

Nonresident Fathers' Family Leisure Patterns during Parenting Time with Their Children

ALISHA T. SWINTON PATTI A. FREEMAN
RAMON B. ZABRISKIE PAUL J. FIELDS
Brigham Young University

The purpose of the study was to examine the leisure patterns of nonresident fathers while spending time with their child(ren), and to examine leisure constraints, leisure facilitators and nonresident fathers' satisfaction with family leisure activities. Four instruments were used to collect the data. Family leisure involvement was measured using the Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP), leisure constraints were measured using the Nonresident Father Leisure Constraint Scale (NFLCS), leisure facilitators were measured using the Nonresident Fathers' Leisure Facilitator Scale (NFLFS), and family leisure satisfaction was measured using the Family Leisure Satisfaction Scale (FLSS). The sample was nonresident fathers ($N = 129$) from 36 states in the U.S. The data supported leisure constraints as a significant predictor of nonresident fathers' satisfaction with family leisure involvement, and their family leisure patterns. The data did not support, however, leisure facilitators as contributing to fathers' satisfaction with family leisure involvement or leisure patterns.

Keywords: nonresident fathers, parenting time, nonresident fathers' leisure, leisure constraints, leisure facilitators, family leisure satisfaction

As divorce rates have increased, the number of nonresident fathers has also increased (Pasley & Braver, 2004). Nonresident fathers' involvement following divorce has been found to aid children academically, socially, and emotionally (Menning, 2002). Although this involvement is important, little is known regarding the context of the involvement. Stewart (1999) determined that "most nonresident parents either engage in only leisure activities with their child(ren) or have no contact" (p. 539). Nevertheless, nonresident fathers' leisure with their children has received little attention in the re-

Alisha T. Swinton, Patti A. Freeman, and Ramon B. Zabriskie, Department of Recreation Management Youth Leadership, Brigham Young University; Paul J. Fields, Department of Statistics, Brigham Young University.

Special thanks to the National Center for Fathering, the Children's Rights Council, the National Fatherhood Initiative affiliate organizations and specifically the Baldwin County Fatherhood Initiative Inc.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Alisha T. Swinton, Department of Recreation Management, Brigham Young University, 273 Richards Building, Provo, Utah 84602-2031. Electronic mail: alishaswinton@byu.net

Fathering, Vol. 6, No. 3, Fall 2008, 205-225.

© 2008 by the Men's Studies Press, LLC. <http://www.mensstudies.com>. All rights reserved.
fth.0603.205/\$12.00 DOI: 10.3149/fth.0603.205



search literature (Menning; Pasley & Braver); yet, it may play a significant role in understanding nonresident fathers' involvement with their child(ren) following divorce.

Only a small percentage of nonresident fathers continue to see their child(ren) after a five-year period following divorce (Blankenhorn, 1995; Stewart). This decreased involvement in their child(ren)'s lives by divorced fathers may be the result of constraints experienced by fathers following divorce. Cohen (1998) found that nonresident fathers' involvement in their child(ren)'s lives is subject to an array of constraints, resulting in decreased participation. He reported that "the role of fathering must be squeezed into short meetings under strained and artificial circumstances" (p. 200). If a father chooses to avoid these situations by not seeing his child(ren), the father likely forfeits leisure time with the child(ren).

Although nonresident fathers experience an array of constraints when trying to spend parenting time with their child(ren) (Cohen), they may also experience facilitators to parenting time that may enhance or encourage time spent together. Examples of facilitators to nonresident father's ability to spend time together with their child(ren) include two bills passed in congress during 1999. The first, the Fathers Count Act of 1999 (*H.R. bill 3073*, 1999) allocated a total of \$35,000,000 to improve fathering programs working with nonresident fathers and other cohorts of fathers. The second bill, Responsible Fatherhood Act (*S. bill 1364*, 1999) proposed dividing \$25,000,000 into support programs aimed at strengthening fragile families. Divorced, nonresident fathers are included in this section of the bill. These programs aim to facilitate parenting time among nonresident fathers by educating fathers about the importance of spending quality time with their child(ren).

By examining facilitators to nonresident fathers' parenting time, researchers can better understand what variables, such as increased income or living in a closer proximity to their children, may possibly increase fathers' time with their children. Because parenting time of nonresident fathers typically occurs in a leisure setting, the benefits of family leisure between nonresident fathers and child(ren) may also be better understood.

The benefits of shared leisure within families include but are not limited to stronger cohesion between family members, and greater adaptability in new situations (Smith, Taylor, Hill, & Zabriskie, 2001; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001, 2003). These benefits are especially important within single-parent families who have likely experienced dysfunction from divorce. Creating family leisure experiences may help ameliorate the effects of divorce in addition to creating stronger functioning between the parent and the child(ren) (Smith et al., 2004).

Given the importance of a child having an involved father following divorce, that involvement often takes the form of leisure, and that no research related to nonresident fathers' leisure with their children exists, the purpose of the study was to examine the leisure patterns of nonresident fathers as they spend time with their child(ren), and to examine leisure constraints, leisure facilitators and nonresident fathers' satisfaction with these activities.

Review of Literature

Divorce and Fathers

As a result of the increased rates of divorce over the past 50 years (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002), child(ren) often reside with one parent, leaving the other to provisional parenting time privileges. Most fathers are the nonresident parent; in fact, at least 80% of divorce arrangements favor the mother as the residential parent (Pasley & Braver, 2004).

Today, nonresident fathers play a crucial role in the lives of their child(ren). Research has demonstrated that the absence of a father, due to divorce, is associated with child(ren) who experience juvenile delinquency, difficulty in the academic arena, and higher levels of social-emotional problems when compared to child(ren) who have a father in the home (Amato & Keith, 1991). Nonresident fathers' involvement in their child(ren)'s lives is often easiest during scheduled parenting time and this parenting time is typically established by the courts and/or by the parents.

