.08***	0.13	0.12***	0.03	0.08***	0.20***	0.21***	-0.21***	-0.10***	
	Family annual income	0.41***	0.15*	0.04***	-0.03	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.12***	0.03	
	Parental ed. attainment	2.36***	1.51***	0.08***	<0.01	0.08***	0.02	0.02	-0.11***	-0.19***	
	Parental occup. prestige	0.03**	0.02**	0.01***	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	
	R^2	0.30	0.25	0.58	0.08	0.16	0.18	0.18	0.11	0.11	
	N in all models	6,782	6,791	6,999	6,932	6,310	6,787	6,782	7,054	6,325	

Table 3 continues to the next page.

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Samples	Independent Variables in Different Models	Children's Well-Being during the Pre-divorce Period (1990): Math test	Reading test	Edu. aspira-tion	Aca-demic readiness	Complete Home-work	Self-esteem	Locus of control	Behavior problems	Teacher reported problems	# of deficits com-pletely explained & averaged % reduction (in brackets [b])
Asian American Sample [e]											
	Model 1 [a] (Baseline)										
	Pre-divorce status	-8.48***	-4.21***	-0.15	-0.75**	-0.25*	-1.56**	-0.83	0.57	0.63*	6 to be
	R^2	0.12	0.14	0.14	0.05	0.14	0.10	0.05	0.06	0.21	explained
	Model 2 (Model 1+ Social)										
	Pre-divorce status	-3.22	-1.77	0.18	-0.44	-0.10	- 0.51	-0.11	-0.16	0.25	6/6
		(-62%)	(-58%)	(/)	(-41%)	(-60%)	(-67%)	(/)	(/)	(-60%)	(-58%)
	R^2	0.25	0.26	0.53	0.08	0.22	0.19	0.20	0.15	0.26	
	Model 3 (Model 1+ Financial)										
	Pre-divorce status	-7.67***	-3.21*	-0.01	-0.83**	-0.24*	-1.54**	-0.58	0.75	0.73**	0/6
		(-10%)	(-24%)	(/)	(11%)	(-4%)	(-1%)	(/)	(/)	(16%)	(-2%)
	R^2	0.22	0.27	0.23	0.07	0.18	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.24	
	Model 4 (Model 1+ All Resources)										
	Pre-divorce status	-3.14	-1.35	0.24	-0.55	-0.13	-0.50	0.03	0.09	0.39	6/6
		(-63%)	(-68%)	(/)	(-27%)	(-48%)	(-68%)	(/)	(/)	(-38%)	(-52%)
	R^2	0.30	0.33	0.54	0.10	0.24	0.20	0.22	0.18	0.29	
	N in all models	625	629	652	649	551	631	631	658	552	
African American Sample [e]											
	Model 1 [a] (Baseline)										
	Pre-divorce status	-4.90***	-4.46***	-0.17	0.03	-0.03	-0.84	-0.75*	0.76**	0.45	4 to be
	R^2	0.12	0.15	0.11	0.08	0.15	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.08	explained
	Model 2 (Model 1+ Social)										
	Pre-divorce status	-4.80***	-4.43***	-0.07	0.05	-0.05	-0.59	-0.62	0.82**	0.41	1/4
		(-2%)	(-1%)	(/)	(/)	(/)	(/)	(-17%)	(8%)	(/)	(-3%)
	R^2	0.17	0.19	0.39	0.12	0.20	0.18	0.16	0.11	0.12	
	Model 3 (Model 1 + Financial)										
	Pre-divorce status	-2.46	-2.87*	0.13	0.09	0.03	-0.71	-0.38	0.67*	0.16	2/4
		(-50%)	(-36%)	(/)	(/)	(/)	(/)	(-49%)	(-12%)	(/)	(-37%)
	R^2	0.24	0.22	0.28	0.08	0.16	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.13	
	Model 4 (Model 1 + All Resources)										
	Pre-divorce status	-2.61	-2.95*	0.10	0.08	0.01	-0.54	-0.34	0.73**	0.15	2/4
		(-47%)	(-34%)	(/)	(/)	(/)	(/)	(-55%)	(-4%)	(/)	(-35%)
	R^2	0.27	0.25	0.45	0.12	0.21	0.19	0.19	0.12	0.16	
	N in all samples	547	545	558	550	501	530	527	569	503	
Hispanic American Sample [de]											

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed tests).

[a] Regressors in the baseline model: pre-divorce status, gender, school affiliation, geographic region, and residence location. Percentage changes in coefficients from Model 1 in subsequent models are in brackets.

[b] The averaged percentage changes in all coefficients from Model 1.

[c] Pre-divorce effects that turned positive and statistically significant when family resources are taken into consideration.

[d] The coefficients and percentage changes of the only deficit in math test among Hispanic Americans: Model 1: -3.69**; Model 2: -3.96** (7%); Model 3: -2.82* (-24%); Model 4: -3.35* (-9%).

[e] The coefficients of resource variables for the non-European samples were suppressed to save space.

TABLE 4. UNSTANDARDIZED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FROM REGRESSIONS OF 1992 WELL-BEING INDICATORS ON POST-DIVORCE STATUS AND PRE-DIVORCE FACTORS IN VARIOUS MODELS BY RACE

		Children's Well-Being during the Post-Divorce Period (1992)									
Samples	Independent Variables in Different Models	Math test	Reading test	Edu. aspira-tion	Aca-demic readiness	Complete Home-work	Self-esteem	Locus of control	Behavior problems	Teacher-reported problems	# of deficits com-pletely explained & averaged % reduction (in brackets)
European American Sample											
Model 1 (Baseline Model) [a]											
	Post-divorce status	-5.26***	-3.18***	-0.20***	-0.03	-0.42***	-0.26	-0.25	0.61***	1.03***	6 to be explained
	R^2	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	
Model 2 (Model 1 + 1990 Corresponding Well-being Indicator)											
	Post-divorce status	-1.27***	-1.29***	-0.06	0.06	-0.35***	-0.16	-0.09	0.32*	0.70***	1/6
		(-76%)	(-60%)	(-65%)	(/)	(-17%)	(/)	(/)	(-48%)	(-32%)	(-49%)
	1990 corresponding indicator	0.95***	0.79***	0.60***	0.38***	0.44***	0.55***	0.47***	0.61***	0.30***	
	R^2	0.85	0.66	0.41	0.15	0.18	0.30	0.23	0.29	0.17	
Model 3 (Model 2 + 1990 Resources)											
	Post-divorce status	-0.99**	-1.14***	<0.01	0.12	-0.31***	-0.02	0.04	0.21	0.65***	2/6
		(-81%)	(-64%)	(<-100%)	(/)	(-26%)	(/)	(/)	(-66%)	(-37%)	(-62%)
	1990 corresponding indicator	0.91***	0.75***	0.40***	0.36***	0.42***	0.53***	0.43***	0.58***	0.44***	
	Parent-parent relationship	0.16*	-0.07	0.02*	0.07***	0.05**	0.11**	0.11***	-0.17***	-0.08*	
	Father-child relationship	0.08	-0.19	0.01	0.06	-0.07	0.05	0.01	-0.03	0.20	
	Mother-child relationship	0.63*	0.30	-0.03	0.08	0.07	0.11	0.26	-0.20	-0.13	
	Father's expectation	0.25	0.32	0.14***	0.05	-0.01	-0.14	-0.12	-0.04	-0.02	
	Mother's expectation	0.29	0.18	0.05*	<0.01	0.04	0.23**	0.19**	-0.08	-0.11	
	Doing things w/parents	-0.11	0.15	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.04	-0.05	-0.01	
	Parent-child discussion	0.02	0.06	0.02**	0.02	0.02**	0.02	0.03	<0.01	-0.05**	
	Attend school events	0.23*	-0.09	0.09***	0.06*	0.04*	0.10*	0.11**	-0.10*	-0.11*	
	Family annual income	0.09	0.01	0.02*	0.01	0.02*	0.10***	0.10***	0.05*	-0.01	
	Parental ed. attainment	0.28***	0.39***	0.11***	<0.01	<0.01	0.07	0.04	0.05	-0.01	
	Parental occup. prestige	0.01	0.01*	0.01***	<0.01**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	
	R^2	0.86	0.67	0.46	0.16	0.19	0.31	0.24	0.30	0.18	
	N in all models	5,638	5,641	6,281	6,618	3,942	6,169	6,164	6,693	3,973	
Asian American Sample											
Model 1 (Baseline Model) [a]											
	Post-divorce status	-6.39*	-1.27	-0.53***	-0.35	-0.53**	-1.07*	-0.38	0.42	1.15**	5 to be explained
	R^2	0.14	0.16	0.08	0.05	0.17	0.08	0.03	0.08	0.12	
Model 2 (Model 1 + 1990 Corresponding Well-being Indicator)											
	Post-divorce status	-2.21*	1.16	-0.38**	-0.01	-0.34*	-0.18	-0.05	0.07	0.81*	1/5
		(-65%)	(/)	(-28%)	(/)	(-36%)	(-83%)	(/)	(/)	(-30%)	(-48%)
	R^2	0.86	0.73	0.43	0.20	0.27	0.34	0.34	0.28	0.23	
Model 3 (Model 2 + 1990 Resources) [d]											
	Post-divorce status	-2.20*	1.35	-0.26	0.27	-0.26	-0.66	-0.02	0.07	0.48	4/5
		(-66%)	(/)	(-51%)	(/)	(-51%)	(-38%)	(/)	(/)	(-58%)	(-53%)
	R^2	0.87	0.74	0.48	0.28	0.35	0.36	0.36	0.31	0.29	
	N in all models	514	517	594	625	404	581	579	637	407	