During parenting time, fathers have the opportunity to interact with their children. Research examining nonresident fathers' paternal involvement is typically conducted in social science fields such as family sciences, sociology, and psychology. These fields examine variables that impact fathers' involvement with their children following divorce (Amato & Keith; Leite & Mckenry, 2002; Palumbo, 2002). Although this research is beneficial, most interaction that takes place between nonresident fathers and their child(ren), occurs in a leisure setting (Stewart). Previous research, therefore, has not captured the leisure experiences that take place during parenting time; it is this perspective that is needed to better understand fathers' involvement with their child(ren) following divorce.

Nonresident Father Involvement

Studies examining nonresident father involvement and parenting time have inadequately addressed what actually occurs during parenting time. Menning states,

Most studies of the effect of nonresident parents on their child(ren) have been restricted to measures of parent/child contact. The lack of significance of contact in these models may be due to the use of unrefined measures. After all, parent/child contact does not by itself indicate that any activity takes place between the parents and child ... it says nothing about the denseness of the activity within the block of time that contact occurs. (p. 651)

One study that did examine what occurred during nonresident parenting time, revealed that most interaction between a nonresident parent and child tended to occur in a leisure setting (Stewart). Stewart's examination of nonresident parents' activity choices with their children is one of the few research articles examining the role of

leisure and nonresident parental involvement. Stewart's classification of leisure activities, however, was limited to only a few choices (outings, play, and school). In addition, Pasley and Braver suggested "new measures must do more to tap the recreational dimension of divorced fathers who see their children" (p. 236). Therefore, by examining leisure involvement between nonresident fathers and their child(ren), as well as the leisure constraints and facilitators to nonresident fathers' involvement, a better understanding of the "recreational dimension" of visitation patterns between nonresident fathers and their involvement may be achieved.

Leisure Constraints

In 1987, Crawford and Godbey created a conceptual model and theoretical framework for analyzing leisure constraints from an intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural perspective. They proposed leisure constraints to be "factors that are assumed by researchers and perceived or experienced by individuals to limit the formation of leisure preferences and to inhibit or prohibit participation and enjoyment in leisure" (Jackson, 1991, p. 279). In addition, they recommended further modification of the Leisure Constraints Model to explore "other lines of leisure research such as the impact of stress of crisis upon family participation in leisure activities" (p. 125). One such area of crisis impacting many American families is divorce. By examining leisure constraints from an intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural perspective, researchers can better understand the "stress" fathers experience in order to share parenting time with their children following divorce.

Crawford and Godbey defined intrapersonal barriers as involving "individual psychological states and attributes which interact with leisure preferences" (p. 122). Examples of some intrapersonal barriers nonresident fathers may experience are stress, depression, anxiety, importance ascribed to role of father, and role satisfaction (Crawford & Godbey; Leite & McKenry). Crawford and Godbey suggested these barriers are experienced at an individual psychological level and are capable of being modified over time.

Fatherhood research outside the leisure discipline has also confirmed the strength of intrapersonal barriers and their role in effective fatherhood involvement. Two particularly influential barriers are narcissism and parental grief syndrome. Cohen examined psychological disorders that developed following divorce and determined fathers with narcissism were more likely to discontinue contact with their children. Similarly, Palumbo introduced the psychological term known as "parental grief syndrome" and used it to explain certain traits he observed in fathers following divorce. These traits included becoming severely distraught and potentially harmful to themselves and others. Fathers who exhibited many of these traits were unable to interact with their children as they would like. Such interaction was also compounded by interpersonal barriers.

Interpersonal barriers examine the individual in conjunction with other individuals to determine how parties establish leisure preferences (Crawford & Godbey). These barriers help explain the dynamics between nonresident fathers, their ex-wife(s),

child(ren), family, extended family, and friends in regard to leisure following divorce. Examples of interpersonal barriers nonresident fathers may experience include “spousal interaction,” and “parent/child relationships” (Crawford & Godbey, p. 123).

Leite and McKenry found co-parental conflict to be extremely indicative of nonresident fathers' involvement with their child(ren). Likewise, McKenry and Price (1992) determined that nonresident fathers' feelings about their former spouse and children served as a predictor of frequency of parenting time. This and similar research (Menning; Palumbo) further supports the need to recognize interpersonal relationships and fathering post divorce.

Structural barriers explain outside influences affecting nonresident fathers' leisure involvement with their child(ren). Examples that might affect nonresident fathers trying to spend time with their child(ren) include, financial resources, scheduling of work time, and geographical distance between father and child(ren) (Crawford & Godbey; Leite & McKenry).

Leisure Facilitators

Leisure facilitators parallel leisure constraints as they are defined as “factors that are assumed by researchers and perceived or experienced by individuals to enable or promote the formation of leisure preferences and to encourage or enhance participation” (Raymore, 2002, p. 39). Although “facilitator” is an antonym for “constraint,” leisure facilitators typically do not directly oppose leisure constraints. For instance, body image has been identified as a constraint directly associated with swimming (James, 2000). A good body image, however, has not been associated with increased participation in swimming; if facilitators directly opposed leisure constraints then those with a good body image would have increased their participation in swimming (Raymore). Raymore suggested that facilitators are much more than the motivation to do something. Rather facilitators are a “condition that exists, whether internal to the individual, in relation to another individual, or to some societal structure that enables participation” (p. 43).

Raymore used the model proposed for leisure constraints by Crawford, Jackson, and Godbey, (1991) to categorize the three types of leisure facilitators. Intrapersonal facilitators are “individual characteristics, traits, and beliefs that enable or promote the formation of leisure preferences and that encourage or enhance participation in leisure” (pp. 42-43). Examples can be seen in one's personality type and attributes, self-efficacy, and past experiences.

Interpersonal facilitators are “those individuals or groups that enable or promote the formation of the leisure preferences and encourage or enhance participation in leisure” (Raymore, p. 43). Examples of these types of facilitators include friends, encouragement from family members, teachers, co-workers and associates, club membership, and religious organizations.

Structural facilitators are “social and physical institutions, organizations or belief systems of a society that operate external to the individual to enable or promote the

formation of leisure preferences and encourage or enhance participation in leisure” (Raymore, p. 43). Examples of structural facilitators are money, ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status.