Table 4 continues to next page.

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Samples	Independent Variables in Different Models	Children's Well-Being during the Post-Divorce Period (1992): Math test	Reading test	Edu. aspiration	Academic readiness	Complete Homework	Self-esteem	Locus of control	Behavior problems	Teacher-reported problems	# of deficits completely explained & averaged % reduction (in brackets)
African American Sample											
	Model 1 (Baseline Model) [a]										
	Post-divorce status	-5.60**	-4.32**	0.19	-0.25	-0.45**	-0.48	-1.41***	0.45	1.00*	5 to be
	R^2	0.12	0.12	0.08	0.06	0.18	0.08	0.10	0.06	0.21	explained
	Model 2 (Model 1 + 1990 Corresponding Well-being Indicator)										
	Post-divorce status	-0.80	-1.44	0.17	-0.26	-0.40*	-0.29	-1.20**	0.01	0.77*	2/5
		(-86%)	(-67%)	(/)	(/)	(-11%)	(/)	(-16%)	(/)	(-23%)	(-40%)
	R^2	0.85	0.72	0.35	0.18	0.20	0.19	0.25	0.25	0.33	
	Model 3 (Model 2 + 1990 Resources) [d]										
	Post-divorce status	-0.69	-1.47	0.19	-0.32	-0.39*	-0.05	-1.29***	0.15	0.72	3/5
		(-88%)	(-66%)	(/)	(/)	(-13%)	(/)	(-9%)	(/)	(-28%)	(-41%)
	R^2	0.86	0.73	0.38	0.21	0.24	0.22	0.30	0.29	0.36	
	N in all models	444	442	474	519	298	462	461	531	296	
Hispanic American Sample [c]											
	Model 1 (Baseline Model) [a]										
	Post-divorce status	0.38	-0.39	0.19	0.71** [b]	0.25	-0.57	-0.60	-0.67	0.14	0 to be
	R^2	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.11	explained
	N in all models	723	725	770	828	418	727	725	852	420	

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed tests).

[a] Regressors in baseline model include: post-divorce status, gender, school affiliation, geographic region, and residence location Percentage changes in coefficients from Model 1 in subsequent models are in brackets.

[b] Positive post-divorce effects. To avoid confusion, they are not counted in the last column.

[c] Coefficients in subsequent models among Hispanic Americans are suppressed due to a lack of significant post-divorce deficits.

[d] The coefficients of resource variables for the non-European samples were suppressed to save space.