Research examining variables that help nonresident fathers visit their child(ren) fit within the leisure facilitator perspective. Examples of facilitators include positive associations between nonresident fathers with higher incomes and visitations with their child(ren) (Sorenson & Wheaton, 2000). Fathers were also more likely to visit if they had positive attitudes toward visiting (McKenry & Price; Rane & McBride, 2000) and if they had less conflict with their ex-wife and child(ren) (Lee, 2002; McKenry & Price). Leisure facilitators are important variables to enable family leisure among nonresident fathers and their child(ren). As has been found in other family leisure research, (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003; Smith et al.; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001, 2003) by engaging in family leisure, nonresident fathers’ are more likely to experience greater cohesion and flexibility in the relationship with their child(ren).

Family Leisure Patterns

Family leisure patterns have been classified by Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) as consisting of core and balance activities. Core activities are associated with family bonding, and usually take place at home. These activities are inexpensive and often spontaneous, such as eating dinner together or playing games. Balance activities are associated with family adaptability because they enable family members to learn how to function in unusual circumstances and environments. These activities tend to be more novel and require more planning, time, and money. Activities such as family vacations or camping trips are common balance leisure activities (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

Both core and balance activities are important for developing positive family functioning. Participating in one type of activity considerably more than the other will likely not render the positive outcomes of consistently participating in both (Zabriskie, 2000; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). Beyond simple participation in family leisure activities, it is important that family members are satisfied with their family leisure involvement.

Satisfaction with Family Leisure Involvement

Satisfaction with leisure has been found to be highly indicative of life satisfaction (Russell, 1987; 1990). In 1990, Russell examined the interrelationships among leisure and other life circumstance variables, one of which was quality of life. She found that religiosity, sex, education, marital status, and age were significantly related to income, health, leisure activity participation, and leisure satisfaction. These variables, however, were not found to influence quality of life directly. The only significant and direct predictor of quality of life was satisfaction with leisure involvement.

According to Zabriskie and McCormick (2003), “[if] leisure plays a substantial role in an individual’s life satisfaction and quality of life ... then it can be hypothesized that family leisure may also be a primary contributor to family satisfaction and quality of family life” (p. 164). In order to test this hypothesis, Zabriskie and McCormick collected data from individual family members. Study participants completed a family leisure activity profile and family satisfaction scale. Findings indicated that family leisure involvement was positively associated with family satisfaction (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). Furthermore, Zabriskie and McCormick (2003) determined there was a negative relationship between families who had a history of divorce and satisfaction with family life. “Both the youth and the parents reported having significantly lower levels of satisfaction with their family life if they had ever experienced divorce in their family, whether it was a current situation or if it had happened in the recent or even distant past” (p.183). These findings suggest that nonresident fathers may be more susceptible to lower levels of leisure satisfaction and satisfaction with family life, due to divorce and the subsequent limited access to leisure time with their child(ren).

Summary and Hypotheses

As divorce has increased over the last century, more nonresident fathers are in a situation where parenting time with their child(ren) occurs through visitation times. Such parenting time tends to occur almost entirely in a leisure setting (Stewart). Little research exists, however, examining the constraints on and facilitator’s to nonresident fathers’ parenting time and leisure with their child(ren).

In addition, identifying core and balance leisure activities enables researchers to better understand what occurs during parenting time and the associated benefits to the family, and make recommendations to practitioners who work with nonresident fathers. Because family leisure is associated with family satisfaction, it is important to examine both leisure activities and nonresident fathers’ satisfaction with these activities during fathers’ parenting time. Therefore, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1. There is a relationship between leisure constraints and nonresident fathers’ satisfaction with family leisure involvement.

Hypothesis 2. There is a relationship between leisure facilitators and nonresident fathers’ satisfaction with family leisure involvement.

Hypothesis 3. There is a relationship between family leisure involvement and nonresident fathers’ satisfaction with family leisure involvement.

Methodology

Sample

The participants in this study were 129 nonresident fathers (69 unusable questionnaires were also received, which consisted of 16 electronic and 53 paper/pencil) from 36 different states within the United States. They were recruited through the Na-

tional Fatherhood Initiative (NFI) affiliate organizations, the Children's Rights Council (CRC) and the National Center for Fathers (NCF). Each organization posted a link to the survey on their web page in addition to sending out an email about the research to their organization's members. Paper/pencil versions of the survey were also mailed to the organizations to distribute to members who did not have internet access. Most fathers were Caucasian (81.5%) followed by Black (14%), Native American (3%), and Asian (1.5%). Their ages ranged from 23 to 64 years, with a mean of 44.5 ($SD = 8.7$) years. Two thirds of the fathers were currently divorced while the remaining one third were separated. Of the fathers who were divorced, about 30% were remarried and 18% lived with a significant other. The length of divorce ranged from one month to 47 years, with an average divorce length of three years, not including the time separated prior to the divorce. Of the fathers who were separated, the length of separation ranged from three months to 14 years, with an average separation time of four years.

In order to participate in the study the men had to have children between the ages of 5 and 18 years old. The reported age of the children ranged from 5 to 18 with a mean age of 11.67 ($SD = 3.8$) years. The number of children per father ranged from 1 to 5, with 35.7% of fathers having one child, 38.8% having two children, 15.5% having three children, 8.5% having four, and 1.6% having five or more children. Household income ranged from less than \$10,000 to over \$150,000 with 67% of fathers earning less than \$80,000 per year. Specifically, 19% earned less than \$20,000, 13% earned between \$20,000 – \$40,000, 18% earned between \$40,000 – \$60,000, 16% earned between \$60,000 – \$80,000, 12% earned between \$80,000 – \$100,000 and 12% earned between \$100,000 – \$150,000, 9% earned over \$150,000.

Only families living in the United States were included in the study. Fathers had to be separated or divorced for a minimum of three months in order to participate. Incarcerated fathers and fathers with disabilities were not included in this study.

Procedures

Prior to collecting data, the study was approved by Brigham Young University's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Nonresident fathers were recruited through the National Fatherhood Initiative (NFI) affiliate organizations, the Children's Rights Council (CRC) and the National Center for Fathers (NCF). Nonresident fathers who were willing to participate were given the option of completing the questionnaire online or by a paper/pencil version. The study was non-random. Consequently the results of this study are limited to those who responded to the questionnaire. Distribution of the questionnaire occurred through email or by mailing the paper/pencil version to the organization who then gave it to the respondents. Each father's consent was acquired through an informed consent statement that appeared at the beginning of the questionnaire. Participants were not compensated for participating in this study. Participants in this study may have been subject to self-selection bias.

Instrumentation

In order to achieve the purpose of this study, four instruments were used to collect the data. First, family leisure involvement that the nonresident fathers engaged in during parenting times with their child(ren) was measured using Zabriskie's (2000) Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP). Second, constraints fathers encountered to parenting time were measured using the Nonresident Father Leisure Constraint Scale (NFLCS) developed for this study based on previous constraint scales (Jackson, 1993; Kay & Jackson, 1991; McGuire, 1984; Raymore, Godbey, Crawford, & Von Eye, 1993; Witt & Goodale, 1981). Third, leisure facilitators nonresident fathers experienced during regular parenting time with their child(ren) were measured using the Nonresident Father Leisure Facilitator Scale (NFLFS) also developed for this study based on suggestions given from Raymore. Fourth, nonresident fathers' satisfaction with family leisure involvement was studied using Zabriskie and McCormick's (2003) Family Leisure Satisfaction Scale (FLSS).

The Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP) developed by Zabriskie (2000) was used to determine the types of leisure activities nonresident fathers engaged in during parenting times with their child(ren). The FLAP is a 16-item questionnaire that measures the frequency and duration of participation in core and balance activities. The first eight items measure involvement in core family leisure activities, which are related to cohesion. These activities are typically home based and tend to require little planning, such as eating dinner together or playing cards. The next eight measure balance activity in family leisure, which addresses adaptability. These activities usually require planning, preparation, and often money as they typically occur away from home. A common example is a family vacation or going to a sporting event (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

Each of the 16 FLAP items consisted of four questions and started with a closed-ended question to determine whether or not the family participated in the leisure interest. For example, "Do you participate in home-based activities (for example watching TV/Videos, listening to music, reading books, singing, etc.) during parenting time with your children?" If the participant answered yes, they were then asked about the duration and frequency of their participation in that activity group. The fourth question for each FLAP item asked if the fathers were satisfied with their level of involvement in the activity, even if they did not participate in the activity. Before beginning the questionnaire participants were instructed to answer the questions in terms of "groups of activities as opposed to any one specific example" offered in the questionnaire.

The FLAP has demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties in terms of construct validity, content validity, inter-rater reliability, and test retest reliability for core ($r = .74$), balance ($r = .78$), and total family leisure involvement ($r = .78$) (Freeman & Zabriskie).

To calculate scores for the FLAP, the frequency and duration of participation for each activity category were multiplied, creating an ordinal index. The eight core items were then summed to produce a core family leisure index. A balance family leisure

index was computed following the same process. Total family leisure involvement was calculated by summing the core and balance scores (Freeman & Zabriskie).

Constraints on fathers' leisure time with their child(ren) was measured using the Nonresident Father Leisure Constraint Scale (NFLCS). It was developed based on the work of Jackson (1993); Kay and Jackson; McGuire; Raymore et al. (1993); and Witt and Goodale. Questions were grouped by intrapersonal, interpersonal and structural constraints. Redundant and inapplicable questions were omitted from the list and then modifications were made to some questions for clarification and fit. A pilot study was conducted with the new instrument to assess the applicability of the questions to non-resident fathers and to clarify the questions. Twenty nonresident fathers participated in the pilot study. Fathers came from three different states within the United States: Virginia (East coast), Montana (Northwest), and Utah (Southwest). The age of the participants in the pilot study ranged from 32 to 62 with a mean age of 42 ($SD = 8.08$). Income ranged from 20,000 to over 150,000. The ethnicity of participants in the pilot study was also similar to the national sample.

Based on responses from the pilot study, a "not applicable" category was offered for fathers who felt certain constraints did not fit their specific situation. For example, several fathers felt uncomfortable answering "not important" to the question "I am too depressed [to visit]" because they felt they were admitting to having depression by marking "not important" when they simply had no symptoms of depression. Sample results from the pilot study and current study rendered acceptable internal consistency of the NFLCS (pilot study, $\alpha = .92$, current study, $\alpha = .94$).

Facilitators to fathers' leisure with their child(ren) was measured using the Non-resident Father Leisure Facilitator Scale (NFLFS). The scale was developed based on the concept of facilitators introduced by Raymore. Because she was the first to suggest the concept of facilitators, questions were not based on previous research. Raymore's suggestions for facilitators were grouped into the three traditional constraint categories of intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural. Therefore, items were written to reflect facilitators within the three categories as well as to reflect items found in research on nonresident fathering. For example, the question, "I am confident that I will have a good visit," is an intrapersonal facilitator examining the father's morale toward the parenting time. The question, "My ex-wife is helpful with the visits," is an interpersonal question looking at the relationship between the husband and wife and what may facilitate time between the father and child. Finally, "I have reliable transportation" is an example of a structural facilitator question. The same pilot study sample as described above was also used to test this instrument. Based on the pilot study, a "not applicable" category was also added to the table of options for fathers who did not experience certain facilitators. From the pilot study data, adequate internal consistency of the NFLCS was achieved ($\alpha = .86$). Acceptable internal consistency was also attained for this study sample ($\alpha = .90$).

When fathers were asked about certain constraints or facilitators they were asked to rank how important these items were in affecting their visitation with their child(ren). Responses to each item on the constraint and facilitator scales ranged from 1 (not im-

portant) to 4 (very important); additionally a 0 was used for items that respondents felt were not applicable to their specific situation. Total leisure constraint and facilitator scores were calculated by summing up each category (intrapersonal, interpersonal, or structural) into a total leisure constraint or facilitator score. Jackson (1993) states, "While this procedure suffers from the limitation of obscuring the types of constraints felt by respondents, it offers the opportunity of identifying sub-groups . . . of leisure constraints" (p. 134).

The fathers' satisfaction with their family leisure involvement was measured using the Family Leisure Satisfaction Scale (FLSS) (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). Following each of the 16 FLAP questions, a follow-up question asked, "How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities?" Participants were asked to identify their satisfaction using a Likert scale from 1 indicating "very dissatisfied" to 5 indicating "very satisfied" (Freeman & Zabriskie). Even if a father did not participate in the given activity this question was important because a father may have been "very satisfied" with his nonparticipation. Scoring for the FLSS was calculated by summing responses to the 16 items (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003).

Demographic information was also collected at the end of the questionnaire and included the age of the nonresident fathers and each of their child(ren), race of the nonresident fathers and each of their child(ren), household income, marital history, duration of time since divorce, and zip code of the fathers.

Data Analysis

Pearson product-moment zero-order correlations between study variables were examined for multicollinearity as well as to identify possible controlling factors that could be included in the subsequent regression equation. Socio-demographic variables indicating significant zero-order correlation coefficients with the dependent variable, as well as other socio-demographic variables thought to be theoretically related to the dependent variables were included as controls in the multiple regression models. The control factors were included to examine the unique contributions of leisure constraints, leisure facilitators and family leisure involvement to family leisure satisfaction (Freeman & Zabriskie).

A blocked multiple regression analysis was used to examine the contributions to satisfaction with family leisure involvement. The sociodemographic variables were entered in the first block followed by total constraints in the second block, and then core and balance family leisure involvement scores in the third block. The multiple correlation coefficients (R^2) were examined for the resulting model at an alpha level of .05, and standardized regression coefficients (Beta) determined the relative contribution of the variables in each significant block.

Results

Nonresident fathers' satisfaction with leisure time spent with their child(ren) scores ranged from 16 to 80 with a mean score of 54.62 ($SD = 14.94$). Total leisure constraints

scores for the nonresident fathers ranged from 0 to 101 with a mean constraint score of 32.78 ($SD = 21.72$). More specifically, intrapersonal constraints ranged from 0 to 36 with a mean score of 9.92 ($SD = 8.02$), interpersonal constraints scores ranged from 0 to 23 with a mean score of 8.48 ($SD = 5.95$), and structural constraints scores ranged from 0 to 43 with a mean score of 14.37 ($SD = 8.94$).

Total leisure facilitators scores ranged from 0 to 111 with a mean score of 74.11 ($SD = 20.17$). Specifically, intrapersonal facilitators ranged from 0 to 44 with a mean score of 34.92 ($SD = 8.50$), interpersonal facilitators ranged from 0 to 34 with a mean score of 15.98 ($SD = 6.99$), and structural facilitators ranged from 0 to 36 with a mean score of 23.20 ($SD = 7.58$).

The core family leisure index score reflected the core leisure pattern of the nonresident fathers during parenting time with their children. They ranged from 0 to 132 with a mean score of 41.80 ($SD = 26.77$). Balance family leisure index scores indicative of the balance leisure pattern with their children during parenting time ranged from 0 to 179 with a mean score of 41.65. ($SD = 28.39$). Total family leisure ranged from 0 to 221 with a mean score of 83.46 ($SD = 46.068$).

Examination of zero-order correlation coefficients indicated a number of significant relationships among the study variables (Table 1). Fathers who were Caucasian indicated higher levels of satisfaction with family leisure involvement than did fathers of ethnic minority. Zero-order correlation coefficients also indicated that fathers with higher incomes perceived greater satisfaction with family leisure involvement. In addition, based on the zero-order correlations, as perceptions of constraints decreased, satisfaction with family leisure involvement increased. Leisure facilitators, however, were not significantly related to satisfaction with family leisure involvement. Finally, greater involvement in both core and balance family leisure was related to higher satisfaction with family leisure involvement.

Following univariate analyses, a blocked multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine if leisure constraints and family leisure patterns contributed to the explanation of satisfaction with family leisure involvement beyond the zero-order relationships (Table 2). The first block containing the sociodemographic variables did account for a statistically significant portion of the variance in satisfaction with family leisure involvement ($R^2 = .124$; $p < .001$) and income was the only significant multivariate positive predictor. The addition of the second block that included total leisure constraints resulted in a statistically significant change ($R^2\Delta = .108$; $p < .0001$) in variance explained in satisfaction with family leisure involvement but income was no longer a significant contributor to the model. The total leisure facilitator's score was not included in the analysis since it was not significant at the zero-order level. The third block containing core and balance patterns also resulted in a statistically significant change ($R^2\Delta = .222$; $p < .0001$) in variance explained in satisfaction with family leisure involvement. Both core and balance patterns were significant predictors of family leisure satisfaction and total leisure constraints also remained statistically significant.

Table 1
Zero Order Correlations among Study Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. FLSS	1	-.008	.073	.331**	.248**	.004	-.435**	-.411**	-.491**	-.357**	.037	.046	-.076	.111	.447**	.549**	.598**
2. Number of kids		1	-.063	.069	.033	.098	-.062	-.078	-.038	-.054	.082	.082	.146	.001	.079	.177*	.155
3. Age			1	.361**	.238**	-.123	-.204*	-.187*	-.184*	-.208*	-.069	-.090	-.174*	.060	-.030	.141	.070
4. Income				1	.456**	-.114	-.349**	-.302**	-.358**	-.343**	-.008	.003	-.177*	.123	.050	.318**	.225*
5. Ethnicity					1	-.222*	-.291**	-.248**	-.329**	-.266**	-.087	-.021	-.251**	.020	.181*	.348**	.320**
6. Remarried						1	.095	.037	.099	.142	.049	.025	.115	-.001	.046	.011	.034
7. Total con.							1	.958**	.915**	.961**	.040	.004	.207*	-.080	-.350**	-.245**	-.354**
8. Structural con.								1	.806**	.881**	.070	.026	.194*	-.017	-.317**	-.233**	-.328**
9. Interpersonal con.									1	.836**	-.004	-.037	.168	-.115	-.381**	-.288**	-.399**
10. Intrapersonal con										1	.032	.008	.219*	-.111	-.311**	-.189*	-.297**
11. Total facilitators											1	.917**	.823**	.878**	.014	.091	.064
12. Structural fac.												1	.675**	.728**	.057	.107	.099
13. Interpersonal fac.													1	.528**	-.015	.059	.027
14. Intrapersonal fac.														1	-.004	.072	.042
15. Core activities															1	.394**	.824**
16. Balance activities																1	.845**
17. Total leisure																	1

Note. * $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed); ** $p < 0.001$ (2-tailed); FLSS = family leisure satisfaction scale

Table 2
 Blocked Regression Equation Predicating Family Leisure Satisfaction

Variable	B	SE B	Beta
Block 1 $R^2 = .124$ ($p < .01$)			
Number of children	-.337	1.258	-.023
Income	1.192	.418	.272*
Ethnic Group	4.928	3.645	.129
Block 2 $R^2 = .108$ ($p < .01$)			
Number of children	-.607	1.185	-.041
Income	.791	.405	.181
Ethnic group	2.380	3.482	.062
Total constraints	-.245	.059	-.356**
Block 3 $R^2 = .222$ ($p < .01$)			
Number of children	-1.809	1.023	-.121
Income	.629	.355	.144
Ethnic group	-1.768	3.018	-.046
Total constraints	-.161	.053	-.234*
Core	.123	.043	.220*
Balance	.208	.041	.395**

Note. * $p < .01$; ** $p < .001$; $n = 128$; Total $R^2 = .454$

Discussion

Overall, findings indicated increased leisure constraints to be influential in determining a nonresident fathers parenting time with his children and a nonresident fathers' satisfaction during parenting time. Leisure facilitators were not influential in increasing parenting time for nonresident fathers, nor did they influence the fathers' satisfaction.

Leisure Constraints

As constraints increased, nonresident fathers' participation in leisure with their child decreased ($r = -.354$). Constraints influenced nonresident fathers' participation in core activities ($r = -.350$) more than balance activities ($r = -.245$) when spending parenting time with their child(ren). In previous research (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003;

Zabriskie, 2000; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001; 2003) core activities have consistently been correlated with cohesion (an aspect of family functioning). If nonresident fathers are unable to establish a pattern of core activities due to constraints, it is more likely that cohesion, and subsequently their family functioning, may be affected.

As the number of constraints increased, nonresident fathers' satisfaction with leisure involvement with their child(ren) decreased (Table 2). Furthermore, when broken down into sub-categories of constraints, the strongest relationship between constraints and family leisure satisfaction was interpersonal ($r = -.491$), followed by structural ($r = -.411$) and then intrapersonal ($r = -.357$). The relationship between increased constraints and decreased satisfaction with leisure supports the research of Shaw, Bonen, and McCabe (1991). They examined over 14,500 adult men and women who had indicated a preference for higher levels of participation in physically active leisure and found they experienced decreased enjoyment with leisure as leisure constraints increased.

Given the nature of divorce (interpersonal conflict likely contributed to the divorce), it is not surprising that interpersonal constraints contributed the most to these fathers' satisfaction with family leisure. The item on the constraint scale with the highest level of agreement among nonresident fathers when asked why they were unable to visit their child(ren) or unable to visit their children as often as they could was "not being at ease with their former spouse."

Structural constraints were the second highest type of constraint associated with the nonresident fathers' satisfaction with family leisure. Examples of structural constraints fathers may have experienced were low income, ethnicity, and time. The item with the second highest level of agreement among the nonresident fathers was "wanting to visit on a different schedule than the current arrangement," which was categorized as a structural constraint.

Intrapersonal constraints followed structural constraints in magnitude of its relationship to nonresident fathers' satisfaction with family leisure. Interestingly, the item with the third-highest level of agreement marked by nonresident fathers as to why they did not visit their children or visit them more often was the experience of "having no role as a parent who lives away from the family." This reflects a cognitive perception of the fathers that is indicative of an intrapersonal constraint. Nonresident fathers must adjust their position in the family both mentally and physically while still trying to maintain a parenting figure in the lives of their child(ren) (Carter & McGoldrick, 1999).

Family Leisure Activities

Part of the process needed to engage in core activities calls for a home-based environment in order for individuals to engage in leisure freely and spontaneously. Given the "away from home" relationship nonresident fathers' are required to maintain with their children, it is likely that nonresident fathers do not experience the environment needed to engage in core activities. The exception to this observation would be during extended visits such as over the holidays or summers, and if the child(ren) were to live

with the nonresident father long enough to establish a routine and likewise be in an environment comfortable enough to engage in core leisure activities.

Although the examination of preparation for core activities was beyond the scope of this study, these findings suggest that the process required to plan for core activities by the fathers' may have been more similar to balance activities. For instance, although nonresident fathers' were asked about specific core activities (such as eating dinner together) they were not asked about the process they undertook to actually eat dinner with their child(ren). If a nonresident father underwent moderate amounts of planning and preparation (i.e., waiting for his scheduled parenting time, planning transportation for the child[ren] or himself, engaging in the activity, and returning the child[ren] back home or going home himself) then a typical core activity would likely resemble more of a balance activity due to the process by which the father followed to engage in the activity.

This possible explanation poses some difficulty for nonresident fathers. Core activities aid in facilitating cohesion between the child(ren) and the nonresident parent. Subsequently, from participating in core activities, balance activities may occur more smoothly. In this study, balance activities were participated in significantly less than by dual parent families in a comparison sample (Hornberger, 2007). The nonresident fathers ($n = 129$) had a mean balance involvement score of 41.65 ($SD = 28.39$) and author's dual parent families ($n = 154$) had an average involvement score of 50.95 ($SD = 25.28$). The balance activities characterized in this study included those that required money and time (e.g., traveling, camping, water sports, etc.). Due to the correlation between income and leisure activities, the data suggests that most nonresident fathers in the sample may not have the means to engage in the more typical balance activities achieved by dual parent families. In addition, it seems the balance activities may be replacing the typical core activities due to the necessary planning and time it takes to have family dinner together or participating in some other core activity as a family.

Leisure Facilitators

Although constraints were significantly correlated with nonresident fathers' satisfaction with family leisure, facilitators were not. This finding mirrors other findings regarding fatherhood programs that attempted to facilitate parenting time between nonresident fathers and their children that were met with little success. Specifically, Parents Fair Share (PFS) is one of many organizations focused on helping lower-income nonresident fathers with finances with the hope of increasing fatherhood involvement. In 2001, their annual report stated, "On average the program did not increase the fathers' level of visitation" (Miller, 2001, p. 8). Although PFS tried to alleviate the financial constraints nonresident fathers experienced due to child support obligations by assisting fathers financially, their efforts had little to no effect on increasing contact between the nonresident father and child. It appears that leisure facilitators do not impact nonresident fathers' parenting time with their child(ren) the same way leisure constraints do.

This finding may be explained by a theory known as *vis-à-vis* marriage (Gottman & Silver, 1999). Gottman asserted that in order for relationships (marriage and others) simply to survive, five positive strokes (e.g., positive communication, body language, gift giving) must be paired up with every one negative stroke (e.g., criticism, blaming, withholding affection). Furthermore, in order for a relationship to flourish, the positive strokes must significantly outweigh the negative beyond a five to one ratio. Likewise, facilitators of nonresident fathers parenting time with their children are similar to positive strokes in that they enable the parent/child relationship to sustain itself. On the other hand, constraints to nonresident fathers' parenting time with their children parallel negative strokes as they are likely to diminish the quality of the relationship. Therefore, if nonresident fathers experience more constraints to facilitators or even an equal number of facilitators to constraints, the weight of one facilitator may not be enough to combat a constraint. This would leave the nonresident father less satisfied with the overall time spent together, and lend the constraint to be more indicative of a father's satisfaction than facilitators.

Further research. Because no significant relationship was found between satisfaction with family leisure and leisure facilitators, further investigation is needed to better understand the role of leisure facilitators in promoting leisure time between nonresident fathers and their child(ren) as well as the role facilitators play in satisfaction with family life and family leisure. Perhaps a different framework, such as Gottman and Silver's (1999) *vis-à-vis* theory, may be used to examine the role of facilitators in both increased leisure time and family relationship development. By examining leisure facilitators from different perspectives, researchers may better understand and use leisure facilitators to combat constraints to parenting time that cannot be removed (e.g., ex-wife, child support, distance, and different living arrangements).

Leisure involvement by nonresident parents and constraints related to other outcomes or quality of life variables, such as satisfaction with family life, family functioning, and life satisfaction, should also be examined. This would enable researchers to more closely understand the role of leisure and its influence on increasing nonresident fathers' satisfaction with their leisure and possibly their quality of life. In addition, a closer examination of the three types of constraints (intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural) should be examined to better understand the role of constraint negotiation and nonresident father involvement in parenting time.

Although core and balance activities were significantly related to family leisure satisfaction in this study, an additional framework for examining the process of how the leisure activity took place may be needed. This would help researchers adequately understand nonresident fathers' leisure due to the unique circumstances of nonresident fathers during parenting time with their child(ren).

Applications for practitioners. In order to increase involvement between nonresident fathers and their child(ren), it is recommended that practitioners, specifically public officials, researchers, and organizations interested in helping fathers engage in productive parenting time, focus on identifying constraints to leisure and finding ways

to obviate these constraints, versus creating facilitating experiences. Based on the vis-a-vis marriage theory (Gottman & Silver) and the minimum five positive strokes to one negative stroke ratio, it seems that removing one constraint to increase parenting time would be more productive than creating five facilitators in attempt to negate a constraint. Additionally, by removing constraints, the fathers and the children do not have to negotiate those constraints in order to participate and can focus on other aspects of the process to participate together in leisure.

Obviously, not every constraint experienced by nonresident fathers can be eliminated; professionals working to increase fatherhood time should focus on teaching nonresident fathers constraint negotiation skills. These skills will help fathers learn how to continue interaction with their child(ren) while experiencing constraints. For example, fathers who encounter conflict with their ex-wife while trying to spend parenting time with their child(ren) may learn and develop techniques to ameliorate the conflict as encounters occur. The type of constraints negotiation could change depending on the nonresident father and his specific situation. Nonresident fathers and professionals must realize that through learning leisure constraint negotiation, participation in parenting time can occur. Participation in leisure during parenting time may positively impact nonresident fathers and their child(ren). In addition, when leisure time increases nonresident fathers' leisure satisfaction tends to increase, this satisfaction is related to life satisfaction which is one of the best predictors of quality of life.

It is also recommended to those who work with nonresident fathers to encourage them to make additional effort to engage in core activities with their children during extended visits. Because extended visits may create a familiar environment for the child(ren) the process for core activities would likely occur. Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) found children reported higher levels of satisfaction with family leisure when engaging in core activities with their family members. This illustrates the importance of core activities to children. Additionally, core activities have been consistently related to cohesion (Freeman & Zabriskie; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001, 2003). If nonresident fathers can create an environment for core activities to occur through extended visits, cohesion may increase between the father and child(ren). For fathers who cannot spend extended periods of time with their children, it is recommended to begin developing "core-like" activities by engaging in activities that are in a familiar environment for the father and child. If this environment does not exist, it may be created by establishing a regular meeting place which over time should create familiarity. When the father and child(ren) feel comfortable in this environment core activities are more likely to occur and in turn, cohesion increase.

Once core activities are in place nonresident fathers will likely have a more cohesive base between themselves and their child(ren) upon which their relationship can grow and be strengthened. Balance activities, on the other hand, tend to create flexibility in the relationship between nonresident fathers and their child(ren). These activities are typically done in a less familiar environment and usually require more time, money, and planning. Nonresident fathers' who do not have access to their children for longer periods of time are also at a disadvantage when engaging in balance activities, because

traditional balance activities (i.e., camping, travel, summer vacations) require longer periods of time for participation. It is recommended that nonresident fathers create balance activities by planning with their child(ren), during their time together in their familiar environment, an extraordinary activity in the near future that can be anticipated and organized together. The additional planning for this activity should create a distinction between typical activities that occur during parenting time. Although the activity may have to be the same length of time as other parenting time together, necessary planning and preparation should help create flexibility between the nonresident father and child(ren) as their planning likely will include communication and compromise.

Increased cohesion from the core activities and the increased flexibility developed by nonresident fathers and their child(ren) from the balance activities foster positive growth in family relationships (Freeman & Zabriskie; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001, 2003). The growth developed from these activities typically results in increased family functioning, a characteristic especially needed by nonresident fathers and their child(ren) following divorce.

References

- Amato, P. R., & Keith, B. (1991). Parental divorce and the well-being of children: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *110*, 26-46.
- Blankenhorn, D. G. (1995). *Fatherless America: Confronting our most urgent social problem*. New York: HarperCollins Publisher.
- Carter, B., & McGoldrick, M. (1999). *The expanded family life cycle: Individual, family and social perspectives*. 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cohen, O. (1998). Parental narcissism and the disengagement of the noncustodial father after divorce. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *26*, 195-215.
- Crawford, D. W., & Godbey, G. (1987). Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, *9*, 119-127.
- Crawford, D. W., Jackson, E. L., & Godbey, G. (1991). A hierarchical model of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, *13*, 309-320.
- Freeman, P., & Zabriskie, R. B. (2003). Leisure and family functioning in adoptive families: Implications for therapeutic recreation. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, *37*(1), 73-93.
- Gottman, J., & Silver, N. (1999). *The seven principles for making marriage work: A practical guide from the countries foremost relationship expert*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Hornberger, L. (2007). Contributions of family leisure to family functioning among single-parent families. Unpublished masters thesis, Brigham Young University, Provo.
- House of Representatives (H.R.) bill 3073, 106D, Cong. Rec. 11880-11886 (1999). (inactive).
- Jackson, E. L. (1991). Leisure constraints/constrained leisure: Special issue introduction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *23*, 285-297.
- Jackson, E. L. (1993). Recognizing patterns of leisure constraints: Results from alternative analyses. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *25*(2), 129-149.
- James, K. (2000). You can feel them looking at you: The experience of adolescent girls at swimming pools. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *32*(2), 262-280.

- Kay, T., & Jackson, G. (1991). Leisure despite constraint: The impact of leisure constraints on leisure participation. *Journal of Leisure Research, 23*, 301-313.
- Lee, M. (2002). Analysis of children's post divorce behavioral adjustment in maternal and dual residence arrangements. *Journal of Family Issues, 23*(5), 672-697.
- Leite, R. W., & McKenry, P. C. (2002). Aspects of father's status and post divorce father involvement with children. *Journal of Family Issues, 23*, 601-623.
- McGuire, F. A. (1984). A factor analytic study of leisure constraints in advanced adulthood. *Leisure Sciences, 6*(3), 313-326.
- McKenry, P. C., & Price, S. J. (1992). Predictors of single, noncustodial fathers' physical involvement with their child(ren). *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 153*, 305-320.
- Menning, L. C. (2002). Absent parents are more than money: The joint effect of activities and financial support on youth's educational attainment. *Journal of Family Issues, 23*, 648-671.
- Miller, C. (2001). The challenge of helping low-income fathers support their child(ren): Final lessons from parents fair share. *Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation*. Retrieved February 14, 2005, from <http://www.mdrc.org/publications/104/full.pdf>
- Palumbo, R. (2002, November). Parental grief syndrome. Letter to the United States Attorney General, retrieved September 13, 2008, from http://www.familieslink.co.uk/pages/courts_USA_parental_grief_syndrome.htm
- Pasley, K., & Braver, S. L. (2004). Measuring father involvement in divorced nonresidential fathers. In R. D. Day & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement* (pp. 217-240). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rane, T. R., & McBride, B. A. (2000). Identity theory as a guide to understanding fathers' involvement with their children. *Journal of Family Issues, 21*(3), 347-366.
- Raymore, L. (2002). Facilitators to leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research, 34*(1), 37-51.
- Raymore, L., Godbey, G., Crawford, D., & Von Eye, A. (1993). Nature and process of leisure constraints: An empirical test. *Leisure Sciences, 15*, 99-113.
- Russell, R. (1987). The importance of recreation satisfaction and activity participation to the life satisfaction of age-segregated retirees. *Journal of Leisure Research, 19*(4), 273-283.
- Russell, R. V. (1990). Recreation and quality of life in old age: A causal analysis. *Journal of Applied Gerontology, 9*, 77-90.
- Senate (S.) bill 1364, 106D, Cong. Rec. 8507 (1999) (inactive).
- Shaw, S. M., Bonen, A., & McCabe, J. (1991). Do more constraints mean less leisure? Examining the relationship between constraints and participation. *Journal of Leisure Research, 27*, 245-263.
- Smith, K. M., Taylor, S., Hill, B. J., & Zabriskie, R. B. (2004). Family functioning and leisure in single-parent families. In W. T. Borrie & D. L. Kerstetter (Eds.), *Abstracts from the 2004 Leisure Research Symposium* (p. 53). Ashburn, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Sorenson, E., & Wheaton, L., (2000). Income and demographic characteristics of nonresident fathers in 1993. Prepared for the office of the assistant secretary for planning and evaluation. Department of Health and Human Services. Washington, DC. Retrieved February 11, 2005, from <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/nonresfathers00/>
- Stewart, S. D. (1999). Disneyland dads, Disneyland moms: How nonresident parents spend time with absent child(ren). *Journal of Family Issues, 20*, 539-556.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2002). Children's living arrangements and characteristics: March 2002. *U.S. Department of Commerce*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Witt, P. A., & Goodale, T. L. (1981). The relationship between barriers to leisure enjoyment and family stages. *Leisure Sciences, 4*(1), 29-49.

- Zabriskie, R. B. (2000). An examination of family and leisure behavior among families with middle school aged child(ren). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.
- Zabriskie, R. B. (2001). The validity and reliability of the Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP). In M. E. Havitz & M. F. Floyed (Eds.), *Abstracts from the 2001 Symposium on Leisure Research* (p. 66). Ashburn, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2001). The influences of family leisure patterns on perceptions of family functioning. *Family Relations, 50*, 281-289.
- Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2003). Parent and children perspectives of family leisure involvement and satisfaction with family life. *Journal of Leisure Research, 35*(2), 163-189.